

Theory of Change

Giving for Change

Global Fund for Community Foundations (GFCF), Africa Philanthropy Network (APN), Kenya Community Development Foundation (KCDF) and Wilde Ganzen (WG)

Problem analysis

Only 4% of the world's population live in countries where fundamental freedoms, including freedom of speech, are respected. Especially the freedoms of women, LGBTQI people, ethnic and religious minorities, migrants and refugees are under attack¹.

Problem: While freedom of speech is a fundamental human right and essential feature of democracy, international aid funding structures, mechanisms, and the power dynamics they create have inadvertently contributed to the erosion of freedom of speech of local people in aid recipient countries:

- 1) Local people are cast as passive and voiceless recipients of aid. Development is done *to* people, rather than *by* them.
- 2) The human rights sector is over-dependent on external funding, failing to engage the public as constituents and supporters.²

ad1 Funding mechanisms are largely top-down, project-driven, and shaped by the agenda of donors rather than by local development needs³. These mechanisms continue to emphasize flows of funding from the global north to meet "needs" in the global south. They are focused on expert-led, scientific solutions deriving from western knowledge systems⁴. Donor-funding has resulted in homogenisation of CSOs, moving them away from local priorities, local constituencies and local accountability⁵. Too often, local communities are regarded as "beneficiaries" rather than mobilized, active citizens with their own opinions, experiences and assets, who are able to claim their rights from power-holders. This, in turn, has created a dependency mindset. As a result, CSOs are not able to "hear" the voices of communities⁶ and do not speak on their behalf.

ad2 Upward accountability to external donors and professionalization of civic action have led many (I)NGOs to divert from their original values and purpose, described as the "de-politicization" or "NGO-ization" of resistance⁷. This has eroded solidarity and the pursuit of rights and justice at community level. For example: donor criteria can prompt CSOs to hire highly educated staff rather than grassroots activists and to look for solutions at government rather than community level⁸. Furthermore, CSOs working on sensitive or unpopular human and social justice issues tend to rely on international funding rather than build local constituencies. This over-reliance on external funding has left them vulnerable to accusations of being illegitimate, foreign-funded agents.

Recent discussions among donors and INGOs have focused on the question of how to share and devolve power and resources in less top-down and more collaborative ways that engage, rather than alienate, communities and that build on, rather than by-pass or undermine, the assets that already exist⁹.

¹ "State of civil society 2019", CIVICUS, p.6

² "Community philanthropy: a way forward for human rights?", Younis, 2017, p.3

³ "Making Aid Agencies Work", Gibson, 2019

⁴ "Encountering development: the making and unmaking of the Third World", Escobar, 1995, p.13

⁵ "Promoting Civil Society and Democracy", Kamstra, 2014, p.168

⁶ "Time to listen", Anderson et al, 2012

⁷ "Help that Hinders", Arundhati, 2004, Le Monde Diplomatique <https://mondediplo.com/2004/11/16roy>

⁸ "Worlds Apart But Much Alike", Kamstra and Schulpen, Studies in Comparative International Development, December 2015, p.344-346

⁹ "#ShiftThePower: The Rise of Community Philanthropy", Hodgson and Knight, 2016, Alliance magazine

Re-routing flows of money from the global North *directly* to southern partners is only part of the solution. The coercive power of donors also stems from the lack of alternative resources available to southern civil society actors¹⁰. To truly ShiftThePower, it is essential to acknowledge, mobilize and aggregate assets existing within communities¹¹. '*Community philanthropy*' is a form of resource mobilization in which citizens become co-investors and thus have a greater say in their development. A growing body of evidence¹² demonstrates that mobilizing local resources is an essential strategy for having local people to express their views, claim their rights and strengthening the link between CSOs and the citizens they serve. People will only give to organizations they trust and value, while evidence of local support strengthens CSOs' legitimacy when it comes to claiming rights from government.

In many low and middle income countries, emerging philanthropy actors (including private foundations and a growing middle-class with disposable income) also create new opportunities for CSOs to tap and blend different kinds of local money. INGOs too are starting to tap into these, but according to Southern CSOs, such INGO efforts "[...] reinforce power dynamics and ultimately close the space for domestic civil society."¹³

If local resources are to be deployed for long-term systemic change there is still much work to be done, in terms of attitudes and behaviours and putting in place appropriate legal frameworks.¹⁴ The draft PBO-Act in Kenya, for example, does not have provisions that cater for the needs of local private (fundraising) foundations, nor does it propose a legal regime on accountability across the sector, which would enhance public trust in CSOs.

There is both an urgent need and a growing opportunity to strengthen the resilience of civil society organizations and structures, both those working on broader community level issues and those focused on the issues of the most marginalized members of society. Community philanthropy offers a proposition based on a more equitable, co-investment approach which challenges the power dynamics that underpin many donor-recipient relationships and creates new spaces for community participation and voice based on control of resources.

Our strategy

Strategic objective: to enhance freedom of speech (both as a means and an end) by amplifying community voices claiming their rights towards power-holders through community philanthropy, with the support of other state and societal actors in 11 countries.

In the **central domain**, we aim to unlock the collective power of *local* communities, represented by Civil Society Actors (CSAs¹⁵: community organisations, movements, informal groups and human rights defenders), to express their opinion through community philanthropy.

We will:

- *activate* a deliberately diverse range of CSAs (including those representing women and marginalized groups) to form and run local Communities of Practice (CoPs) to support peer learning, network building and inclusion. Here, human rights defenders increase their capacity to build local constituencies, while community organizations gain more understanding and become more vocal on human rights issues.
- *strengthen the capacity of* CoP members through training, coaching, and mutual learning to *influence* the dependency mindsets of communities (*educational role*) and *mobilise* support for their work by building local constituencies and through philanthropic giving. A local support base strengthens the legitimacy and the *cooperative role* (more resources available) of CSAs.
- increase *political participation* by capacity strengthening and funding for CSAs and CoPs to express citizens' voices and claim rights at local level (*representational role*), based on

¹⁰ "Promoting Civil Society and Democracy", Kamstra, 2014, p.165

¹¹ "Active social capital", Krishna, 2002

¹² Summarized in: "New Horizons for Community-Led Development", Hodgson et al, 2017 and "Analysing the relationship between domestic resource mobilisation and civic space", Kumi and Hayman, 2019

¹³ "Open letter to INGOs" (openDemocracy, 8 March 2020)

¹⁴ "Creating an enabling environment for philanthropy through tax incentives", KCDF and Strathmore Tax Research Centre, 2014, p.6-7

¹⁵ Wherever we write "CSA's" this includes Civil Society Organisations (CSOs).

collective action plans for lobbying and advocacy developed during training courses to address community priorities.

- stimulate CSAs to use existing citizen engagement platforms or lobby for the creation of such spaces (*communicative role*).

Capacity strengthening and small-scale seed funding for innovative approaches of CSAs and CoPs are crucial. We will build on successful models piloted and adapted by members of GFCF's global network and the Change the Game Academy's Local Fundraising and Lobby and Advocacy trajectories (WG and its partners).

Impact and (intermediary) outcomes

Intermediate outcomes:

- More involvement of local communities by CSAs in determining their priorities and lobbying other stakeholders to realise them
- More community resources mobilized, stewarded and utilized
- More participation of CSAs in citizen engagement platforms/mechanisms.

Outcome:

- CSAs are more relevant, rooted, legitimate, and trusted
- CSAs effectively hold power-holders accountable and influence policies and practices that affect their constituencies
- CSAs catalyze people-led, inclusive social change

Medium term impact:

- Communities express their voice through CSAs and are empowered to take control of their own development
- Government and power-holders are accountable and respect human rights

Assumptions

- Increased capacity of CSAs to build constituencies and mobilize domestic resources leads to stronger CSAs and more engagement and trust between CSAs and citizens
- "Mainstream" CSAs can be brought to collaborate with CSAs representing the voice of minorities
- People only give to organizations they trust and who work on things relevant to them
- Government officials are more open to claims from CSAs who have a strong local support base
- Human rights and civic space will only be secured and protected when the public holds power-holders accountable.

Indicators

- # of CoPs mobilized and # of CSA actors involved
- # of groups/organizations with increased capacity to build constituencies and make claims
- # of groups/organizations that have increased their domestic income
- # of cases of successful agenda-setting with power-holders by communities
- # of government or NGO policies/practices changed

Our learnings, stories and evidence from the central domain feed into our lobby efforts under the second and third domain. We will capture both hard and soft outcomes and develop alternative metrics that can measure success, working parallel and in partnership with GFCF-hosted learning circles on measurement of community philanthropy and social change. For example: how do you measure "trust" of communities in the CSAs that represent them, "community pride", "legitimacy" and "rootedness"?

In the **second domain**, we influence in-country *national* state and societal actors (government, emerging philanthropists, individual donors) to support community philanthropy by creating favorable conditions to promote the power of local philanthropic giving as a form and driver of expression of opinion. We will:

- *broker* between CSAs and these national actors
- raise the profile of community philanthropy by *creating visibility*, *mobilizing* ShiftThePower convenings and *funding* National Community Philanthropy Platforms (NCPPs)
- *influence public awareness* on domestic philanthropic giving (giving for change instead of giving for direct needs) and increase trust in CSAs through media campaigns
- *conduct research* on legal frameworks for domestic philanthropic giving

- *lobby* for legislation on domestic philanthropic giving, with the support of the general public and/or emerging philanthropic actors. In Kenya, for example, we will work on the drafting and passing of a Foundations Law.

Impact and (intermediary) outcomes

Intermediate outcomes:

- increased awareness of government on the importance of facilitating donations to CSAs
- increased awareness of individual donors and emerging philanthropic actors on the potential of community philanthropy and CSAs as drivers for social change

Outcome:

- Increased domestic giving for social and systemic change
- CSAs are seen as more relevant, trusted and legitimate
- CSAs effectively lobby for positive laws and regulations on philanthropic giving

Short term impact:

- Government adopts laws and regulations that enable domestic philanthropic giving

Medium term impact:

- Government and power-holders are accountable and respect human rights

Assumptions

- A media campaign can positively influence public perception of CSAs and motivate people to give beyond the direct needs of their personal network
- Emerging philanthropic actors are open for dialogue on effective models for philanthropic giving
- Governments of some of our target countries are open to inputs on a more enabling environment for philanthropic giving because of the expansion of philanthropy, increasing pressure on national budgets and a decrease in foreign aid.

Indicators

- % increase of people who give to CSAs in a selected geographic area within a given year (as compared to % measured yearly by the World Giving Index at national level)
- # of philanthropic actors who participated in meetings, conversations and debates
- # of philanthropic actors who changed funding policies
- # of cases of influence on government agenda setting
- # of adapted or adopted laws and regulations

In the **third domain**, we challenge and change the existing practices of *international* foundations, INGOs and bi- and multilateral donors in working with southern CSAs. We will advocate to put community philanthropy at the heart of their *funding* policy and to focus (more) on *brokering*, *diplomacy* and *technical expertise* roles. We will:

- disseminate research outcomes and the learnings from the central domain
- organise workshops and lectures at relevant international fora and gatherings (like WINGS)
- conduct face-to-face meetings
- propose resolutions, provide advice and potential models to international fora

Impact and (intermediary) outcomes

Intermediate outcomes:

- increased awareness of international donors on the negative effects of their present practices and the advantages of community philanthropy
- models tested where top-down, vertical structures meet more emergent, horizontal ones that allow people to drive their own development.

Outcome:

- International donors support community philanthropy and the political roles of CSAs

Medium term impact:

- Communities express their voice through CSAs
- Government and power-holders are held accountable and stimulated to respect human rights.

Assumptions

- Building on our existing contacts and networks, international donors can be convinced to start exploring community philanthropy, while those already involved in #ShiftThePower conversations can be convinced to alter their funding policies

Indicators

- # of International Foundations and INGOs that have participated in meetings, conversations and debates
- # of these who changed funding policies
- # of cases of bi- or multilateral donor officials who have made statements in support of community philanthropy
- # of bi- or multilateral donor policies changed

Country selection

In our six *primary countries* (Brazil, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Uganda), through our partner networks, we will:

- build on our previous work on community philanthropy, lobbying and advocacy on local issues and domestic resource mobilization
- support lobbying, where feasible, for a more enabling legal environment at national level.

These countries present different contexts in terms of civic space, donor and philanthropy landscape (e.g. donor withdrawal and emerging philanthropic actors in Ghana, Kenya and Brazil, while Uganda receives much external donor support), and the extent to which conversations around shifting power are already taking root.

While the program focuses on Africa, Brazil has been added because many community organizations in Brazil are strong advocates for human rights, which provides a good opportunity for South-South learning as this is less so the case in Africa. Also, our Brazilian partners expressed strong interest to participate in this program because Brazil's political situation necessitates building citizen constituencies and defending freedom of expression and freedom of press at community level.

In our five *secondary countries*, where we also have partner relations, the #ShiftThePower debate is in a more nascent state: Benin, Mozambique, Senegal, Tanzania, Palestine Territories. Here, we will:

- focus on the central domain (empowering communities) and starting #ShiftThePower conversations
- select some elements from the other two domains, based on country context
- start later, so the implementation benefits from experiences gained in primary countries.

Within countries we will focus on geographical areas where there:

- are specific hindrances to freedom of expression, while ensuring a mix of urban and rural settings
- exists the possibility to bring together different types of civil society groups (human rights defenders, community organizations, movements)
- is a need and opportunity to address gender and inclusion (see next paragraph).

Gender and inclusion analysis

We define community as something that can be place, identity or issue-based (this is reflected in the global constituency of GFCF for example, which includes women's, environment, LGBTQI, Dalit and other social justice funds as well as those focussing on a particular geography). While place can provide an important starting point around which to mobilize people and resources, we recognize that majority issues can sometimes prevail – at the expense of minorities and women - and that organizations can be subject to 'elite capture'. To mitigate this risk and make sure local development is inclusive and no one is left behind, we will, in the CoPs, support the formation and/or strengthening of formal and informal coalitions of a deliberately diverse range of CSAs that represent different kinds of community interests (community organizations, human rights defenders, movements, and others representing women and youth, people living with disability and other marginalized formal groups, including identity-based communities, such as LGBTQI, religious and ethnic minorities). This allows for building bridges, empathy and solidarity around collective, sectoral issues to do with power and resourcing.

Furthermore, beyond this peer learning among unlikely partners, we will draw on some of the particular innovations in community-driven development that have emerged from social justice movements, which focus on managing, challenging and sharing power. These include community giving, participatory grantmaking, community audit processes, community voice, and community claim making. The interests of marginalized communities lie at the heart of our approach. We will also deliberately draw in the assets of community organizing strategies that have evolved at the edges of societies.

Civic Space analysis

Civic space is 'narrowed' in Ghana, 'obstructed' in Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Kenya, Mozambique and Senegal, and 'repressed' in Ethiopia, Palestine Territories, Tanzania and Uganda, according to the 2019 CIVICUS civic space monitor. Space to actually work on community philanthropy and national legislation is not always dependent on the category these countries are in:

- In some countries (e.g. Ghana - 'narrowed' - and Burkina Faso - 'obstructed'), government recognizes the vital role of civil society in development. The Burkinabé government, for instance, has indicated an interest to collaborate with us on domestic philanthropic giving. In such countries, the program will focus on safeguarding civic space by advocating for a supportive legal framework for domestic resource mobilization.
- In Ethiopia, though 'repressed', we expect to be able to focus on a correct implementation of recently adopted legislation.
- In other countries (e.g. Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Brazil) national government perceives and portrays civil society organisations, human rights defenders and the media as troublemakers who seek to destabilize politics, misuse funds and are supported by foreign actors who want to interfere in domestic affairs by influencing public opinion. At the more local level, space may be somewhat larger. To defend the remaining civic space and, where possible, enlarge it, we will support CSAs to increase their legitimacy and credibility by building and sustaining close links with their communities (strengthening their capacity to build local constituencies, mobilise domestic resources and take up their four political roles), so that the loudest voices on laws, policies and practices come from citizens.

Through our interventions, we build a collective voice that speaks to issues that affect citizens directly and to the overarching issue of civic space. Our media campaigns will stress the legitimacy of civil society and its different actors and try to build trust.

A potential "turn of the tide" in civic space, for instance because of regime change, may hamper these efforts. We will mitigate this risk by using non-confrontational frames, stressing the contribution that community philanthropy and domestic philanthropic giving can make to achieving the countries development goals and the SDGs, and avoiding words like 'systems change' in our media campaigns.

In two of our primary countries we have already tested a tool developed by the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL) and WINGS to map existing legislation and identify possibilities and strategies for improvements. We will use this tool to refine our strategy for more countries.

Partner analysis

In each national program, a "national anchor institution" (NAI) plays a crucial role in mobilizing, connecting and strengthening different actors involved. NAIs combine a strong presence at and understanding of communities and community philanthropy with a national outreach.

NAIs will catalyze a movement of CSAs (community organizations, human rights defenders, movements, and others representing women and marginalized groups) that are up for a radical review of how things are done. They will start by mobilizing organizations that have already been trained under Change the Game Academy or are supported by GFCF and have proven to be forerunners. These forerunners will help select and involve other CSAs in their vicinity, and especially those working on inclusion, in Communities of Practice. CSAs and CoPs will practice community philanthropy, lobby and advocate at local level, and contribute to national lobbying and advocacy.

Each NAI will help create a national #ShiftThePower platform, consisting of representatives of CoPs, NGOs and movements, human rights organisations and activists, philanthropic foundations, interested scholars, and other individuals. The platform will organize #ShiftThePower convenings and seek collaboration with NGO platforms, HR movements, and lobby groups.

At both local and national level we work with media to support our lobby and advocacy work, specifically *non-mainstream* media because of government, corporate and/or religious influence on mainstream media. At community level we will work with community radio and influencers of public opinion as important advocates for freedom of expression. At national level we will work with influencers (bloggers/vloggers) and social media activists.

Where applicable, we collaborate with ICNL to research legal frameworks and, besides local experts, with RNW-media for working with bloggers/vloggers. Lastly, we will collaborate with academic institutions that are open to test alternative research methods and metrics and produce peer-reviewed, evidence-based publications.

At international level, consortium members will influence donors and INGOs through networks such as APN convenings, WINGS, (European) Foundation Center, and national NGO networks in key European countries. Potential allies in this lobby are forerunners in changing their funding practices, such as certain institutional donors (Dutch MFA, USAID and DFID) and foundations like CS Mott and Ford Foundation), and stakeholders/influencers like CIVICUS and the Count me In consortium.

The Fund for Global Human Rights will collaborate as a thought-partner, advocate and convenor for conversations about local constituency building for human rights, starting with Kenya and Uganda, where it has a presence.

Connection with Dutch society

WG has the support of around 35,000 individual givers and some 20 private Dutch foundations. Through quarterly magazines, newsletters and social media WG can communicate about this program with these supporters. In addition, WG supports the work of 400 Dutch private development initiatives (PDIs). We will share the results, resources produced and lessons learned under this program to help PDIs reflect on how they can support Southern partners in expressing the voice of their constituencies, build on local assets, and shift power in their partner relation. WG will continue its advocacy work in the Netherlands on "ShiftThePower" towards other INGOs and policymakers through continued collaboration with Vice Versa.

Requested amount

€ 35 million, of which:

Central Domain	55%
Domain 2	15%
Domain 3	15%
Research, Monitoring and Evaluation	9%
International coordination	6%