

---

**Community Call to Action (CC2A) Pilot Program**

**Program Review**

---

**Final Report**

Stephen Morrow, Jo Thomson

Canberra, 11 October 2010

**Acronyms**

<b>ACRONYM</b>	<b>NAME</b>
ACFID	Australian Council for International Development
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
B4MD	Business for Millennium Development
BKFA	Birthing Kit Foundation Australia
CBO	Community based organisation
CC2A	Community Call to Action
GAP	Grant Appraisal Panel
M & E	Monitoring and evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NGO	Non governmental organisation
QAE	Quality at Entry
QAI	Quality at Implementation
TA	Technical Assistance
TOR	Terms of Reference
YWAM	Youth With a Mission

## **Executive Summary**

- a) The Community Call to Action (CC2A) Pilot program was developed in response to the Parliamentary Secretary for International Development's concern to engage the commitment and energy of domestic CSOs with grass-roots community reach but without AusAID accreditation, and to provide support to them for small scale overseas development activities they were undertaking.
- b) A CC2A program design was developed by AusAID and articulated in the document entitled *Community Engagement Fund Design Document January 2009*. The goal and objective were specified as:
  - Goal: to strengthen the commitment & efforts of the Australian community to reduce international poverty and achieve the MDGs;
  - Objective: to engage a broader range of Australian organisations with reach into the Australian community in local and global development efforts.
- c) AusAID adapted this design to address a number of concerns about risk, to accommodate a budget reduction from \$6m to \$1.5m, and also to address other priorities and recommendations to strengthen development awareness in the wider community.
- d) The CC2A Pilot Program was launched in mid 2009. At this stage, the program design was articulated in a range of information/guideline documents published on the AusAID website but it was not described in a single program design document. Although the original design was peer reviewed, the CC2A Pilot Program with the reduced budget did not benefit from AusAID due diligence processes such as peer review and QAE analysis.
- e) There is no explicit goal or objective(s) for the CC2A Pilot Program but the intention was variously described as:
  - To support activities to raise awareness about global poverty and the MDGs;
  - To engage with a broader range of Australian groups;
  - To reduce poverty and achieve the MDGs.
- f) The absence of a formal design document for the CC2A Pilot Program with objectives, an M&E framework, a risk management plan and a resourcing strategy, combined with the subsequent use of implicit rather than explicit objectives to guide implementation, left significant scope for ambiguity. In this context risk management was addressed primarily through AusAID's relationship management with participating CSOs, and the focus of the pilot program was at the outputs level, with limited regard for outcomes. This necessarily limits capacity to assess the impact of the program.
- g) That said, the CC2A Program was highly relevant at its inception and it remains relevant to Australia's global, national and agency level priorities and commitments. It gives effect to Australia's commitments under the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action, the Government's National Compact, and AusAID's Domestic Communications Strategy. It is consistent with peer international donor practice.
- h) The CC2A Pilot Program is being implemented in 2010. It is a \$1.5m program with almost \$1.4m disbursed as grants of \$27,300 to \$150,000 to thirteen CSOs. Twelve project proposals explicitly focus on raising awareness of the MDGs in their objectives, one does

so implicitly. The activities are wide ranging and encompass the three main distinct but overlapping categories of awareness raising i.e. development information/ communication; advocacy and campaigning; and development education.

- i) The CSO reports indicate that the CC2A Pilot Program activities have directly ‘reached’ well over 50,000 people to date i.e. engaged them in direct face to face discussions, seminars, workshops, lectures etc. about the MDGs. They have indirectly ‘reached’ well over 240,000 people. These numbers will increase as some of the activities continue throughout 2010. Further, there has been extensive and overwhelmingly positive media coverage of CC2A activities across the country in local, state and national media.
- j) It is important to note that ‘reach’ does not necessarily equate to increased knowledge of the MDGs and it was not possible to assess the impact of the CC2A Pilot Program. However, the CC2A Pilot Program is providing remarkable leverage for AusAID and value for money in terms of engaging the wider Australian community in development issues. Significantly, the nature and level of that engagement is unclear.
- k) Other positive aspects of the CC2A Pilot Program reported by the CSOs included the opportunity to increase self learning and internal capacity development. For example, five of the 13 CSOs are on a pathway to AusAID accreditation and the CC2A Pilot Program enabled them to engage with AusAID in a relatively low risk activity, to strengthen their knowledge, understanding and work around the MDGs, and also their knowledge of AusAID systems and process including risk management, thus strengthening their own organisational capacity and preparation.
- l) In very general terms and using only approximate means of assessment, the CC2A Pilot Program has achieved the first two of the ‘implicit objectives’ i.e. it has supported activities seeking to raise awareness about global poverty and the MDGs; and it has enabled AusAID to engage or work with a broader range of Australian groups. These ‘implicit objectives’ were appropriate, ‘successfully achieved’ and remain relevant.
- m) The third ‘implicit objective’, to reduce poverty and achieve the MDGs, was ill conceived and unreasonably ambitious and not surprisingly has not been achieved.
- n) As noted in g) above, the CC2A Pilot Program is relevant to Australia’s global and national level priorities and commitment, and thus contributes to Australia’s work and reputation in terms of good global citizenship. At the agency level it is also relevant to the Communications Strategy and gives effect to public service agency principles of best practice when it creates space for citizen engagement in policy debates, and when it promotes transparency in the policy processes.
- o) The Review Team recommends that AusAID continue the CC2A program to a second phase. However, the *sine qua non* for proceeding is that Phase II of the CC2A Program should undergo a formal design process to ensure there is one agreed goal and one set of objectives which underpin all aspects of the program, and which are communicated to all stakeholders in the program. A number of other recommendations or points for consideration are presented throughout this report.

## **Recommendations**

### **a) Recommendation/Finding**

*The Review Team recommends that AusAID continue the CC2A program to a second phase subject to AusAID's clarification of the objectives to ensure they underpin all aspects of the program. A number of other points or parameters will be addressed throughout this report for consideration in the design process of a second phase.*

### **b) Recommendation/Finding**

*The Review Team finds that the Pilot Program did not have any explicitly documented Objectives. However, the pared back intent of the original CC2A Design Document provided some implicit 'objectives' for the CC2A Pilot Program which were generally known by all stakeholders. The first two implicit 'objectives' of the Pilot program were appropriate, achieved successfully and remain relevant.*

*The Review Team considers the original CC2A Program Goal and Objective to be well conceived, appropriate and relevant:*

**Goal:** *to strengthen the commitment & efforts of the Australian community to reduce international poverty and achieve the MDGs; and*

**Objective:** *to engage a broader range of Australian organisations with reach into the Australian community in local and global development efforts.*

*The Review Team recommends that AusAID undertake a **formal CC2A Phase II design exercise** in which this goal can be revisited and affirmed or intentionally modified to clarify the strategic goal of the CC2A program and any subsidiary objectives.*

### **c) Recommendation/Finding**

*The CC2A Pilot Program did not have a formal design nor has it benefitted from AusAID's own internal design and peer review processes. As a result it was implemented using only an implicit set of 'objectives'.*

*Phase II of the CC2A Program should undergo a formal design process to ensure there is one agreed goal and one set of objectives which are then communicated to all stakeholders in the program, including AusAID staff, CSOs seeking to apply, and other stakeholders such as the media and other members of the broader Australian community.*

### **d) Recommendation/Finding**

*The Review recommends the use of a clear and simple set of criteria which reflect a balance between activity quality and organisational capacity as well as value for money. For the purposes of transparency and fairness, clear selection criteria must be communicated to the applicants prior to submission.*

**e) Recommendation/Finding**

*The Review Team recommends as part of a formal design process to be undertaken for Phase II of the CC2A, a program level M&E Framework be developed.*

**f) Recommendation/Finding**

*Participating CSOs should follow good practice standards in their reporting and disaggregate data by gender.*

**g) Recommendation/Finding**

*As it is currently structured (i.e. in the absence of development effectiveness and quality management measures) with the aim of awareness raising in the Australian community, the CC2A program should primarily fund in-Australia activities, and only fund overseas aid activities if they are a minor but cohesive element of the proposal. If this occurs, specific monitoring arrangements should be agreed during implementation to ensure reasonable development practice, with due regard to the cost of such arrangements and value for money in terms of verifiable results in awareness raising in the Australian community.*

*The Review Team recommends that the issue of in-Australia and/or overseas activities be interrogated further in a CC2A phase II design exercise.*

**h) Recommendation/Finding**

*The Review Team recommends that CC2A grants are significantly less than funding available to Base level accredited NGOs under AusAID's ANCP scheme.*

## **Table of Contents**

### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1. Background
- 1.2. Objectives of the review
- 1.3. Methodology
- 1.4. Limits/constraints

### **2. Overview of CC2A Pilot Program performance**

### **3. Review of Pilot Program Objectives**

- 3.1. Relevance of the CC2A Pilot Program
- 3.2. Assessment of the CC2A Pilot Program Objectives

### **4. Review of the design, selection process and risk management of the CC2A Pilot Program**

- 4.1. Design
- 4.2. Funding guidelines and selection process
- 4.3. Monitoring and reporting
- 4.4. Risk management

### **5. Review of 13 CC2A Pilot Program Activities**

- 5.1. General
- 5.2. In-Australia and/or overseas activities
- 5.3. Accreditation: early steps: grant size

### **6. Issues for consideration in a second phase of the CC2A program**

- 6.1. General
- 6.2. Scale of a second phase: AusAID – Contractor management
- 6.3. Baseline information
- 6.4. Synergies: starting off
- 6.5. Fundraising
- 6.6. Definition of terms: awareness raising
- 6.7. Managing potential conflict of interest

### **7. Conclusions**

#### **Annexes:**

- Annex 1:** Terms of reference
- Annex 2:** Review of international donor practice
- Annex 3:** Review schedule and list of informants
- Annex 4:** Performance assessment framework & key questions

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Background

With rapid globalisation and increasing interconnectedness between Australia and other countries at all levels, the Parliamentary Secretary for International Development was concerned to acknowledge and support the work of many Australian Civil Society Organisations (CSO) whose primary focus was domestic but who also undertook small but well founded international development initiatives. AusAID responded to this concept, developed a series of options and presented a proposal to the Minister for Foreign Affairs in March 2009.

The Community Call to Action (CC2A) Pilot Program was announced in July 2009. It is a \$1.5mn pilot program working with community groups, peak bodies, membership organisations and others, to raise awareness of global poverty and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG).

A key aspect of the program is that participating CSOs generally have significant 'reach' into the broader Australian community but they are not traditional AusAID partners and are not Accredited NGOs. A key difference from the original vision is that the CC2A Pilot Program is primarily focused on activities in Australia, with some flexibility for limited overseas activity but this is the exception rather than the norm.

Around 120 groups applied for funding under the program. In October 2009 the Minister announced that 13 groups had been awarded grants of from \$27,300 to \$150,000 to implement activities in the 2010 calendar year.

### 1.2. Objectives of the review

AusAID has conducted an internal review of the CC2A Program<sup>1</sup> and has now commissioned this external review. The purpose of this review is to gain an independent assessment of the CC2A Pilot Program, particularly the objectives, to inform a decision about continuing the program or not. The review seeks to identify lessons, strengths and weaknesses, and to recommend changes or approaches to enhance future program delivery. The Terms of Reference are attached at **Annex 1**. They task the review team to provide:

- An analysis of whether the objectives of the pilot program were met;
- A recommendation on whether to proceed with a next phase of the program;
- Recommendations on what changes, if any, are required in proceeding with a next phase of the program.

Further, the ToRs seek:

- A review of the design, selection process and risk management of the CC2A pilot program;
- A review of the 13 activities funded under the CC2A pilot program.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Community Call to Action Pilot Desk Review: Discussion Paper June 2010 – Prepared by NGOs and Community Engagement Section and Community Call to Action: Review of Pilot Funding Guidelines and Selection Process.*



### 1.3. Methodology

The Review Team comprised two external consultants, Stephen Morrow and Jo Thomson, with support provided by Partnership and Volunteers Section, AusAID. The Section conducted the internal reviews and provided the desk review of international donor practice (**Annex 2**).

The bulk of the review was conducted between 30 June and 5 August with AusAID and CSO consultation meetings in Adelaide, Canberra, Hobart, Melbourne and Sydney, and telephone consultations with participating CSOs in other locations. A final AusAID consultation meeting was conducted in early October. A schedule and list of informants is attached at **Annex 3**.

The review team developed a standardised assessment framework consistent with AusAID's QAI process to consider, albeit lightly, issues of relevance; efficiency; effectiveness; monitoring and evaluation; gender equity; sustainability; lessons learned; and other factors. This framework guided a series of questions to assess the 13 CSO activities in a consistent manner. Key questions were also developed for other stakeholders i.e. AusAID staff, to ensure consistency of inquiry. These are attached at **Annex 4**.

The review included the following activities:

- Contextual analysis through comprehensive document review;
- Web based review of international donor practice; and
- Key informant interviews with the Parliamentary Secretary for International Development, AusAID staff, and members of each CSO.

The review team provided AusAID with verbal feedback and a draft report in July, before the review report was finalised in early October 2010.

### 1.4. Limits/constraints to this review

As tasked by the ToRs, this review focused on the CC2A Pilot program objectives, the program design, selection processes and risk management. It includes a limited scan of the CSO activities, but NOT a review of the operations or impact of the 13 CSO activities. The report is based on the methodology cited in the section above and is constrained by a number of factors including the following:

- There is ambiguity about what the CC2A intended to achieve i.e. confusion around the objectives and no articulation of expected outcomes, so assessing success has been challenging;
- Time was limited at the outset so that the review started rapidly with limited time for formation and preparation prior to implementation;
- Similarly, limited time meant that consultations covered participating CSOs only and did not include other CSOs e.g. unsuccessful applicants. Those consultations were limited to two hours, generally with a single informant, and did not include triangulation with other sources. Face-to face discussions were held with nine CSOs and the remaining four of the 13 participating CSOs were consulted through telephone interviews.

## 2. Overview of CC2A Pilot Program Performance

In general terms the CC2A Pilot Program has achieved a positive level of performance in providing funding and non-funding support to a broad range of Australian CSOs who in turn engaged widely and extensively with the Australian community about issues of global poverty and the MDGs.

The list of CSOs receiving CC2A funding, the grant and the activity are summarised in Tables 1 and 2 on pages 11 and 22. The objectives of the 13 proposals generally focussed on the MDGs, while their activities were wide ranging and encompassed the three main categories of awareness raising<sup>2</sup> in varying degrees. For example:

- The Birthing Kit Foundation of Australia (BKFA) focused on **development information/communication** when it developed resources and conducted kit assembly days making the issues around MDGs 4 and 5 more apparent to several thousand Australians, and building public support and engagement to address them. The Erina Rotary Club activity also focused on development communications/information.
- The ACFID activity was about resources and support for the Make Poverty History (MPH) *Every Minute Counts* campaign, and the Oaktree Foundation conducted an MPH Roadtrip. Both are **advocacy and campaigning** activities. They focus on organising and supporting efforts towards the specific goals of increasing many thousands of people's awareness and concerted actions to register the significance of the MDGs and global poverty; the notion that aid is an effective means to address poverty; and the need to improve the quantity and quality of aid. Symbiosis International is also conducting an advocacy activity; a road trip using Bangladeshi cycle rickshaws to facilitate forums and seminars with thousands of school children, church and civic groups.
- The ACTU proposed a **development and global education** activity, the development of a flexible training module that is being used in their membership training and by affiliated unions. It focuses on MDG1 and the decent work agenda and educates at least 2,500 people moving through awareness of the issues, to consider the causes and effects and options for engagement to address them. The Tasmanian Center for Global Learning's activity includes a major element of development education as well as some advocacy as schools forge links with ongoing development projects.

All the CSO activities encompassed some or all of the main categories of awareness raising, and most had overlapping elements of the three ie:

- Development communications/information i.e. *communication about aid and development challenges, policies, programs and results to different audiences in donor countries;*
- Advocacy and campaigning i.e. *arguing on behalf of a particular issue, idea or person; and an organised effort towards specific political goals;* and
- Development education i.e. *an active learning process, founded on values of solidarity, equality, inclusion and cooperation.... enables people to move from*

<sup>2</sup> OECD Policy Brief #35, *Building Public Awareness of Development: Communicators, Educators and Evaluation*, p7.

*basic awareness...through understanding of the causes and effects of global issues, to personal involvement and informed action.*<sup>3</sup>

Consultations with the CSOs, as well as a review of activity proposals and 6 month progress reports, provide a conservative and very approximate estimate of Australian community members '**reached**' by the CC2A Pilot Program activities by the beginning of July. These are summarised in Table 1 below.

A cautionary note is required here as there is not a shared understanding or definition of the term 'reach', if it involves simple recognition of the concept or 'brand' of the MDGs, or something more substantive. This was noted in an internal review of the CC2A.<sup>4</sup> Also, the numbers in Table 1 are not statistically reliable, are likely to be greater as CSOs analyse their work further, and will certainly increase as the year progresses and CC2A activities continue to be implemented. It is also important to note that 'reach' does not necessarily equate to increased knowledge of the MDGs. Assessing the impact of the CC2A Pilot Program in this regard was beyond the scope of this review.

With that caveat, Table 1 provides a snapshot of positive general progress of activities to date, or as an AusAID staff member noted,.... *the CC2A does... communications work but at a grass roots level ....it achieves a remarkable level of media coverage for core issues and a level that AusAID simply could not achieve. It is fantastic.*

Table1: Australian community members 'reached' by the CC2A program

Title	Grant	Reach		
		A: Direct	B: indirect	C: peripheral
Tasmanian Center for Global Learning	\$43,250	626		
Birthing Kit Foundation of Australia	\$150,000	3,500		54,200
Youth With A Mission(YWAM)	\$106,632	23,500		>10,000
Rotary Club of Erina	\$27,300			
Business for Millennium Development	\$100,000	2,980		>50,000
Girl Guides Australia	\$149,000	779		> 750
Local Government Managers Australia	\$50,000	370		22,500
Fairtrade	\$100,000	1,250	20,000	>50,000
Skateistan	\$57,200			
Oaktree Foundation	\$150,000	1,000	10,708	10,000
Symbiosis	\$120,000	12,400		10,000
ACTU	\$146,618	2,900		> 120,000
ACFID	\$150,000	2,000		
	<b>\$1,350,000</b>	<b>51,305</b>	<b>30,708</b>	<b>213,250</b>

Note: Levels of reach & examples:

- A. direct reach: eg individual participation in a workshop/forum/lecture/training/discussion/road trip etc. These formal activities lasted from 30 minutes to 7 days.
- B. indirect reach: eg general participation in an event with MDG information & materials available, signing a petition, visitors to an exhibition

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p 9.

<sup>4</sup> Community Call to Action: Review of Pilot Funding Guidelines and Selection Process, p 1.

- C. peripheral reach: eg non professional estimates of media readership, numbers visiting stall at a festival, email outs, passive recipients of brochures/DVD/ books/t shirts/ resource materials, web-hits, etc.

The CC2A Pilot Program activities generated enormous media coverage that is not reflected in Table 1. AusAID has a media monitoring service which assesses readership of print articles, audience numbers for TV and radio articles, and some internet traffic. It indicates very widespread coverage of the CC2A activities across Australia, however it doesn't enable AusAID to develop a summary analysis of media coverage, balance or depth of positive, negative and neutral articles, or a qualitative analysis and assessment of the state of the national conversation. Such an analysis might identify any trends in terms of an Australian community being informed about global poverty, about the MDGs, and about the Australian aid program. A brief scan of AusAID's media reports indicates that the overwhelming balance of coverage is positive with a very limited number of negative or critical media articles.

AusAID staff and many CSOs noted that the program is providing remarkable leverage for AusAID and **value for money** in terms of media coverage, and in terms of engaging the wider Australian community in development issues. However, it must be noted that the nature and level of that engagement are unclear. The CC2A pilot program documents did not articulate expected outcomes, any changes in the Australian community's knowledge, attitudes or practices with regard to the MDGs or other issues.

Several CSOs who had been doing overseas activities for many years and who are at various points on a pathway to AusAID accreditation noted that the CC2A Pilot Program's explicit focus on the MDGs helped them to develop their own analysis of their work, to contextualise it within the MDG framework, to link with other CSOs and to develop a more measured approach to their work e.g. in terms of monitoring and evaluation. In effect, the CC2A Pilot Program contributed to their **organisational capacity** development.

Five of the thirteen CSOs indicated they were on a pathway to apply for AusAID NGO Accreditation. YWAM, the BKFA, Symbiosis, B4MD and the Oaktree Foundation are all at varying stages of preparation for accreditation, and commented that their CC2A activity had enabled them to engage with AusAID, to increase their knowledge in a reasonably low-risk activity, thus strengthening the basis for any further engagement with AusAID through accreditation or other means. Several other CSOs indicated that on the experience of the CC2A activity they would consider applying for AusAID accreditation in future years.

While there was generally positive feedback about the CC2A Pilot Program from AusAID staff and from participating organisations, this feedback was based on a range of differing perspectives about the purpose of the CC2A Pilot Program. It was not based on a shared understanding of a single set of CC2A objectives and expected outcomes.

As will be discussed in the next section, the CC2A Pilot Program objectives were unclear and left room for ambiguity. In this context, CSOs focused on activities and

outputs with limited regard for outcomes. That said, the activities being implemented in Australia appear to be occurring in a reasonable manner, with extensive Australian community involvement and no apparent significant problems, but with no reliable way to assess the level of impact.

This rapid review confirms the generally positive impression of the CC2A Pilot Program and its significant progress at the operational level where the focus is on outputs and numbers e.g. resource materials produced and distributed, community participants in wide range of activities, extent of media coverage etc. However, there are a number of issues at the strategic level that should be addressed in a second phase, with an increased focus on outcomes to strengthen the quality and impact of the future CC2A phases. The **major issue** is the need to clarify the **objectives of the CC2A program** so that they underpin all stages of the program including the articulation of expected outcomes, the development of performance indicators and monitoring and evaluation at outcome as well as output level. A program monitoring and evaluation framework could be used to assess program performance, and also to inform individual activity planning and reporting.

#### a) Recommendation/Finding

*The Review Team recommends that AusAID continue the CC2A program to a second phase subject to AusAID's clarification of the objectives to ensure they underpin all aspects of the program. A number of other points or parameters will be addressed throughout this report for consideration in the design process of a second phase.*

### 3. Review of Pilot Program Objectives

#### 3.1. Relevance of the CC2A Pilot Program

The CC2A Program was highly relevant at its inception and it remains relevant to Australia's global, national and agency level priorities and commitments. In addition it is consistent with peer international donor practice.

At a **global level**, the CC2A Program reflects Australia's commitment to the Accra Agenda for Action and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness which calls for *...enhancing donor's and partner countries' respective accountability to their citizens and parliaments for their development policies, strategies and performance.*<sup>5</sup> The 2008 OECD DAC Peer Review<sup>6</sup> recommended that Australia increase its support of development awareness activities in line with donor countries. The CC2A Program directly supports Australia's commitment to the MDGs Call to Action, to which it is a signatory.

At a **national level**, the CC2A Program is aligned with the Australian Government's *Social Inclusion Agenda* and the *National Compact*<sup>7</sup>, resonating particularly with the key principle *that authentic consultation, constructive advocacy and genuine*

<sup>5</sup> OECD Policy Brief #35, *Building Public Awareness of Development...* p 12

<sup>6</sup> OECD 2009:p12

<sup>7</sup> Australian Government, *National Compact, working together 2010*, p 3.

*collaboration between the Third Sector and the Government will lead to better policies, programs and services for our communities.* The CC2A Program also gives effect to the second of the National Compact's Priorities for Action which requires the Government and Third Sector partners *to protect the Sector's right to advocacy irrespective of any funding relationship that might exist.*

At an **agency level**, the CC2A Program sits centrally within AusAID's *Domestic Communications Strategy 2009-2010*. One of three priorities highlighted in the strategy is *accelerating progress towards achieving the MDGs*. While AusAID is currently reviewing this strategy with a view to enhancing and strengthening the communications function within the agency, raising awareness of the MDGs will presumably remain relevant.

An AusAID analysis of relevant international donor practice, attached at **Annex 2**, indicates that the CC2A Program is relevant and consistent with international practice. It finds that the majority of peer donors have, at minimum, a basic framework for national community engagement in place, and in general the most successful awareness raising activities are achieved by donors working in close partnership with domestic community organisations on small, grass-roots projects. Germany, the United Kingdom and the European Union have formal policies outlining their national community engagement strategies and this has provided a clearer framework and direction for building sustainable, effective awareness raising and partnership programs. Like the CC2A Program the funding mechanism by which most donors administer these programs is primarily small grants schemes. It is unclear in many cases however whether donors have made specific efforts to address the recommendations around community engagement and public awareness raising in relevant DAC Peer Reviews.

### 3.2. Assessment of the CC2A Pilot Program Objectives

An assessment of the CC2A Pilot Program objectives proved challenging due to the fact that the Pilot Program did not have any explicitly documented objectives. The CC2A Pilot Program did not have a formal design and, presumably because its budget was reduced, nor had it gone through AusAID's internal design and peer review process. The Review found that the intent or purpose of the CC2A Pilot Program was variously referred to in a collection of supporting documents, thus providing a proxy for at least implicit objectives. These 'implicit objectives' were generally known by all stakeholders although with some different interpretations and prioritisation of focus.

While the objectives for the Pilot Program were vague, those of the original CC2A Program were clear and documented in the *Community Engagement Fund Design Document January 2009*. Within AusAID at least, the corporate memory of the original CC2A Program Design Document meant that relevant senior staff assumed similar objectives for the Pilot Program even in the absence of an explicit design.

The original CC2A Program Design Document (January 2009) included the following goal and objective:

**Goal:** to strengthen the commitment & efforts of the Australian community to reduce international poverty and achieve the MDGs;

**Objective:** to engage a broader range of Australian organisations with reach into the Australian community in local and global development efforts.



This original CC2A Program Design was not pursued however and when the final CC2A Pilot Program was launched in mid 2009, it was no longer articulated in a single design document but was summarised in a number of information and guideline documents on the AusAID website including the *CC2A Funding Guidelines* and *Fact Sheet*. At its commencement there were no longer explicit objectives as such, although the intention of the CC2A Program was variously described as:

- To support activities to raise awareness about global poverty and the MDGs;
- To engage with a broader range of Australian groups;
- To reduce poverty and achieve the MDGs.

These became the ‘working’ or implicit objectives of the CC2A Pilot Program albeit not in a formalised sense. While these ‘working objectives’ approximate to the original *Goal*, they are ambiguous and ambitious in linking disparate awareness raising efforts with poverty reduction or achieving the MDGs. The net result being that stakeholders interviewed for this Review held a range of different interpretations of the ‘objective/s’ of the CC2A Pilot Program. One CSO commented that *the language changed in the various CC2A guideline documents on the website so it wasn’t always clear if the CC2A was about promoting the MDGs, about poverty alleviation, or the Australian aid program, or a combination.*

The ambiguity around the Objective/s has affected all dimensions of the program. The key ambiguity lies in whether the CC2A Pilot Program was about raising awareness of the MDGs *or* about AusAID engaging with a broader range of non- accredited organisations *or* both. The ambiguity or ‘schizophrenic’ nature of the ‘objectives’ is symptomatic of a flawed design process and in turn has impacted on the selection process, program and risk management processes and even where the program is located within AusAID. These implications are expanded upon further in section 4 below.

To add further to the ambiguity, AusAID’s own internal review of the CC2A Pilot Phase<sup>8</sup> undertaken in June 2010 outlined the retrospective rationale for the program. The rationale or aims listed were more closely aligned to the original CC2A Program Design as follows:

- To meet Australia’s international obligations and recommendations;
- To increase the Australian community’s engagement with international development;
- To assist in the production of a coherent and coordinated approach to development awareness messages and campaigns;
- To increase AusAID’s engagement with non-accredited NGOs;
- To promote good development principles; and
- To assist Australian NGOs to build more effective and inclusive partnerships.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Community Call to Action Pilot Desk Review: Discussion Paper June 2010 – Prepared by NGOs and Community Engagement Section.*

This would suggest that although the original CC2A Program Design (which encompassed a much broader suite of strategies to engage with community organisations) had been rejected, its intent flowed through into the Pilot Program.

If we assume therefore that the implicit or ‘working’ objectives of the CC2A Pilot Program were:

- To support activities to raise awareness about global poverty and the MDGs;
- To engage with a broader range of Australian groups; and
- To reduce poverty and achieve the MDGs,

then the CC2A Pilot Program has successfully achieved the first two of these ‘objectives’. The third ‘objective’ which was referred to in various documents, was ill conceived and unreasonably ambitious and not surprisingly has not been achieved.

This Review finds that the first two ‘objectives’ were appropriate, successfully achieved and remain relevant.

## **b) Recommendation/Finding**

*The Review Team finds that the Pilot Program did not have any explicitly documented Objectives. However, the pared back intent of the original CC2A Design Document provided some implicit ‘objectives’ for the CC2A Pilot Program which were generally known by all stakeholders. The first two implicit ‘objectives’ of the Pilot program were appropriate, achieved successfully and remain relevant.*

*The Review Team considers the original CC2A Program Goal and Objective to be well conceived, appropriate and relevant:*

**Goal:** *to strengthen the commitment & efforts of the Australian community to reduce international poverty and achieve the MDGs; and*

**Objective:** *to engage a broader range of Australian organisations with reach into the Australian community in local and global development efforts.*

*The Review Team recommends that AusAID undertake a **formal CC2A Phase II design exercise** in which this goal can be revisited and affirmed or intentionally modified to clarify the strategic goal of the CC2A program and any subsidiary objectives.*

## **4. Review of the design, selection process and risk management of the CC2A Pilot Program**

### **4.1. Design**

Since the original design in January 2009, the Community Call to Action was amended to accommodate AusAID’s legitimate concerns about risk, and also recommendations to strengthen development awareness in the wider community.

However, the subsequent CC2A Pilot Program suffered from this apparent process of



disjointed incrementalism<sup>9</sup>, an approach in this instance weighted in favour of risk aversion with regard to various elements of the original design, rather than more proactive risk management of the coherent set of elements.

The original CC2A Program was well designed. It benefitted from significant analysis and preparation undertaken by AusAID and ACFID to manage the associated risks while still reflecting the vision articulated by the Parliamentary Secretary for International Development and AusAID.

The CC2A Pilot Program did not have a formal design nor was it subject to AusAID's internal design and peer review processes because its budget was less than \$3mn. As outlined in section 3.2 above, the CC2A Pilot Program did not have explicitly documented objectives; rather it has been implemented using implicit 'objectives'. The Pilot Program therefore did not benefit from the critical analysis of a peer review process and lacked the complementary set of measures and tools which would normally come from a formal design process. These would generally include: well considered and explicitly articulated objectives and outcomes; clear selection criteria; transparent appraisal and selection processes; an M&E Framework; a risk management framework and adequate resourcing for management. It must be noted though that despite these omissions, the CC2A Pilot Program has been implemented in a reasonably efficient and effective manner within the limitations imposed by the absence of these standard measures.

The ambiguity of the CC2A Pilot Program's implicit 'objectives' becomes acutely relevant when considering the design of the program and any future phases of the CC2A. To illustrate, consider the two main implicit objectives i.e. to increase awareness of the MDGS; and to engage with a broader range of CSOs. If the first implicit objective is key, then there would be greater efficiencies in simply engaging with accredited NGOs to undertake this work with all the related risk and quality management processes already in place. If however the second implicit objective of engaging with a broader range of CSOs is paramount, then something like the CC2A Pilot Program may be the appropriate strategy i.e. working with non-accredited NGOs, but perhaps better positioned within the AusAID Communications and Research Branch.

### **c) Recommendation/Finding**

*The CC2A Pilot Program did not have a formal design nor has it benefitted from AusAID's own internal design and peer review processes. As a result it was implemented using only an implicit set of 'objectives'.*

*Phase II of the CC2A Program should undergo a formal design process to ensure there is one agreed goal and one set of objectives which are then communicated to all*

<sup>9</sup> Incremental decision-making deals with selective issues as they arise. These issues may require slightly new thinking, but they are not significant enough to trigger a policy window or fundamental decisions. Thus they are dealt with ad hoc and in a disjointed manner, using whatever analysis is close at hand, without any comprehensive review of all the associated issues.... ([http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/tools/Theory/Theories\\_muddlethrough.html](http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/tools/Theory/Theories_muddlethrough.html)) 26 July 2010

*stakeholders in the program, including AusAID staff, CSOs seeking to apply, and other stakeholders such as the media and other members of the broader Australian community.*

## 4.2. Funding Guidelines and Selection Process

This Review concurs with the findings of AusAID's internal review<sup>10</sup> of the Funding Guidelines and Selection Process undertaken in June 2010. Specifically that the Funding Guidelines lacked clarity in regards to the objectives of the Pilot Program, lacked a nuanced definition of awareness raising, and that the selection criteria were overly complex and somewhat confusing for applicants.

As noted in other parts of this report, the CC2A Pilot Program did not have explicitly articulated objectives and this was borne out in the *Funding Guidelines and Facts Sheet* available to applicants.

The *Funding Guidelines*, application format and selection criteria did not provide or appraise activities on the basis of a nuanced definition of 'awareness raising' which could include development communications and information; Advocacy and campaigning; and Development education. The implications of a lack of clarity around this issue were borne out when subsequent campaigning activities undertaken by at least one organisation exposed AusAID to some criticism. This risk could be better managed with clearer guidance provided to organisations at the outset and even to being included in future selection criteria.

The selection criteria listed in the Funding Guidelines were long winded and lacked clarity. They comprised eight questions that the Selection Panel would ask when ranking submissions, with an additional five points added as issues that the Selection Panel would also consider. The questions were:

1. Does the project contribute to the initiative's overall objectives of raising awareness of global poverty and the MDGs?
2. Who will benefit from the project?
3. Have stakeholders been consulted and are they on board?
4. Is the project designed around good development principles? (For guidance refer to the Statement of International Development Practice Principles...)
5. Does the project represent value-for-money?
6. Is the project sustainable? Does the project create on-going dependency on your organisation for overseas local communities?
7. What strategies do you have in place to safeguard your organisation against misuse of funding?
8. If children are directly involved in your project or activities, what strategies do you have in place to protect children?

The additional five points were:

1. The organisation's capacity to implement the proposed activities;
2. The organisation's governance arrangements, financial status and risk profile;

<sup>10</sup> *Community Call to Action – Review of Pilot Funding Guidelines and Selection Process, AusAID NGO and Community Engagement Section, June 2010*

3. The overall quality of project design including what the money will be used for, how it will make a difference and how it will meet the required initiative objectives;
4. That the project or activities proposed can be completed within 12 months of commencement date;
5. The extent to which proposals incorporate good development principles and are aware of AusAID's important issues such as child protection, disability inclusiveness, gender, environmental sustainability, and protection against fraud and corruption (including the misuse of funds by organised crime and terrorists). The AusAID website has information to assist you understand issues related to these themes.

Applicants then prepared their submissions based on this set of 'selection criteria' using reasonable transparency assumptions. The long list provided to applicants would have proved extremely challenging for a selection panel.

AusAID acknowledges the unwieldy nature of the selection criteria when it advises that it worked with members of the GAP, with oversight by the Probity Adviser, to develop a set of selection criteria that derived from the larger group but which were more workable for assessment purposes. Care was taken not to undermine the various sets of published selection criteria – but to make them workable for the GAP. This was successfully achieved.

Importantly this final, much simplified set of criteria reflected a balanced focus on just three criteria: activity design; budget; and the organisations capacity to implement. It used the standard AusAID rating/scoring system. Interviewing each of the GAP members was beyond the scope of this Review but it is understood from AusAID's internal review of the selection process, that GAP members were generally satisfied with the process and felt that many more activities were suitable for funding.

#### **d) Recommendation/Finding**

*The Review recommends the use of a clear and simple set of criteria which reflect a balance between activity quality and organisational capacity as well as value for money. For the purposes of transparency and fairness, clear selection criteria must be communicated to the applicants prior to submission.*

#### **4.3. Monitoring and Reporting**

The monitoring and reporting processes utilised in the CC2A Pilot Program are generally commensurate with the scope, scale and risk profile of activities although are unlikely to elicit reliable findings regarding its outcomes or impact.

The nature of the application process and subsequent reporting requirements have not lent themselves to particularly robust monitoring and evaluation of activities, nor the assessment of achievements of the overall program. Of particular note is that the proposal format and reporting requirements are focused on inputs, activities and outputs. This, coupled with the short time frame of 12 months, has not in any way encouraged or enabled the organisations to undertake base line surveys or subsequent

analysis of changes to knowledge, attitudes or practice e.g. with regard to the MDGs, the aid program or other matters. Similarly, the CC2A funding agreement referred to outcomes with only three of the thirteen CSOs, so clearly outcomes and subsequent impact assessment were not highlighted with the majority of participating organisations.

Having not been through a formal design process, the CC2A Pilot Program lacks an overall M&E Framework at the AusAID program level. Similarly, as there are no explicit objectives or anticipated outcomes at the Program level, it is not possible to determine whether AusAID has achieved what it hoped to with the Pilot Program.

As outlined in other parts of this report, the 13 activities funded have been reasonably successful, undoubtedly raising awareness of the MDGs in the Australian community and allowing AusAID to engage with a broader range of organisations, however it is not possible to assess the impact of the program overall. In this regard, the CC2A Pilot Program fails to address one of the National Compact's key principles which commit the Government and Third Sector partners *to develop measurable outcomes and to invest in accountability mechanisms to demonstrate the effectiveness of our joint endeavours*.

#### **e) Recommendation/Finding**

*The Review Team recommends as part of a formal design process to be undertaken for Phase II of the CC2A, a program level M&E Framework be developed.*

At the operational level, most CSOs indicated they had found the reporting and accountability requirements to be straightforward and reasonable, and in one case more so than the CSO's parent or senior organisation in Australia. This is appropriate for in-Australia awareness raising activities that are diverse, are the core business of the CSOs, and which form part of the broader national conversation, but they are inadequate for overseas activities in more complex operating environments where a number of risks are significantly higher.

As noted above, the CC2A Pilot Program guidelines steer the CSOs towards simple output rather than outcome level reporting. For example the formal funding agreement between AusAID and ten of thirteen CSOs includes the activity proposal with headings: *Project Objectives; Background analysis; Description of activity; Roles and responsibilities; Monitoring and evaluation* etc. It does not have a section or a heading for *outcomes* and so that level of analysis and reporting is not required. The fact that three funding agreements have different formats and headings from the other ten may indicate some confusion in the CC2A start up phase, at least in terms of consistent activity descriptions.

A small but significant issue arises when each CSO signs off on the *Statement of International Development Principles*. It charges the organisation, amongst other things, to support *basic program standards which ... seek to enhance gender equality*. Most CSOs indicated that while they considered they worked in a gender neutral way in Australia, this was usually implicit rather than a matter of policy or formal analysis and intent. None of the CSOs had disaggregated data or reporting on their activities

although some advised that it would be possible to obtain it. This is in contrast to activity reporting on their overseas activities which would normally be disaggregated by gender. In terms of good development practice, CSOs should at the very least provide reports disaggregated by gender.

#### **f) Recommendation/Finding**

*Participating CSOs should follow good practice standards in their reporting and disaggregate data by gender.*

### **4.4. Risk Management**

This sub section provides an analysis of the *risk management* strategies and processes utilised by AusAID in the implementation of the CC2A Pilot Program. It does not provide an analysis of the *risks* in and of themselves.

As with many other aspects of the CC2A Pilot Program already noted in this report, the lack of a formal design has also had implications for risk management. As would be expected in a formal design, the original January 2009 CC2A Program design document included a Risk Management Plan. It identified a number of risks under broader headings of:

- Supporting organisations with little experience of international development;
- Weak management and implementation capacity of funded organisations;
- Relationship between AusAID and partners mediated by a third party (Contractor);
- Politicisation of the funding scheme;
- Raising expectations which cannot be met;
- Over-extending capacity (CSOs and/or AusAID-Contractor)
- Poor internal management by AusAID-Contractor.

Many of these risks still pertained in the final CC2A Pilot Program e.g. many CSOs highlighted the challenge to their organisational capacity posed by the CC2A grant. However once the original CC2A Program Design was rejected, the subsequent Pilot Program comprised only a small grants scheme and no longer included the other three elements/modalities that would have provided AusAID with key risk management measures i.e.:

- Potential partnerships with select organisations;
- Provision of Technical Assistance and program-wide events; and
- Coordinated development awareness campaigns.

These three measures, together with the small grants scheme, were intended to combine to create a cohesive set of modalities and would have provided a comprehensive quality management platform to more pro-actively manage risks associated with:

- Organisations that had not previously partnered with AusAID nor undertaken any of the standard front end risk management processes such as NGO Accreditation;

- Poor quality small-scale overseas development activities through closer monitoring and Technical Assistance where appropriate;
- A potentially disparate set of messages or awareness raising measures across the funded organisations, so that they formed a coherent set that at a minimum was not-inconsistent with AusAID's Domestic Communications Strategy, and ideally would provide development communications results greater than the sum of the individual activities.

While the CC2A Pilot Program was certainly of a reduced scale and scope, many of the same risks still remained relevant but without the associated risk management strategies in place. The responses to the risks above were encompassed in some of the elements that were discarded from the initial design prior to the launch of the CC2A Pilot Program, leaving AusAID somewhat exposed.

Despite the lack of a formal Risk Management Framework and the more limited suite of risk management strategies, The CC2A Pilot Program is being implemented in a reasonably efficient and effective manner in regards to risk management. In the absence of formalised risk management measures, AusAID's **relationship management** with the 13 non-accredited community organisations has become the critical factor in the effective implementation of the CC2A Pilot Program, particularly in identifying and managing risk, providing technical assistance to community groups, and coordinating development awareness messages and campaigns. For example, AusAID reviewed the educational resources, media and other materials as they were developed by each of the 13 CSOs to ensure they were not inconsistent with AusAID policy or message.

Relationship management with non-traditional implementing partner organisations is necessarily more staff/resource intensive than a more traditional grant management scheme with accredited NGOs or commercial companies who are operating on the basis of standardised operating procedures, and risk management mechanisms. In the absence of these mechanisms, relationship building, frequent communication and advice from AusAID was vital to successful risk and quality management.

## 5. Review of 13 CC2A Pilot Program activities

### 5.1. General

Thirteen CSOs were awarded grants of from \$27,300 to \$150,000 to implement activities in the 2010 calendar year. Twelve proposals explicitly focus on **raising awareness of the MDGs** in their **objectives**, one does so implicitly. The activities are headlined in Table 2 below.

Table2: CC2A activities

CSO	Grant	Activity
Tasmanian Center for Global Learning	\$43,250	5 Children's View Forums in Tasmania on the MDGs, with follow-up education resources and links to development projects.



CSO	Grant	Activity
Birthing Kit Foundation of Australia	\$150,000	Development of educational resources focused on MDGs, for use in birth-kit assembly days conducted in South Australia and also for wider distribution.
Youth With A Mission (YWAM)	\$106,632	Public awareness raising of the MDGs through a medical ship visiting 15 Australian port cities and conducting information events.
Rotary Club of Erina	\$27,300	An ambulance, destined for Timor Leste, on a road trip from NSW to Darwin with awareness and information events around MDGs.
Business for Millennium Development	\$100,000	A series of public lectures and events in Canberra, Sydney and Melbourne featuring Professor Mhd Yunus, raising awareness of business and the MDGs.
Girl Guides Australia	\$149,000	MDG and leadership training and advocacy events at national, state and local level across Australia.
Local Government Managers Australia	\$50,000	MDG information event at the National Congress and throughout LGMA media, with options for ongoing local council engagement.
Fairtrade	\$100,000	Communication and public events to raise awareness of fair trade and poverty.
Skateistan	\$57,200	Electronic linkages between Afghan and Australian youth to develop theater and arts projects highlighting the MDGs
Oaktree Foundation	\$150,000	A Roadtrip by 1,000 young Australian conducting MDG awareness and information events in rural and urban Australia.
Symbiosis	\$120,000	A Roadtrip using Bangladeshi rickshaws to focus awareness and information events on poverty and the MDGs.
ACTU	\$146,618	Develop and implement a one-hour flexible education module on the MDGs and the Australian aid program, for use in delegate and member training across Australia.
ACFID	\$150,000	Development and distribution of resources for an MDG Every Minute Counts campaign being conducted by an extensive network of Australian CSOs.
	<b>\$1,350,000</b>	

Twelve CSOs had submitted 6-month progress reports at the time of this review.<sup>11</sup> These, and consultations with informants in each CSO indicate that 12 of the 13 activities are generally being implemented according to plan, within budget and schedule, with some minor changes often about logistics or minor operational matters.

The B4MD activity had significant changes when they secured further funding and expanded the program of lectures and events featuring Professor Mohammed Yunus, thus delivering greater value for money than had been envisaged in the proposal. The Girl Guides negotiated a contract variation with AusAID to focus the activity more on the MDGs and less on the centenary of the Girl Guide movement. There have been significant delays and changes to the Skateistan activity. They plan to restructure the activities outlined in the CC2A proposal and at the time of the review, had not

<sup>11</sup> The ACFID grant was only finalised in May 2010, so a 6-month progress report is due at the end of the CC2A period.

negotiated these changes with AusAID. Subject to that occurring satisfactorily, this activity warrants further review.

As noted earlier in this report, the 6-month reports and consultations with the CSOs indicate that over 50,000 Australians have been directly *reached* by the activities, participating in seminars, forums, workshops, organised tours or participatory exhibitions and other active engagement with CC2A events. Well over 250,000 Australians have been indirectly *reached* through viewing exhibitions, receiving resources, viewing websites etc. The AusAID media monitoring service indicates very extensive positive media coverage of the CC2A events and activities. Whether this has led to an increased knowledge of the MDGs, or any change in the Australian community's attitudes is unknown and impossible to assess across the CC2A program. The Oaktree Foundation summed up the situation when they acknowledged that *...while output monitoring was relatively straightforward, numbers of events, numbers of participants, quality and number of resources etc, as a relatively small, volunteer CSO they simply did not have the resources to assess public knowledge of MDGs and attitudes on a broader scale, and thus to assess the results of their activity.*

Several CSOs, Erina Rotary, YWAM and the ACTU, did use a brief *participant evaluation form*, a single question with a Likert scale response, at the end of their information event to gauge changes in individual knowledge of the MDGs. While this is not a reliable measure, it does provide a snapshot and YWAM's figures indicate that 73% of the visitors to the ship had *...learnt something new about the MDGs.*

In very broad terms, the CC2A appears to deliver value for money if you assume the *reach* figures are meaningful in terms of awareness, if not knowledge, of the MDGs.

## 5.2. In Australia and/or overseas activities

The CC2A generally focuses on calling the **Australian community** to action. Twelve of the thirteen proposals involve activities in Australia to raise awareness amongst the Australian community around the issues of global poverty and the MDGs. Several of these CSOs have overseas projects or aid activities, but these are not the focus of the CC2A funded activity. For example, the BKFA funds training programs in Vietnam, Kenya and elsewhere; Symbiosis implements integrated community development programs in rural Bangladesh; YWAM conducts health activities in PNG; Oaktree Foundation conducts education projects in Cambodia, and South Africa. Many Australians whose understanding of global poverty and the MDGs has been heightened by the CC2A activities may engage in further action e.g. participating in or otherwise supporting these activities.

One CSO is based overseas, implements activities overseas and has limited presence or activity in Australia. This CC2A project is about establishing linkages from those overseas activities into Australia and other countries, and thus raise awareness of poverty and the MDGs. This hasn't occurred at the time of the review and is well behind schedule.

Given that the CC2A program works with non-accredited CSOs that are supposed to have current and significant reach into the Australian community, but whose capacity and track record in implementing overseas aid activity have not generally been tested



or verified, it poses a major risk to the program if the bulk of the CC2A funded activities occur in other countries, distant from Australian community based scrutiny and checks and balances.

#### **g) Recommendation/Finding**

*As it is currently structured (i.e. in the absence of development effectiveness and quality management measures) with the aim of awareness raising in the Australian community, the CC2A program should primarily fund in-Australia activities, and only fund overseas aid activities if they are a minor but cohesive element of the proposal. If this occurs, specific monitoring arrangements should be agreed during implementation to ensure reasonable development practice, with due regard to the cost of such arrangements and value for money in terms of verifiable results in awareness raising in the Australian community.*

*The Review Team recommends that the issue of in-Australia and/or overseas activities be interrogated further in a CC2A phase II design exercise.*

### **5.3. Accreditation: early steps: grant size**

Several CSOs advised that the CC2A focus on the MDGs had helped them to sharpen the analysis of their work, to contextualise it in the MDG framework, to be aware of other actors and to make links with them i.e. to increase self learning and internal capacity development. Similarly, the grant funding application, reporting and other steps provided lessons and capacity development.

Five of the 13 CSOs funded under the CC2A are at various points on the pathway to AusAID Accreditation. They consider the CC2A program has been a valuable and positive opportunity to engage and develop a more substantive relationship with AusAID, while at the same time pursuing their mission and relatively low risk activities through the CC2A funding.

Base level accreditation means that NGOs can receive up to \$150,000 ANCP funding per year. Three of the five CC2A grants to these non-accredited CSOs were for \$150,000 and the other two were for \$120,000. In order to maintain the integrity of the accreditation process, and the related organisational development and risk management benefits for CSOs and AusAID, CC2A grants in a second or subsequent phase should be significantly less than funding available under the ANCP.

#### **h) Recommendation/Finding**

*The Review Team recommends that CC2A grants are significantly less than funding available to Base level accredited NGOs under AusAID's ANCP scheme.*

## 6. Issues for consideration in the second phase of the CC2A

### 6.1. General

AusAID has already conducted an internal review of the CC2A Pilot Program, and of the Funding Guidelines and Selection Process.<sup>12</sup> These identify many of the same issues for consideration in the design of a second phase as this current review e.g. the confusing selection criteria, the lack of definition of the term 'reach', the distinctions between development information/communications; advocacy and campaigning; and development education, the tensions around CSO fundraising, the relatively simple reporting requirements and others.

The key issue highlighted in this external review is the ambiguity around the CC2A Pilot Program objectives vis-à-vis the lack of formal design process. A fundamental recommendation of this review therefore is that AusAID undertake a formal design exercise for the second phase of the CC2A program, to clarify its objectives. Whether this is a clean slate exercise or simply revisiting the January 2009 design, the results will inform and underpin all other elements of a second phase of the CC2A program. The following issues or points arise from the review of the pilot phase, and may no longer be relevant once a formal design of the second phase has been completed. They are presented here as an aide memoire for consideration during the design exercise.

### 6.2. Scale of a second phase: AusAID – Contractor management

While the CC2A Pilot Program was budgeted at \$1.5mn, of which almost \$1.4mn was disbursed in grants to participating CSOs, it made sense from a financial efficiency, lesson learning, and risk management perspective that the program be managed internally by AusAID. AusAID's relationship management with the participating CSOs was a critical factor in the pilot phase. With the lessons arising from the CC2A Pilot Program, highlighted by the AusAID staff and in the three reviews, and to be interrogated in a proposed design exercise, it should be feasible for AusAID to scale up in a second phase of the CC2A program, and to clarify the services that could be delivered by a Contractor, and those that would necessarily remain with AusAID.

As the CC2A program scales up and more effectively addresses some of AusAID's broader policy agendas such as Communications Strategy and the Community Engagement Strategy, and does this through work with non-traditional partners, it would be appropriate to increase the level of resourcing for management of the program whether that management is delivered directly by AusAID or by a Contractor.

### 6.3. Baseline information

If the second phase of the CC2A is about awareness raising around the MDGs it could use the major qualitative and quantitative research undertaken by the AusAID Communications Branch in May/June 2009, with planned tracking research at 12

---

<sup>12</sup> *Community Call to Action Pilot Desk Review: Discussion Paper June 2010 – Prepared by NGOs and Community Engagement Section.*  
*Community Call to Action: Review of Pilot Funding Guidelines and Selection Process.*

month intervals. The 2009 research could provide a baseline for impact assessment as it had samples in every electorate in Australia so would be relevant for CSOs from across the country. Similarly, there was provision within the research and the proposed tracking work, to gauge levels of awareness of the MDGs.

#### 6.4. Synergies: starting off

The CC2A Pilot Program worked with a broad range of CSOs who do not normally work with AusAID. Some are volunteer, others are professional, they are geographically diverse and have differing constituencies or membership. Many of the 13 CSOs in the pilot phase indicated that while time and other resources are limited, they could see value in a CC2A start up meeting with participating CSOs, either electronically or a one day event to address at least the following:

- Information sharing across participants, setting the CC2A context across the country;
- Identifying 'go to' people in AusAID and in each CSO;
- Identifying commonalities and differences between planned activities, and any opportunities for collaboration or clashes in timetables/audiences etc;
- Clarifying AusAID expectations at a more nuanced level than the funding agreement or the website guidelines. Similarly, clarifying CSO expectations of AusAID;
- Clarifying the support/supervision available from AusAID, what definitely is not available, and any areas in-between;
- Contextualising the CC2A program within the broader AusAID strategic direction e.g. the communications strategy, the community engagement strategy;
- Other matters.

#### 6.5. Fundraising

As noted in the internal review of the CC2A Pilot Program, the guidelines about fundraising are not without tension. They indicate that fundraising events will not be eligible for CC2A funding. This is straightforward, however many CSOs pointed out that while they were careful about not fundraising at CC2A events, donating or fund-giving is a ready response of the Australian public when they participate in volunteer run events with CSOs. It would be useful to develop a **principles based approach** to this issue which confirms that fundraising is never the focus of an event or an activity, but which acknowledges that fund-giving/fund-raising may occur incidentally in an activity. The CSO and AusAID should be able to track this through their monitoring and reporting, and if events consistently attract significant donations then that should indicate a need to revise the nature of the event.

#### 6.6. Definition of terms: awareness raising

An OECD policy briefing highlights the three main categories of *awareness raising*, the fact that they are different, and that most awareness raising activities encompass overlapping elements of each of:

- Development communications/ information;
- Advocacy and campaigning; and
- Development education

AusAID is currently reviewing and revising its Domestic Communications Strategy. This may affirm the OECD definitions or develop a different understanding of the term *awareness raising* and the emphasis or distinction AusAID makes between the three main categories, *development communication/information*; *advocacy and campaigning*; and *development education*. This in turn should inform the design of the second phase of the CC2A program.

#### **6.7. Managing potential conflict of interest**

ACFID played a significant role in the CC2A Pilot Program development and was then a member of the Grant Appraisal Panel (GAP) and also an applicant for funding. An independent Probity Advisor oversaw the whole process and confirmed it was managed effectively and fairly, however there is plenty of scope for CSOs that did not obtain a grant and for others in the wider community to perceive an apparent conflict of interest. ACFID suggested that in future they not sit on the GAP to address this. The Review Team concurs.

### **7. Conclusion**

The CC2A Pilot Program can be assessed as ‘successful’ in that it has promoted MDGs to a wide audience in Australia, a priority in terms of AusAID’s global, national and agency commitments. The qualification is necessary because there is a range of definitions or understanding of key terms such as *awareness raising*, or people *reached*, and because ambiguity around the program’s objective meant that there aren’t agreed criteria for success.

The pilot has been successful as a pilot in that it has managed the implementation of a broad range of community based activities through non traditional CSO partners, with significant media coverage and extensive direct participation by the community, all with very few major problems and it has highlighted a number of issues and lessons to inform a second phase of the CC2A. These are identified in the internal reviews and this report. The key issue is to clarify and confirm the CC2A program goal and objectives and to undertake a formal design exercise for a second phase. These steps will form the base on which a program monitoring and evaluation framework can be built, and hence enable a reasonably consistent assessment of progress and success i.e. outputs and outcomes.

**Annex 1: Terms of reference**

## REVIEW OF COMMUNITY CALL TO ACTION PILOT PROGRAM

## - TERMS OF REFERENCE -

**Background**

In April 2008, the Prime Minister announced that Australia had joined the 'MDG Call to Action'. This was a global initiative calling community groups, government and the private sector to work together to support global action to reach the MDG targets.

To encourage Australians to get involved in the MDG Call to Action, the Government established a 12-month pilot 'Community Call to Action' grant funding program, to support the efforts of the Australian community to raise awareness about global poverty. The program was established with a view to an evaluation and review at the conclusion of the pilot to determine the ongoing nature of the program.

Applications for funding opened on 27 July 2009 and closed on 7 September 2009. A selection panel comprising three representatives from AusAID, one representative of the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) and one community representative, considered 115 applications. The proposals were assessed against the following criteria:

- that the proposed activity raised the profile of the MDGs in Australia;
- that the proposing organisation was registered in Australia;
- that it was not already receiving AusAID support through the AusAID-NGO Cooperation Program;
- that it was able to demonstrate good reach into the Australian community;
- that it had demonstrated strong implementation capacity; and
- that the proposed activity offered good value for money.

A copy of the Community Call to Action Funding Guidelines are at [Attachment 1](#).

Thirteen proposals were assessed as meeting the criteria, and successful applicants were announced in October 2009, with grant payments of between \$25,000 and \$150,000 negotiated on a case by case basis (see [Attachment 2](#) for details). Projects and activities under the pilot program were to be completed within a 12 month period.

**Objectives of the assignment**

The objectives of this assignment are to conduct a review of the Community Call To Action pilot program, and providing AusAID with:

- (a) An analysis of whether the objectives of the pilot program were met;
- (b) A recommendation on whether to proceed with a next phase of the program, and
- (c) Recommendations on what changes, if any, are required (and why) in proceeding with a next phase of the program.

**Scope of the assignment**

There are three aspects to this assignment as follows:

- (a) assess the objectives of the Community Call To Action pilot program;
- (b) review the quality, reach and impact of the 13 activities conducted under the Community Call To Action pilot program;

- (c) evaluate the design, process, and risk management issues in relation to the pilot program and any successor program.

*(a) Assessment of Community Call To Action Program Objectives*

Consider (this is not an exhaustive list):

- Is there a clear objective of the Community Call To Action program? Does the objective provide sufficient clarity and coherence for stakeholders?
- Was the objective achieved in the pilot program?
- What do other donors do to engage their broader national community in international development? How do they respond to DAC Peer Review recommendations (if any) on this?
- Is there complementarity or overlap between the objectives of this program and the Global Education Program, also funded by AusAID?

*(b) Review of 13 Activities*

Consider (this is not an exhaustive list):

- Desk study already conducted by the NGOs and Community Engagement Section ([Attachment 3](#))
- Impact and reach by the organisations' activities
- Timeliness
- Value for money
- Ongoing impact
- Reporting and accountability

*(c) Review the design, process, and risk management elements of the program*

Consider (this is not an exhaustive list)

- Match of design with objectives
- Whether risks were identified early on in the pilot program, and how they were managed
- If risks not identified, what lessons have been learned for successor program
- How to embed risk management elements into the design and selection process

### **Duration and Phasing**

The Review of the Community Call To Action Pilot Program is to be completed by 30 September 2010. Suggested (italics) and compulsory (bold) milestones are detailed below:

*By 2 July : Commence background reading and desk research completed*

*By 9 July: Consultations with relevant AusAID staff, the Australian Council for International Development, selected NGOs and community organisations completed*

*By 16 July: In-Australia visits to, and discussions on, Community Call To Action pilot projects completed*

**By 22 July: Discussion held with AusAID senior executives (DDG SDPD and ADG CPLA) on initial findings**

**By 30 July: Draft reports presented to AusAID****By 30 September: Final consolidated report with Executive Summary presented to AusAID****Specification of the team**

A team of up to Three people would be appropriate for the review tasks, with one of the team members designated as Team Leader. Skills required for each element of the assignment include:

- (a) Assess the Community Call To Action Program Objectives:
  - international experience and reputation in review and evaluation of development activities;
  - strong skills in evaluation methodology;
  - excellent links to other international aid donors;
  - broad understanding of NGO and community sector within Australia;
  - high level of understanding and appreciation of the role of domestic policy and political imperatives in donor countries.
- (b) Review the 13 Community Call To Action pilot projects:
  - experience in review and evaluation of development activities;
  - good understanding of NGO and community sector within Australia;
  - understanding of financial management, accounting and probity.
- (c) Review the design, process, and risk management elements of the program
  - international experience in review and evaluation of development activities;
  - strong skills in evaluation methodology;
  - broad understanding of NGO and community sector within Australia;
  - good understanding and experience in risk management techniques.

**Reporting**

A verbal progress report must be provided to AusAID by 22 July 2010, a draft report should be submitted by 30 July 2010, and a final report to be submitted by 30 September 2010, with an Executive Summary containing findings and recommendations.

**Attachments to TOR**

Attachment 1 - Community Call to Action Funding Guidelines  
Attachment 2- Community Call to Action Successful Applicants  
Attachment 3 – Desk Review: Discussion Paper June 2010



## Attachment 1



Australian Government

AusAID

Community Call to Action

# Community Call to Action Funding Guidelines

Meeting the Millennium Development Goals

An Australian Government Initiative - July 2009

## The 2009–10 Pilot

### What is the Community Call to Action?

The \$1.5 million Community Call to Action is a new Australian Government pilot initiative that supports activities to raise awareness about the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and global poverty.

The Community Call to Action is administered by the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) and aims to support efforts by the Australian community to reduce poverty and achieve the MDGs.

The eight Millennium Development Goals agreed to at the United Nations Millennium Summit in September 2000 are: eradicate extreme hunger and poverty; achieve universal primary education; promote gender equality and empower women; reduce child mortality; improve maternal health; combat HIV/AIDS malaria and other diseases; ensure environmental sustainability; and develop a global partnership for development.<sup>13</sup>

This initiative provides grants for community awareness raising projects and activities across the country. There is an opportunity for funding a limited number of overseas development activities that also contribute to raising awareness of the MDGs in Australia.

<sup>13</sup> Australia is a signatory to the Millennium Development Goals and is one of nearly 190 countries that have committed to eradicating poverty by 2015. More information can be found at : <http://www.ausaid.gov.au/keyaid/mdg.cfm>



## Why has the fund been established?

The Community Call to Action initiative was established in response to the Prime Minister's announcement, in April 2008, that Australia has joined the 'Millennium Development Goals Call to Action'. This global initiative sees international leaders pledging to work together to help the world get *back on track* in meeting the Millennium Development Goals and ending poverty by 2015. To do this, world leaders are calling community groups and the private sector to action. To support the efforts of the Australian community to raise awareness about global poverty, the Australian Government is piloting this 12 month initiative in 2009–10.

## When can I apply?

Applications for funding under the Community Call to Action pilot initiative open on **Monday 27 July 2009** and close at **2pm** (local time) on **Monday 7 September 2009**. Projects or activities must be completed within 12 months of commencement date.

## What are individual grants worth?

Funding for individual project activities will range from \$25,000 to a maximum of \$150,000. To maximise opportunities for community groups to get involved, only a limited number of large grants may be awarded to high impact activities.

## Eligibility

### Mandatory requirements:

Organisations must be:

- Australian entities registered in Australia
- not-for-profit community or professional peak body or community organisation
- small business (i.e. an entity that carries on a business with an aggregated turnover of less than \$2 million per annum)
- Organisations not currently receiving funding through the AusAID NGO Cooperation Program.

### Preferable requirements:

- a wide reach into the Australian community such as through a membership base or networks.

### Non-eligible entities:

- accredited organisations receiving funding through the AusAID NGO Cooperation Program
- individuals
- organisations not registered in Australia.

## What types of projects and activities may be funded?

Projects that meet the objectives of the Fund may include:

- networking events
- activities that build links within an organisation and between organisations
- conferences
- seminars
- workshops
- special events.

Some overseas development activities will be considered based on their ability to achieve good development outcomes, in addition to raising awareness about global poverty.

Please refer to examples of activities that may be considered for funding on the examples link, note that these are a guide only.

Innovative approaches are encouraged.

## What types of projects and activities will NOT be funded?

- evangelism or missionary outreach activities
- political campaign activities
- projects or activities that create dependency
- direct emergency relief or refugee settlement activities
- retrospective funding
- sponsorship
- fundraising events
- proposals primarily for equipment, freight or building.

## Who will select grant recipients?

A Selection Panel will determine successful grant recipients through a merit based process based on the Selection Criteria. The Selection Panel has representatives from AusAID, the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) and a community representative.

During the selection process AusAID may contact your organisation to discuss your proposal. This is not a guarantee that your organisation will receive funding.

If successful, AusAID may negotiate changes to your proposal before entering into a Funding Agreement with your organisation. A Funding Agreement is available on the AusAID website for your information.

## What are the Selection Criteria?

The Selection Panel will be asking these types of questions when ranking submissions:

1. Does the project contribute to the initiative's overall objectives of raising awareness of global poverty and the MDGs?
2. Who will benefit from the project?
3. Have stakeholders been consulted and are they on board?
4. Is the project designed around good development principles? (For guidance refer to the *Statement of International Development Practice Principles* on the AusAID website.)
5. Does the project represent value-for-money?
6. Is the project sustainable? Does the project create on-going dependency on your organisation for overseas local communities?
7. What strategies do you have in place to safeguard your organisation against misuse of funding? (The *Commonwealth Guidance for Non Profit Organisations on Safeguarding Organisation Against Terrorism Financing* at [www.nationalsecurity.gov.au/npo](http://www.nationalsecurity.gov.au/npo) has strategies to assist organisations manage these risks).
8. If children are directly involved in your project or activities, what strategies do you have in place to protect children? (AusAID's Child Protection Policy at the following link can be used for guidance:  
[http://www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pubout.cfm?ID=7954\\_7703\\_6074\\_4255\\_4227&Type=PubPolicyDocuments&FromSection=Publications](http://www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pubout.cfm?ID=7954_7703_6074_4255_4227&Type=PubPolicyDocuments&FromSection=Publications)

The Selection Panel will also consider the following criteria in making its decision:

- the organisation's capacity to implement the proposed activities
- the organisation's governance arrangements, financial status and risk profile
- the overall quality of project design including what the money will be used for, how it will make a difference and how it will meet the required initiative objectives
- that the project or activities proposed can be completed within 12 months of commencement date
- the extent to which proposals incorporate good development principles and are aware of AusAID's important issues such as child protection, disability inclusiveness, gender, environmental sustainability, and protection against fraud and corruption (including the misuse of funds by organised crime and terrorists). The AusAID website has information to assist you understand issues related to these themes.

## When will successful recipients be announced?

Successful applicants will be announced during International Anti-Poverty Week in mid October 2009.

## How do I apply?

Application forms, fact sheets, FAQs and links to relevant policies and guidelines are available on the AusAID website: [www.ausaid.gov.au/](http://www.ausaid.gov.au/)

For more information, or if you want an information pack posted to you, please contact the Community Call to Action Hotline on (02) 6206 4435 or email [cc2a@ausaid.gov.au](mailto:cc2a@ausaid.gov.au)

### REMEMBER

Applications for the Community Call to Action pilot close at **2pm** (local time) on **Monday 7 September 2009**.

Proposed activities must be completed within 12 months.

### Helpful resources to consult:

- The Statement of International Development Practice Principles [www.ausaid.gov.au](http://www.ausaid.gov.au) under Community Call to Action.
- The Commonwealth Guidance for Non Profit Organisations on Safeguarding your Organisation Against Terrorism Financing: [www.nationalsecurity.gov.au/npo](http://www.nationalsecurity.gov.au/npo)
- AusAID's Child Protection Policy:  
[http://www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pubout.cfm?ID=7954\\_7703\\_6074\\_4255\\_4227&Type=PubPolicyDocuments&FromSection=Publications](http://www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pubout.cfm?ID=7954_7703_6074_4255_4227&Type=PubPolicyDocuments&FromSection=Publications)

## Attachment 2



Australian Government  
AusAID

## Community Call to Action Successful Applicants

October 2009

### 1. Girl Guides Australia Inc - Take Action, Speak Out, and Step Up -

**\$149,000**

Location: Australia wide

The Girl Guide's *Take Action* campaign includes an intensive national weekend event focused on leadership, advocacy and the Millennium Development Goals for 20 young women. Participants will develop an advocacy project to educate their local communities about the MDGs and also form a Committee to develop a template for running State-based advocacy and MDG workshops throughout the Girl Guides Centenary Year Celebrations.

### 2. Australian Council for International Development Inc - Every Minute Counts: Make Poverty History - \$150,000

Location: Australia wide

ACFID Inc will develop an Australia-wide *Every Minute Counts* campaign which seeks to make the MDGs simple, real, immediate and easy to support through initial 'one minute actions'. Campaign promotion will be driven through ACFID's extensive partnerships and networks with other Australian community organisations.

### 3. The Oaktree Foundation (Australia) - MDG Roadtrip - \$150,000

Location: Australia wide

The Oaktree Foundation is an entirely youth-run international aid and development agency that aims to empower developing communities through education. On the MDG Roadtrip, 1000 young people will simultaneously travel throughout their capital cities and rural Australia to educate the Australian public about poverty alleviation and the MDGs.

**4. ACTU Organising, Education and Campaign Centre - Educating Working Australians through Unions on the MDGs and Australian Governments International Development Aid Program - \$146,618**

Location: Australia wide

The ACTU Organising, Education and Campaign Centre (OECC) will design and implement a one-hour education module on the MDGs and the Australian Aid program. The package will educate Australian workers on why the MDGs are in the interests of working men and women in developing countries and why Australian workers depend on increasing prosperity in Asia and the Pacific. It will be promoted through union conferences and existing trade union training structures.

**5. The Rotary Club of Erina Inc - Reducing Maternal and Child Mortality Road Show - \$27,300**

Location: NSW, NT

Rotarians will raise community awareness of maternal health, child mortality and poverty in East Timor by promoting the work of Midwives East Timor Australia (a project of the Rotary Club of Erina) and whilst driving a Maternity Ambulance from the Central Coast of NSW to Darwin.

**6. Symbiosis International - The Great Aussie Rickshaw Ride - \$120,000**

Location: QLD to Tas

During the Great Aussie Rickshaw Ride, 400 people on Bangladeshi rickshaws will call the Australian community, including rural areas, to take action on global poverty on a 2000 km trek from Queensland to Tasmania. Local media at locations along the trek will be targeted to increase public awareness of the MDGs.

**7. Birthing Kit Foundation Australia - Birthing Kit Assembly and Development Awareness Raising Campaign - \$150,000**

Location: Australia wide

The Birthing Kit Foundation will promote the MDGs through the production of an educational film, CDs and brochures on how the Birthing Kit Foundation addresses the MDGs, to assemble a birthing kit and opportunities for in-country training, which will be disseminated to schools, universities, community groups and Zonta International Clubs around Australia.

**8. Skateistan Australia - Afghan and Australia Youth Theatre and Exchange Program - \$57,200**

Location: NT (Australian youth), Afghanistan (Afghani youth)

Using internet and film cameras, Afghan and Australian youth will be brought together to write, produce and implement theatre and arts projects that express their understanding of the themes of poverty, health and education.

**9. Business for Millennium Development Ltd - Meeting the MDGs Through Sustainable Social Business Enterprise: A Business Call to Action - \$100,000**

Location: Melbourne and Sydney

The Business for Millennium Development Ltd will conduct two high level lectures (black tie) with Senior Executives of Australia's leading companies with Professor Mohammed Yunus. The purpose of the lectures will be to catalyse project initiatives from corporate Australia in support of the Business Call to Action and in line with the MDGs. Professor Yunus won a Nobel Peace Prize for developing micro-credit finance schemes (through the Grameen Bank) for the poor in Bangladesh.

**10. Local Government Managers Australia – MDGs - Australian Local Government: Awareness and Education Campaign - \$50,000**

Location: QLD, NSW, Tas, WA, QLD regional communities

The Local Government Managers Australia (LGMA) will educate the Australian local government sector about the MDGs and poverty alleviation through its National Congress, the annual LGMA Business Expo and LGMA's monthly magazine.

**11. Tasmanian Centre for Global Learning - Your Home: Our World - \$43,250**

Location: Tasmania

Tasmanian Centre for Global Learning will run a number of Kids View Forums in Tasmania and follow-up educational resources and training to educate children about how poverty affects children in the Philippines.

**12. Fairtrade Labelling Australia and New Zealand Ltd - Promoting and Mainstreaming Fairtrade in Australia - \$100,000**

Location: Australia wide

Fairtrade Labelling Australia will conduct communications activities and public events with businesses, education institutions, churches, media and members of the public to increase public awareness and understanding of the MDGs and the impacts of fair trade on poverty alleviation.

**13. YWAM Marine Reach - YWAM Australia and PNG Ship Tour - \$106,632**

Location: Port cities on Australia's East Coast

YWAM's Medical Ship (operating since 2007) will focus on increased media awareness of poverty and the MDGs by visiting schools and holding concert events in 15 Australian port cities. They will highlight PNG culture and development needs in light of the MDGs. The Ship will then travel to Port Moresby to conduct awareness raising activities about the MDGs in PNG schools and provide health care services. YWAM's Medical Ship has been providing health care to South Pacific island communities since 2007.

**Attachment 3****Community Call to Action Pilot**

- **Desk Review: Discussion Paper June 2010 –**
- ***Prepared by NGOs and Community Engagement Section -***

**1. Purpose**

This paper provides an analysis of AusAID's Community Call to Action (CC2A) pilot scheme. It contains information and analysis on its purpose and implementation, summarises key lessons from the pilot and assesses whether it is meeting its aims. The pilot will end in October 2010 and this review will inform the possible development of stage two.

**2. Summary**

The CC2A is a 2009-10 pilot scheme that funds non-accredited community groups, business organisations and peak bodies with a wide reach into the Australian community to help raise awareness in the Australian community of poverty alleviation and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The CC2A has increased the Australian community's engagement with international development - this is evident in the significant media generated by activities funded through the scheme, and the number of attendees at CC2A events. However, this has not been across all States and Territories, with the scheme having a significant East Coast bias.

The CC2A has also expanded AusAID's engagement with non-accredited Australian NGOs. However, this engagement has not included the promotion of good development practices, other than through the Statement of International Development Practice Principles. This has occasionally resulted in CC2A organisations promoting or engaging in development practices that AusAID does not support.

In some cases, CC2A activities have been perceived as lobbying or political, especially where funded organisations or activities have included specific campaigns within the community, encouraging people to undertake activities such as writing to their local member and/or visiting Parliament House. Some funded activities also included reference to promoting the Australian aid program in addition to promoting the Millennium Development Goals.

More resourcing, both in terms staff/risk management by AusAID and assistance to CC2A organisations to support good development and public communications outcomes, is required to better meet the scheme's objectives.

**3. How was this desk review performed?**

This paper is informed by a desk review of the CC2A, undertaken by AusAID's NGO and Community Engagement (NCE) section. Data on the CC2A has been collected using a diversity of methods, which include:



- semi-structured interviews with the CC2A Grant Assessment Panel, the NCE Director, and staff within AusAID's Communications Branch;
- review of CC2A policies and Guidelines (see Appendix);
- attendance at CC2A events, including: a YWAM port visit, the Girl Guides National Workshop, the Oaktree Foundation's Roadtrip launch and Summit, Fairtrade Labelling Australia New Zealand (FLANZ) Fairtrade Fiestas and the Local Government Managers Australia (LGMA) Expo;
- collation and analysis of CC2A media; and,
- a review of CC2A organisations' six monthly reports, which included their review of their lessons learned, and the objectives they have met.

### 3.1 *Limitations to this approach*

CC2A activities are still underway at the time of this review. Activities yet to begin include: Symbiosis's Great Aussie Rickshaw Ride and Skateistan's theatre events. Further, a number of organisations are still undertaking their projects, or have only completed them recently. Feedback from CC2A organisations has been received through their six monthly reports, however, more feedback should be sought at the completion of the pilot, including of the comments CC2A organisations have collected from attendees at their events. Further analysis of the scheme will also be required at the completion of the pilot to examine the approach and value for money of the original intent of the program – to raise awareness in the Australian community of poverty alleviation and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

## 4. **Why was the Community Call to Action developed?**

The CC2A was developed to suit a number of purposes.

### 4.1 *A response to international recommendations*

In 2008 Australia's aid program, including its approach and management efficiency, was peer reviewed by other donor countries. This Review recommended that Australia increase support for development awareness activities in line with other donor countries, such as the UK, Germany and the Netherlands. The Review suggested that AusAID work more closely with NGOs to raise public awareness of international development, stating that 'working more with NGOs to raise public awareness would be beneficial given the public credibility of NGOs' (OECD 2009: 12).

This recommendation is in line with commitments Australia made in the Paris Declaration and the Accra Action Agenda to engage more broadly in the Australian community and to call the community to action to reduce poverty and achieve the MDGs.

In 2009-10 AusAID will spend approximately \$8.8 million, 0.23 per cent of total ODA, on community engagement and development education, of which \$1.5 million has been directed towards the CC2A. The CC2A accounted for less than 0.04 per cent of the total ODA budget in 2009-10.

### 4.2 *A mechanism to increase the Australian community's engagement with international development*

The Australian Government has committed to increase ODA to 0.5 per cent of GNI by 2015-16. This represents a near doubling of the aid budget. A scale up of this size requires informed and sustained community support. The OECD Peer Review also made this argument, stating that, 'while public and political support for development aid has increased, Australia must sustain its efforts to widen this support, especially as increasing aid volumes will require a strong constituency' (OECD 2009: 12).

AusAID has undertaken two measures to increase community awareness of international development. The first measure was the modification, in May 2009, of rules applying to the AusAID-NGO Cooperation Program, which provides subsidy funding to accredited Australian NGOs, to allow up to 10 per cent of funds to be used for awareness raising activities within Australia.

The second measure is the CC2A. The CC2A is especially concerned with building knowledge of international development in communities that are not traditionally engaged in international development. Working with a range of representative groups, that have a broad reach to different people across Australia – such as Business for Millennium Development, the ACTU, and Girl Guides Australia – was intended to ensure that more people had access to information about the MDGs and international development issues.

Both measures, if successful, are intended to result in a more informed community, better able to hold the Government and aid program to account and to debate and engage on policy issues related to international development.

#### *4.3 To assist in the production of a coherent and coordinated approach to development awareness messages and campaigns*

AusAID and the Australian development sector have clear messages around international development that, if disseminated in the Australian community, should result in improved knowledge of international development. For example, the *Make Poverty History* campaign is a coherent network of trade unions, community groups, faith groups and NGOs who are campaigning collectively to end global poverty. However, evidence from NGO reporting indicates that the Government and the sector could work in a more coordinated fashion to articulate the reasons for, and the outcomes of, their development work. The CC2A was intended, in part, to assist in the dissemination of coherent and coordinated development messages, and thereby improve knowledge in the community of international development.

#### *4.4 To increase AusAID's engagement with non-accredited NGOs*

In recent years, Australian NGOs that have not traditionally been engaged in international development have become increasingly interested in the area. This is evident in the many requests that AusAID receives for funding from smaller, less experienced or emerging NGOs. These organisations do not usually have the long-term track-record required to meet AusAID's risk management requirements for funding through the AusAID-NGO Cooperation Program (ie: to be accredited with AusAID). However, they are undertaking development programs internationally (or are involved in domestic awareness on these issues) and many of these organisations have a high "Australian" profile domestically and internationally. It is important for AusAID to engage with and support a wide range of organisations, to share knowledge on good practice, to mitigate against the

risk of “Australian aid” being seen to be ineffective or harmful (where possible), and to encourage a wider pool of knowledge and expertise to be involved in Australia’s international development efforts. The CC2A pilot has provided a mechanism through which AusAID has been able to do this with some organisations.

#### *4.5 To promote good development practice principles to non-AusAID accredited NGOs*

An early aim of the CC2A scheme (in initial design) was to promote good development practice principles to non-AusAID accredited NGOs. This objective was considered important as the number of non-accredited NGOs engaged in international development is increasing and AusAID wished to ensure that activities implemented by Australian organisations overseas would maintain the basic principles of good development and comply with international development standards. Further, this would build skills and knowledge within CC2A organisations. In the original Design Concept Paper, one way this was envisaged as being achieved was through the provision of technical assistance to CC2A organisations. This assistance has not been provided in the pilot. However, organisations have agreed to comply with AusAID’s Statement of International Development Practice Principles (agreed by the AusAID Executive in 2009). AusAID has discussed the specific development issues and risks addressed in the Principles with each of the successful organisations.

### **5. What happened in the pilot?**

Launched on 22 July 2009 by Mr McMullan, the CC2A received a strong response from organisations across Australia. 115 applications were received, with organisations seeking a combined total of approximately \$10 million.

A Grant Assessment Panel (GAP), formed by AusAID, assessed these applications. The panel was comprised of representatives with specific expertise in community engagement, community based organisations, communications, risk management and monitoring. The panel included representatives from AusAID, the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) and an Australian non-government organisation. An independent probity adviser oversaw the selection process and found that the grant assessment and selection process was fair, equitable and in accordance with the requirements of the Call for Submissions and Commonwealth Grant Guidelines.

The selection of activities was a merit-based competitive process. Decisions on which activities would be funded were based on the following criteria:

- that the project raised the profile of the MDGs in Australia;
- that the organisation is an Australian registered organisation;
- that the organisation was not already receiving AusAID funding under the AusAID-NGO Cooperation program;
- the organisation’s reach into the Australian community;
- the capacity for the organisation to implement the activities; and,
- value for money.

The GAP selected 13 organisations for AusAID to enter into funding agreements with. These were: Girl Guides Australia; the Australian Council for International Development; the Oaktree Foundation (Australia); the ACTU Organising, Education and Campaign Centre; the Rotary Club of Erina Inc;

Symbiosis International; the Birthing Kit Foundation Australia; Skateistan Australia; Business for Millennium Development Ltd; Local Government Managers Australia; the Tasmanian Centre for Global Learning; Fairtrade Labelling Australia and New Zealand Ltd; and, YWAM Marine Reach Australia. An additional two organisations were shortlisted by the panel - in case negotiations with any of the 13 successful organisations were not successful (eg: if due diligence checks produced negative results).

AusAID successfully entered into funding arrangements with the 13 successful applicants. These 13 organisations are currently engaged in activities to educate the Australian public on the challenges of global poverty and the Millennium Development Goals. Funding for individual project activities ranges from \$27,000 to \$150,000.

## **6. What can be learnt from the pilot?**

### **6.1 Public Affairs**

AusAID has developed a public affairs strategy to increase the profile of CC2A activities. Key pillars for the strategy include: a workshop assisting CC2A organisations to engage their local media, suggested key messages, tips for writing media releases and AusAID-initiated media stories on CC2A events. This strategy supports the aim of the scheme to increase community awareness of international development.

The organisations funded under the CC2A have generated significant media interest, including stories on the 7 PM Project, Channel Ten Weather Watch, ABC, and in newspapers around Australia. The Make Poverty History Road Trip and Summit also generated significant media interest, particularly in regional press, including in rural and remote areas.

There have also been negative media reports. The *Herald Sun* columnist Andrew Bolt (21 March 2010 and 31 March 2010) suggested that organisations that supported the Australian Labor Party's election campaign received preferential funding through the scheme. Steve Lewis, from News Ltd, also reported negatively on the scheme, stating that the aid program includes 'millions spent by the AFL, Girl Guides, ACTU and community groups on "selling" a pro-aid message to the public'.

This attention highlights some of the risks attached to the scheme. In particular, there is potential for a poorly executed activity to provoke negative public opinion about the scheme and/or the aid program.

### **6.2 Justification**

Negative media on the CC2A has also highlighted difficulties AusAID may have in justifying the CC2A to the public, media and NGO sector. In particular, when activities appear to be directed primarily towards attracting domestic attention, AusAID is vulnerable to the accusation that funding could be better directed elsewhere. Again, this is an issue highlighted by the *Herald Sun*, which stated in reference to Symbiosis International's 'Great Aussie Rickshaw Ride':

*Another winner is the Great Aussie Rickshaw Road Show, which got \$120,000 to help 400 people take Bangladeshi rickshaws around Australia to tell us to send more aid to the poor overseas, rather than to, say, these funsters on wheels.*

These criticisms may increase if the CC2A continues and if there is an increase in its budget, without any changes to selection criteria or program objective.

### 6.3 Branding

The CC2A Guidelines require funded organisations to acknowledge Australian Government support in promotional materials and media releases. Nonetheless, there is some sensitivity within AusAID around how its branding is used.

Currently, all CC2A media releases and promotional material are being cleared through the AusAID NGOs and Community Engagement and Communications Sections on a case-by-case basis. AusAID has sought to ensure that organisations acknowledge Australian Government support by alerting them of their obligations under the Guidelines and ensuring appropriate branding on materials. In some cases, where an AusAID funded activity is only one activity within a broader program of activities being undertaken by a specific organisation and where other activities may be considered lobbying, in order to reduce confusion, use of the AusAID logo has not been considered necessary.

There is, hence, no consistent approach to branding. While this has been manageable within a pilot program, further clarity on branding needs to be developed in order to ensure there is no confusion within CC2A organisations or AusAID. Further, when AusAID branding is not used, except for information provided on AusAID's website about successful applicants, it is not clear to the public that a particular activity has received Government funding.

### 6.4 Advocacy and Lobbying

Some organisations funded through the pilot phase of CC2A are engaged in public campaigns and lobbying activities. For example, NGOs funded under the *Make Poverty History* banner are campaigning for an increase in the aid budget to 0.7 per cent of Gross National Income (GNI) and for international development to be managed as a separate department with a dedicated Cabinet-level minister. The CC2A pilot guidelines are clear that CC2A funding is not to be used for specific lobbying or partisan activities, however where organisations undertake both, it is difficult for the public to distinguish between what the Government is and is not funding.

It is noted that this position must be balanced with the Government's commitment through the National Compact (launched by Prime Minister Rudd on 17 March 2010) to support 'constructive advocacy' with the Third Sector and to 'protect the freedom of Third Sector organisations to contribute to public debate without impact on their funding or status'. As such, in recommending any modifications to the CC2A guidelines, AusAID needs to be certain that the CC2A Guidelines are not in conflict with the principles of the National Compact and that CC2A funding does not constrain the advocacy capacity of funded organisations.

This issue is particularly likely to arise during the selection process. While it is tempting to avoid funding organisations that are politically sensitive, organisations should be funded based on the application guidelines, not on their support for, or disagreement with, government aid policies.

#### *6.5 Promoting good development practice*

Funding for this component (outlined in the design of the program) was not included in the pilot phase (including in assessment criteria). As such, other than CC2A organisations agreeing to abide by AusAID's Statement of International Development Practice Principles, there is no mechanism within the scheme for such promotion or risk assessment. As a result, AusAID has not focused on assessing or affecting the development practices of CC2A organisation through this scheme. This limitation has been obvious in a number of CC2A activities where organisations' development approach and expertise has not been assessed as part of the criteria:

- For example, the Birthing Kit Foundation of Australia has produced a CC2A-funded DVD on their work which includes discussion of maternal health. AusAID's Health Adviser noted that while not unsafe, the DVD promotes practices that are not in accordance WHO Guidelines on best practice. AusAID has been able to offer some limited advice on this to the organisation, but has not required the organisation to fundamentally change its practices.
- YWAM Australia collects second-hand spectacles for distribution in PNG and has done so during its CC2A funded tour of Australian port cities. AusAID does not generally promote the importing of second-hand equipment for people with disabilities as good development, as it can lead to dependency or incorrect use of the spectacles. The second issue is mitigated by the fact that trained professionals do travel on the ships and deliver the spectacles.

These two examples highlight how the lack of a mechanism within the scheme to promote good development practice can create risk for AusAID. These examples have forced AusAID to decide how closely it aligns itself with these activities, especially through its branding. Further, it forces questions as to the quality of the awareness-raising that is being undertaken by CC2A organisations.

This is also an issue within which AusAID must be careful to work to the principles of the National Compact, which state that the independence and diversity of NGOs should be respected (2010: 3). As such, the promotion of development practice principles should not homogenise or constrain CC2A organisations, but rather, build their capacity, sustainability, skills and knowledge of good practice development.

These issues will need to be considered if funding for the program (post pilot phase) is agreed to - AusAID will need to decide whether or not it wishes to promote good development practice to CC2A organisations, and if it does, it will need to increase resourcing to the scheme and ensure guidelines are structured appropriately.

#### *6.6 Materials and Equipment*

A number of CC2A organisations have used CC2A funding to purchase major equipment. For example, both YWAM and Skateistan have purchased (or are planning to purchase) audio-visual equipment, with YWAM spending almost \$10,000 on audio equipment and over \$7,000 on projectors.

Two issues arise from this. First, AusAID must decide whether it is acceptable for CC2A funding to be used to increase the assets of funded organisations. Second, consideration needs to be given as to how and if support is given to the long term maintenance of this equipment.

#### *6.7 Fundraising*

The CC2A Guidelines state that 'fundraising events' will not be funded using the CC2A funding. However, this is not without tension. For example, the provision of material, such as membership forms, at CC2A events, has meant that some activities have the perception of including fundraising elements. Further, some organisations have sought to include fundraising events within their activities, for example LGMA originally planned a 'Make Poverty History' fundraising dinner within its Expo. AusAID advised LGMA of its obligations under the CC2A funding agreement, and LGMA removed the fundraising element from their activity. However, this example serves to highlight that CC2A activities need to be monitored carefully in order to ensure that they are not perceived or actual fundraising events.

#### *6.8 Reporting Requirements*

Formal feedback on AusAID's reporting requirements have not yet been sought. However, recognising that many of the CC2A organisations are small or new to engaging with AusAID, the CC2A design (as per peer review recommendations) has attempted to ensure that reporting requirements for CC2A organisations are simple, flexible and easily met. For example, the six monthly reports are only three pages long, and have sought only basic program management information on objectives, lessons learnt, impact and accounts. 12 of the 13 organisations have completed their reports, and none have suggested that they have had difficulty doing so.

#### *6.9 AusAID Program Management*

Central to resolving risk issues identified above is appropriate Agency support (and resourcing) for the CC2A scheme. Concerns regarding publicity, branding and advocacy have been relatively effectively managed; however given the approach taken in the pilot of working with individual agencies on each issue, management has been relatively resource intensive. The position of CC2A manager has changed twice during the pilot phase. The position of CC2A project officer has also been vacant for substantial periods, and has been filled by three different people over the course of the pilot phase - due to AusAID restructuring and staff being assigned to other Sections. Strong program management has helped to reduce the risk of staff changeovers; however appropriate management arrangements need to be considered if the program proceeds past the pilot phase.

The pilot phase has been primarily managed within the NGOs and Community Engagement Section (with some support from AusAID's Communications Section). As NCE does not have specific skills in branding or communications, consideration should also be given to ensuring appropriate management - relevant to the objectives of the scheme. (ie: consideration should be given to whether or not Communications Section should manage the program – if the main objective remains a communications focus.

### **7. Is the Community Call to Action meeting its aims?**



### *7.1 A response to international recommendations*

The CC2A has met the recommendations made in the OECD Peer Review. It relies on NGOs to raise public awareness of international development, and seeks to increase knowledge of development issues within the Australian public.

### *7.2 A mechanism to increase the Australian community's engagement with international development*

The CC2A has increased the Australian community's engagement with international development. This is evident in the significant media generated through activities funded by the scheme (NCE has collated a media file of this), much of which is regional press. For example, YWAM have had media in Newcastle, Geelong, Ulladulla, Portland, Eden and Hobart. Further, CC2A organisations have provided, in their six monthly reports, estimates of the numbers of people their activities have reached. Most significant is Oaktree's claim that through their Roadtrip, 'Over 15 million people heard the Make Poverty History message [and]... in just 10 days 50,000 people signed The Act To End Poverty'. YWAM also state that there have been over 10,000 viewings of their presentation on YouTube and that they have presented to 23,500 people about the MDGs in PNG.

However, the CC2A Guidelines did not make clear that AusAID sought organisations from a mix of Australian States and Territories. As a result, successful applicants are primarily from the East Coast. If the scheme continues, the selection criteria will need to be refined so that a broader audience is reached (see Appendix for specific feedback on funding guidelines and selection process).

### *7.3 To assist in the production of a coherent and coordinated approach to development awareness messages and campaigns*

AusAID's public affairs strategy has increased the profile of CC2A activities, and the provision of a media workshop assisted in the development of more coordinated messages. Further, the emphasis on the MDGs by most CC2A organisations has given their messages some coherence. However, coherence and coordination could be improved through increased AusAID engagement with CC2A organisations. In particular, AusAID could promote good development practice principles to CC2A organisations before their projects are underway.

### *7.4 To increase AusAID's engagement with non-accredited NGOs*

AusAID's engagement with non-accredited NGOs has increased as a result of the CC2A. 13 NGOs have been funded through the scheme, and 115 organisations applied for funding through it. The CC2A has enabled AusAID to work with high profile organisations not traditionally engaged in the aid program, such as Girl Guides Australia, the ACTU Organising and Education Campaign Centre and Local Government Managers Australia (LGMA). CC2A has also increased AusAID's engagement with non-accredited organisations that undertake overseas development work, such as YWAM Marine Reach and the Rotary Club of Erina – Midwives of East Timor.

This engagement with non-government organisations (that AusAID has not traditionally worked with) is supported by ACFID, who stated in their 2009 Budget Submission that they welcome:

*... the government's Community Call to Action, which has met with high demand and public interest, and therefore recommends that the program be expanded beyond its pilot phase with a greater level of funding (Recommendation 1.6) (ACFID 2009: 10).*

However, AusAID needs to be clear as to why it is increasing its engagement with these organisations. If it wishes to promote pathways to accreditation, or to promote good development practice, then more engagement with CC2A organisations is required.

#### *7.5 To promote good development practice principles to non-AusAID accredited NGOs*

While AusAID's engagement with non-accredited NGOs has increased, as noted in section 5.5, the aim of promoting good development practice principles (outlined in the original design) was not included in the pilot phase, other than through CC2A organisations agreeing to abide by AusAID's Statement of International Development Practice Principles. As such, the CC2A pilot has not promoted good development practice principles to CC2A organisations and no training has been provided to them on international development.

#### *7.6 To assist Australian NGOs build more effective and inclusive partnerships*

CC2A organisations have engaged with each other in some instances. For example, Make Poverty History ambassadors met with the Rotary Club Reducing Maternal and Child Mortality Road Show and YWAM members. The Oaktree Foundation also has strong connections to ACFID and other accredited NGOs. However, such meetings have been ad hoc and have occurred without coordination or encouragement from AusAID.

## **Annex 2: Review of international donor practice**

### **CC2A: Desk Review: Other Donor Activity on Community Engagement (July 2010)**

#### **1. Purpose**

This paper provides an assessment of what other donors do to engage their broader national community in international development. The information in this paper will be used to inform the Community Call to Action (CC2A) Pilot Review that is currently being undertaken and the subsequent possible development of stage two of the program.

#### **2. Précis of other donor activity**

- The majority of peer donors have, at minimum, a basic framework for national community engagement in place.
- Broadly, the most successful awareness raising activities were achieved by donors working in close partnership with domestic community organisations on small, grass-roots projects.
- Germany, the United Kingdom and the European Union have formal policies outlining their national community engagement strategies. Subsequent donor evaluations have found that this has provided a clearer framework and direction for building sustainable, effective awareness-raising and partnership programs.
- The funding mechanism by which most donors administer these programs is primarily small grants schemes; applicants are required to undergo a standard selection process.
- In many cases, it is unclear whether donors have made specific efforts to address the recommendations around community engagement and public awareness-raising in relevant DAC Peer Reviews and if so, whether this has led to positive program outcomes.

#### **3. How was this desk review performed?**

This paper is informed by publically available data on donor community engagement from sources that include:

- Relevant donor websites
- Donor policy and program documents
- Donor country and thematic evaluations
- Donor agency annual reports and media releases

##### *3.1 Limitations to this approach*

This is a general overview of other donor activity in this area. The study has been constrained by timeframes and limited easily accessible data.

#### **4. What do other donors do in relation to community engagement?**

There are several ways that other donors engage their broader national communities in international development. A sample of relevant donor agencies was selected and their community engagement initiatives outlined in relation to DAC Peer Review recommendations (if applicable) and any existing donor program reviews or evaluations.

##### *4.1 United States – USAID*

*The United States needs to improve public awareness of its development cooperation. It should develop a strategy for better targeted and accurate information to the public, while seeking alliances with other public, private and civil society organisations (DAC Peer Review 2006)*

- In November 2008, the USAID Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid report “*From the American People: Why the Story That U.S Foreign Assistance is Working Must be Told*”, outlined the challenges faced in getting the American public ‘on board’ with the US aid and development agenda.
- USAID’s public affairs department is responsible for promoting understanding of and support for its programs to the American public. The Agency manages public liaison activities aimed at educating domestic communities about its role, mission and programs.
- In 2004, USAID launched a new Development Outreach and Communications (DOC) initiative designed to broaden both domestic and global understanding of US development and aid programs.
- Under DOC, USAID seeks to integrate a group of trained professionals into its missions to support strategic and tactical communications efforts, subsequently enhancing their ability to tell USAID’s story to domestic and overseas communities.
- This has manifested in the ‘*Telling Our Stories*’ initiative, a web-based application where individual aid and development success stories are published as a public resource, giving a face to specific programs. Through these stories, USAID aims to show the public how American resources are helping to achieve the MDGs.
- Complementary to this, the Knowledge Management department at USAID works to connect its development partners and the community by providing the ‘what, who and how’ that they need to know in order to accomplish USAID’s mission and strategic objectives.
- In addition, USAID hosts various public events such as conferences, seminars and exhibits – often jointly with think-tanks or the private sector – to launch new initiatives, discuss major aid and development issues or highlight the Agency’s successes.
- It is unclear what funding mechanism USAID uses to support these particular initiatives as they are ‘owned’ by a corporate function of the Agency. In general, USAID provides assistance to partner organisations using a grants funding model for discrete small scale projects.

#### 4.2 **Germany – Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)**

*The fulfilment of international commitments will require broad-based support within the government and civil society, building on political foundations, church-based organisations and NGOs. Germany is encouraged to rethink communication to ensure a better public understanding of development issues and outcomes in general, including the rationale underlying delivery modalities that are more conducive to aid effectiveness (DAC Peer Review 2005)*

- BMZ has released a *Development Education and Awareness Raising* policy paper, which describes the goals, methods and tools that BMZ uses, introduces its partner organisations and offers guidance on the methods used and approaches adopted in its cooperation with these partners.
- The policy paper emphasises the new focus on “global learning measures intended to enable citizens to develop a critical understanding of development topics and encourage them to get involved themselves”.
- A key tool of this policy is the financial and technical support that it provides to civil society initiatives.
- These are generally non-repayable grants for small-scale projects, between EUR 12,500 and EUR 37,500.
- To be eligible for project funding, 25% of the recipient organisation’s own contribution is required (a minimum of 10% from the organisation and up to 15% from

other non-governmental sources, although the recipient organisation can also finance the full 25%).

- Activities that BMZ directly engages in to promote development education and awareness raising include:
  - Promoting campaigns and other events directed towards the broader public;
  - Offering a citizen's information service;
  - Giving regular presentations to schools and universities; and
  - Distributing films via the network of state public film services.
- BMZ also relies on its partner organisations such as NGOs, the Lander (states) and governmental implementing organisations to deliver awareness-raising and development education activities through government funded programs:
  - Work and study trips to Africa, Asia and Latin America (ASA);
  - The Service Agency Communities in One World (SKEW);
  - The development-related school competition sponsored by the Federal President;
  - Development education in Germany (EBD); and
  - A programme for development-related school exchanges (ENSA).

#### 4.3 **Japan** – Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

*The government of Japan should make a policy statement on coherence for development and seek ways to educate the public on this issue (DAC Peer Review 2003)*

- The JICA Partnership Program (JPP) is a technical cooperation program which contributes to grass-roots social and economic development in developing countries.
- It does this specifically through close collaboration with “Partners in Japan”, such as NGOs, universities, local governments and public corporations.
- JICA funds these initiatives through a **general projects grants scheme**, however the Agency is currently reviewing its Procurement policies and guidelines.
- The JPP aims to:
  - Strengthen collaboration between communities in both developing countries and Japan by promoting the participation of Japanese citizens in international cooperation activities
  - Encouraging local citizens in Japan to employ their knowledge, experience and technologies for international cooperation activities, which in turn revitalizes Japanese communities.

#### 4.4 **United Kingdom** – Department for International Development (DFID)

*Maintaining current high levels of public support for development will be a special challenge. DFID will need to identify and communicate results and “tell the story” to the British public and elected political representatives (DAC Peer Review 2006)*

- DFID have recently released a paper titled ‘Civil Society and Development’ which clearly outlines DFID's approach to working in partnership with civil society in order to deliver the MDGs.
- Global Community Links is a DFID **small grant initiative (between £1,000 to £10,000)** based on ‘community linking’ – creating an ongoing relationship between a community group in the UK and a community group in a developing country. A key part of this program is to encourage people to share their learning about development issues with the wider community by running UK learning events.
- DFID supports four national development education organisations in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, spending approximately £8 million per annum on formal education project activities and products.

- DFID also administered the Development Awareness Fund (DAF) which is now closed. The DAF was the primary funding mechanism through which DFID funded development awareness activities within the UK.
- The DAF was open to any UK-based non-profit organisation or network committed to raising awareness and understanding of development issues and **grants** awarded were between £10 – 100,000 per year for a maximum period of three years.
- In May 2010, DFID announced an immediate freeze on any new funding for awareness projects in a push to re-focus aid spending. Five existing awareness projects were stopped and funding redirected to areas where it will have a greater impact on global poverty.
- DFID engages with the broader national community when developing its policies, hosting public consultations to ensure that a wide range of community groups are given the opportunity to comment on specific policy development. These consultations are guided by the *Compact between the Government and the Voluntary and Community Sector*, which includes a specific code of good practice on ‘Consultation and Policy Appraisal’.

#### 4.5 *New Zealand – NZAID*

*NZAID is encouraged to continue with the implementation of its communication strategy. Proper attention should be given to the need to ensure a better public understanding of what the agency does and of development issues and outcomes in general, including the rationale underlying new delivery modalities and New Zealand’s engagement with multilateral organisations (DAC Peer Review 2005)*

- The New Zealand Government has implemented Trade Aid, a leading alternative trading organisation that is supported by NZAID. Trade Aid stores have been established throughout New Zealand selling products sourced from developing countries at ‘fair trade’ prices.
- Additionally, NZAID is funding the Fair Trade Association and the Fairtrade Labelling Association of Australia and New Zealand to raise domestic consumer awareness about fair trade issues.
- NZAID funds Trade Aid through **a substantial capacity-building grant.**
- NZAID also sees Global Education as an essential component of aid and development programs in donor countries that are members of the OECD.
- The Global Education Fund (GEF) is a contestable pool of money allocated through NZAID. The aim of the GEF is to provide funding for small projects to develop awareness and understanding of global perspectives such as development education, the environment, human rights, social justice and peace education amongst New Zealand communities.
- The relationship between NZAID and its local partner organisations is guided by the ‘*Strategic Policy Framework for Relations Between NZAID and New Zealand NGOs*’, which sets out a rationale for the relationship and outlines shared principles and respective undertakings by both parties.

#### 4.6 *Canada – Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)*

*CIDA would benefit from a communications strategy that strengthens its outreach to the public and promotes a wider understanding of the efforts and outcomes of development co-operation and of the reform agenda embodied in the Paris Declaration (DAC Peer Review 2007)*

- Community engagement activities are managed by the CIDA Canadian Partnerships Branch. This branch is currently reviewing its programs to ensure that its priorities align with Canada’s Aid Effectiveness Agenda announced in April 2009.



- Canada has been involved in policy work and dialogue with Canadian civil society organisations (CSOs) on the role of non-state actors in program based approaches and aid effectiveness. CIDA has also engaged in “partnership renewal” involving Northern and Southern civil society and private sector organisations. The process has been accompanied by high-level engagement with CSOs in Canada as well as with Southern and Northern CSOs in the work of the DAC Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness.
- CIDA’s Public Engagement Fund (PEF) financially supports projects that:
  - Seek to increase the awareness, understanding and engagement of Canadians in international development issues and programs;
  - Increase domestic support for Canada’s international assistance program and for international efforts to reduce global poverty; and
  - Create opportunities for meaningful community participation in international development activities.
- The PEF accepts proposals for projects that take place in Canada and target specific Canadian audiences.
- Canadian NGOs, youth organisations, environmental NGOs and publically funded colleges and universities are eligible for PEF funding.
- CIDA provides **grant funding for these initiatives on a cost-shared basis** through a contribution agreement between CIDA and the relevant organisation.
- CIDA contributes up to 75% of the project costs, with the Agency contributing between \$25,000 and \$175,000 for approved initiatives.

#### 4.7 *European Union – EuropeAid and the European Commission*

- The European Union’s (EU) thematic, cross-sectoral approach to development cooperation aims to ensure cohesion between European policies and development priorities.
- Under the *Non-state Actors and Local Authorities* thematic program, **annual grants funding** between EUR 20,000-1,000,000 is provided to non-state actors and local authorities to undertake projects with specific objectives which include:
  1. Supporting small-scale actions in the EU and acceding countries aimed at raising public awareness of development issues and promoting education for development, to mobilise greater public support for action against poverty and fairer relations between developed and developing countries; and
  2. Supporting actions aimed at achieving more efficient cooperation, fostering synergies and facilitating dialogue in the area of development between civil society networks and local EU associations and acceding countries.
- All non-profit state actors from the EU can be eligible for funding under this program.
- A report titled ‘*General Evaluation of Actions to Raise Public Awareness of Development Issues in Europe*’ was released by the EU in December 2008. The report evaluated the Development Education and Awareness Raising component (point 1, above) of the *Non-state Actors and Local Authorities* thematic program, with the aim of helping to define the European Commission’s strategy on Development Education and Awareness Raising and to subsequently improve the overall impact of these projects.
- The report found that the program had been particularly successful in:
  - Mobilising the expertise of a significant number of NGOs throughout the EU;
  - Using the proposal mechanism to select good projects relevant to program objectives;



- Developing actions of development education and awareness raising in all Member States, in particular in areas where this content was almost unknown;
- Empowering development education and awareness raising for a within national platforms and linking them through a specific program forum.
- The report found that the program has been less successful in:
  - Ensuring continuity for some good project initiatives;
  - Developing an overall strategic vision in the Non-state Actors and Local Authorities program;
  - Taking full advantage of the links established between grass-roots level, regional approaches, national and European level; and
  - Establishing a clear definition of expected results and indicators of program achievement.

**Annex 3: Review schedule and list of informants**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Tasks/meetings</i>	<i>People met</i>
2/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel to Canberra</li> <li>• AusAID briefing</li> <li>• Logistics, CSO liaison</li> <li>• AusAID consultations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sandra Kraushaar, AusAID</li> <li>• Therese Mills, AusAID</li> <li>• Fiona McLean, Chris Elstoft, Claire McGeechan, AusAID</li> </ul>
3/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document collection &amp; review</li> </ul>	
4/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop initial methodology, indicative workplan, logistics</li> <li>• Review &amp; analysis of documents;</li> </ul>	
5/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel to Sydney</li> <li>• CSO consultations: Girl Guides of Australia</li> <li>• Write up notes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fiona Krautil; Lisa Burstall; Lola Cowle, Girl Guides Australia</li> </ul>
6/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel to Canberra</li> <li>• AusAID consultations</li> <li>• CSO consultations: ACFID</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Megan Anderson, AusAID</li> <li>• Robin Davies, Donna Kingelty, AusAID</li> <li>• Zoe Tiller; Susan Harris-Rimmer, ACFID</li> </ul>
7/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set up CSO teleconferences</li> <li>• Write up notes</li> <li>• CSO consultations: Skateistan (skype)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oliver Percovich, Skateistan</li> </ul>
8/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel to Melbourne</li> <li>• CSO consultations: Business for Millennium Development &amp; Fairtrade</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Faulmann, B4MD</li> <li>• Stephen Knapp via skype, Cameron Neil, Fair Trade</li> </ul>
9/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSO consultations: Local Government Managers Australia &amp; the Oaktree Foundation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helen Diggerson, LGMA</li> <li>• Robbie Tileard, Viv Benjamin, Oaktree</li> </ul>
12/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Write up notes</li> <li>• Document review &amp; analysis</li> </ul>	
13/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel to Hobart</li> <li>• CSO consultations: Tasmanian Center for Global Learning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mary Dickins, Helen Hortle, Jeremy Picone, TCGL</li> </ul>
14/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel to Adelaide</li> <li>• CSO consultations: The Birthing Kit Foundation Australia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jenny Weaver, Joy Ohazy, Julie Monis-Ivett, BKFA</li> </ul>
15/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Write up notes</li> <li>• CSO consultation: Youth With A Mission- skype</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rebekah Hoover, YWAM</li> </ul>
16/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSO consultations: ACFID/Act for Peace &amp; ACTU</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alastair Gee, ACFID/Act for Peace</li> <li>• James McWhinney, ACTU</li> </ul>
19/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Write up notes</li> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>	

<b><i>Date</i></b>	<b><i>Tasks/meetings</i></b>	<b><i>People met</i></b>
20/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSO teleconference: Erina Rotary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Margaret Aggar</li> </ul>
21/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Write up notes</li> </ul>	
22/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Travel to Canberra</li> <li>Debriefing with AusAID</li> <li>AusAID consultation</li> <li>PS International Devlt consultation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sandra Kraushaar, Therese Mills, Robin Davies, Murray Proctor, AusAID</li> <li>Paul Nicholls, AusAID</li> <li>Bob McMullan, Parliament House</li> </ul>
23/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Write up notes</li> </ul>	
26/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSO consultation teleconference: Symbiosis International</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jeff McClintock</li> </ul>
27/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report write up</li> </ul>	
28/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report write up</li> </ul>	
29/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft (1) report submission</li> </ul>	
30/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AusAID feedback</li> <li>Report revision</li> <li>Draft (2) report submission</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sandra Kraushaar</li> </ul>
4/8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AusAID briefing &amp; feedback</li> </ul>	
5/8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report revision</li> </ul>	
7/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Travel to Canberra</li> <li>AusAID consultation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Therese Mills</li> </ul>
8/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report revision</li> </ul>	
11/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final report submission</li> </ul>	

## **Annex 4: Performance assessment framework & key questions**

### **ACTIVITY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK**

<b>Performance Domain</b>	<b>Line of Inquiry</b>
1. Relevance	1.1 Briefly describe your understanding of the overall Objective/s of the CC2A program?
	1.2 Why do you think AusAID has the CC2A Program?
	1.3 What are the objectives of your CC2A activity?
	1.4 How does your CC2A activity fit within your organisations broader objectives/strategy?
	1.5 How much of your CC2A activity was designed specifically for the CC2A Program, as distinct from CC2A funding your existing work?
	1.6 How do the CC2A Program Objective and your activity objectives work together? Are there any gaps? Any particular intersection or synergies?
	1.7 Does your CC2A activity remain relevant within your organisation today or would you do it differently now?
2. Efficiency (includes AusAID)	2.1 How did you learn about the CC2A?
	2.2 Describe your experience of the application process?
	2.3 What were/are your expectations of the relationship with AusAID? eg support, materials etc
	2.4 Do you know the other participating orgs? Would you like to meet with them? Why? Describe the extent of your interactions with other participating organisations.
	2.5 Is the implementation of your activity on schedule and within budget? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any changes in the planned budget and/or timetable?</li> <li>Can you describe any changes/envisaged changes in the activity since commencement?</li> <li>Do you feel your activity is adequately resourced?</li> </ul>
	2.6 What are some of the positive and negative surprises that are arising in your activity?
3. Effectiveness	3.1 Do you think you will achieve your activity's Objectives?
	3.2 What are the obstacles (risks) in terms of achieving your Objectives?
	3.3 What have been/or will be the benefits/positive results from your CC2A activity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Your organisation?</li> <li>Your constituency?</li> <li>AusAID?</li> </ul>
	3.4 What are some of the difficulties or problems with your CC2A activity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Your organisation?</li> <li>Your constituency?</li> <li>AusAID?</li> </ul>

Performance Domain	Line of Inquiry
	3.5 Why did these happen? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contributing factors?</li> <li>How to resolve them?</li> </ul>
4. M&E	4.1 How do you and others know that these results are happening? 4.2 What indicators were established to show progress of your activity (quantitative and qualitative)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How are these being monitored? By who? When?</li> <li>How are you managing your performance reporting obligations to AusAID?</li> </ul>
5. Gender Equity	5.1 How do you involve women and men (girls and boys) in your activity? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any targeting of either gender?</li> <li>Can you describe the participation of women and men in planning, implementation?</li> <li>Any disaggregated info on the results of your work?</li> </ul>
6. Sustainability	6.1 What happens after you complete this activity? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>in terms of future similar work?</li> <li>In terms of your organisation and engagement with AusAID?</li> <li>In terms of follow-up with the participants in the current activity?</li> </ul>
7. Lessons Learned	7.1 What have you learnt from your experiences of the CC2A program and your CC2A activity? 7.2 If this Pilot leads to a continuation of the CC2A Program, what do you think it should be?
8. Other	8.1 How have you operationalised the statement of international development principles? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gender equality?</li> <li>Anti-terrorism?</li> <li>Other principles/practices?</li> </ul>
	Anything else?

### AusAID staff: Possible key questions/prompts

#### *Program objectives*

- a) What do you understand to be the overall aim or goal of the CC2A program?
- b) What are the objectives of the program?
  - What changes would make the objective more relevant to AusAID's priorities?
  - Have there been any changes in the objective over the period of the CC2A?
  - Is it as relevant
  - Where is this documented?
- c) What the status of the 'purposes' /objectives listed in the June 2010 desk review?
  - 4.1 A response to international recommendations*
  - 4.2 A mechanism to increase the Australian community's engagement with international development*
  - 4.3 To assist in the production of a coherent and coordinated approach to development awareness messages and campaigns*

- 4.4 To increase AusAID's engagement with non-accredited NGOs
  - 4.5 To promote good development practice principles to non-AusAID accredited NGOs
- d) Once we identify the objective, how is it relevant to AusAID's priorities/ strategies? Where does it sit within various strategies?
- e) How widely is this objective/goal known & how is it understood outside AusAID:
- In the aid sector?
  - In the wider community?
  - How was the CC2A publicised?
- f) How does the CC2A and the objective align with the AusAID funded Global Education Program?
- Any synergies? Eg impact assessment tools?
  - Any overlap?
  - Any assessment of impact in the Global Education program?

### ***Program progress***

- g) Can you tell me about some of the activities funded/implemented under the CC2A?
- h) How have they contributed towards the objective?
- i) What do you expect the outcomes of the CC2A to be?
- j) How was the first quarter 2009 'tri-annual community attitudes survey towards aid and development' used in planning and implementing the CC2A?

### ***Program design, process (management?) & risk management***

- k) What's the status of the design document (Jan 2009)?
- What happened to the risk management matrix that was attached to that? How has it been used?
  - The DD included a number of ways to manage potential risk eg capacity building, use of a contractor, negotiations with orgs about projects, linking the orgs with accredited agencies etc. How have these been managed since then?
- l) Can you describe the current program design & how it operates now?
- How does this enhance or impede achievement of the objective?
- m) What were the selection criteria for community projects?
- The list provided in the June 2010 Desk review is different from the list in the funding guidelines.
- n) Risk: What risk analysis and management steps/documents do you have?
- o) What was the importance of participating orgs putting out consistent or coherent messages ie aligned with AusAID's comms strategy? How did you seek to do this?
- p) What aspects of the CC2A program would you change? Why?

### ***Conclusion***

- r) Any other comments or information you'd like to add?