



# Together<sup>4</sup>Change

V

Consortium check

# INDEX

V	Consortium Check	V-2
V.1	The consortium's capacity <i>(criterion 4.3.1)</i>	V-2
V.2	The consortium's added value <i>(criterion 4.3.2)</i>	V-10

## V Consortium Check

### V.1 The consortium's capacity (*criterion 4.3.1*)

#### V.1.1 Financial management of the consortium (*criterion 4.3.1a*)

In the period 2007-2010 ICS is the lead party of the Change for Children-consortium which receives MFS-I subsidy. During this subsidy period ICS further built and developed the organisation and its capacity, gained a lot of experience and learned some valuable lessons. All in all, after a couple of years, ICS has expertise as a lead party which is a solid basis for the new consortium under MFS II. ICS is convinced that it, together with the consortium partners, has sufficient capacity to guarantee adequate financial management and to secure efficient and effective implementation of the consortium's programmes.

#### *Organisational development of ICS 2007-2010*

As part of the MFS-I subsidy ICS has made some major changes in its organisation. Most significant was the creation of a programme department within both the office in the Netherlands and in the regional offices in Africa and Asia. This was necessary to be able to achieve the ambitious objectives in the subsidy application and the strategic plans for 2007-2010. Other significant developments were the setup of a Quality Management System, major improvements in ICS' financial and programmatic monitoring and the strengthening of the capacities of its partners.

In 2009 ICS concentrated itself on improving its programmatic and financial organisation. This was one of the major objectives for this year, based on the recommendations of the external auditor in 2008. In the most recent report (Management letter 2009, Appendix 12) the auditor concluded that ICS made some important steps in improving its monitoring at consortium level, both programmatic as financial. It can be concluded that after three years of organisational development and gaining experience as a lead agent the management and monitoring of the consortium's resources are now adequate.

#### *Consortium 2011-2015*

When anticipating on further collaboration beyond 2010, ICS and the other consortium partners evaluated their collaboration in the Change for Children consortium. Four out of five consortium partners of the current Change for Children-consortium concluded they want to be involved in the consortium's programmes in the next period, running from 2011 until 2015.

ICS will continue as the lead party and Wilde Ganzen will again participate in the consortium as co-applicant. Both Net4Kids and Kidsrights will also be involved in the Action for Children-programma beyond 2010, but will no longer be a co-applicant due to their minimal involvement in the programme and the consortium. Zeister Zendingsgenootschap has decided not to continue as co-applicant and will join another consortium.

ICS has been orienting itself to broaden the consortium with other organisations that have specific expertise and scope to contribute to the objectives of the consortium. There have been several discussions with other like-minded organisations in the Netherlands, of which SOS Kinderdorpen and Wereldkinderen finally joined the consortium.

In terms of capacity, scale and background, the four consortium members are more equal compared to the members of the Change for Children-consortium. ICS is therefore confident about the

manageability of the consortium, as it can rely on the capacities, experiences and commitment of its co-applicants.

## **Organisational assessment**

The capacity of each potential consortium partner has been subject to intensive discussions and assessment. In first instance the partners searched for common ground on programmatic level. When this discussion as effectuated into a letter of intent of all partners to join hands, the focus of the discussions shifted towards the organisational and financial capacities of all organisations.

An organisational assessment of all consortium members (ICS and co-applicants alike) was carried out by an external consultant under the final responsibility of ICS. The outcomes of the assessments of the co-applicants are presented in Appendix 25 and served as an important input for ICS' appraisal of the quality and capacity of all co-applicants. In addition it served as input for the risk assessment in the feasibility analysis (IV.3.2). The outcomes of the assessment of ICS were used as input for the Organisational check in this subsidy application. All consortium members were assessed, including ICS. In the assessment of the three co-applicant ICS was intensively involved. For ICS this was a good opportunity to gain information on the capacities of its potential partners, especially in case of the two new consortium partners, SOS Kinderdorpen and Wereldkinderen.

The following seven domains were assessed in accordance with the MFS II application format for the Organisational check:

### **1. The quality of the administrative organisation**

All organisations have a solid administrative organisation, with effective procedures in place. It was found that formal policy documents were not always institutionalised and implemented to the same degree in all organisations, such as anti-corruption and sanction policies. The improvement plans include the formalisation and implementation of such documents in the course of 2010. Through discussion and exchange, the consortium partners will support each other to achieve this.

### **2. Efficiency of the organisation**

Each organisation uses different tools to manage its efficiency. Despite of the variety in tools it is concluded that each co-applicants adequately manages efficiency. The consortium aims to tune the different tools and look for general methodologies to manage efficiency for all partners in the consortium.

### **3. Application of the Wijffels Code**

All organisations verifiably adhere to the Code Wijffels. Each co-applicant has separated the executive and supervision of the organisation. Also, each organisation complies with the Rules on Remuneration, which is also referred to in threshold criterion 15. Each co-applicant has a complaint procedure for private donors. Complaint procedures regarding Southern partners are not always formalised, although informal mechanisms may exist for processing complaints. This will be adapted in 2010 by each co-applicant.

### **4. Policy on Southern partner organisations**

Although the quality of the partner policy documents varies per co-applicant, in each case there is scope for improvement. In the last few months, the consortium jointly formulated and approved a joint Partner Policy (appendix 9 of the Consortium Partnership agreement, Appendix 27) which will be used as a base for further development of each of the applicants' own partner policy in 2010. Each co-applicant offers a forum to their Southern partner organisations to influence the policy and programmatic development of the organisation. In none of the organisations, there is a formal structure for organising and anchoring an independent Southern voice to influence its policies and strategies directly. This will be set up as an consortium, by installing an advisory board on programme level, starting in 2010.

### **5. Track record**

All co-applicants have documented track records of their programmes. Documentations and evaluations are available and of sufficient quality. However, the challenge is to streamline the various ways of reporting to optimise learning from the track records.

## **6. Context analyses**

Each co-applicant has conducted context analyses of sufficient quality. The analyses of the consortium members are all relevant for their programmes. To conduct joint analyses the consortium members need to synchronize their methodologies and formats and make working agreements.

## **7. Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation**

Within all organisations a wealth of procedures are in place to monitor and evaluate projects and programmes. The manner in which action is taken on the results of what is being measured and assessed is not always efficient. There is a tendency to over-evaluate, as the conclusions are not always shared and conclusions are not always sufficiently taken into account. In order to optimise learning in the alliance there has to be an agreement on a set of principles, procedures and guidelines for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation and procedures must be planned to make PME feed inter-organisational learning.

## **Capacity of the consortium 2011-2015**

The essence of the programmes of the Change for Children-consortium 2007-2010 will remain the same in 2011-2015, but will be broadened with the addition and reinforcement of elements where the new consortium members add their strengths.

Wilde Ganzen, Kidsrights and Net4Kids remain the Dutch organisations that run the Action for Children programme, together with three known Southern organisations and two new partners in the South. ICS will implement the Investment for Social and Economic Change-programme together with a number of partner organisations which ICS cooperates with in the current CDCD-programme (such as Context, international cooperation, Stichting Het Groene Woudt, Aflatoun and a number of local Southern organisations). ICS will continue the Child Protection-programme, however with some adjustments in its focus, together with Southern organizations, such as ACPF. The new co-applicants, SOS Kinderdorpen and Wereldkinderen, have experience with MFS- and TMF-subsidies and will use this experience for their role in the consortium.

ICS concludes that the organisational assessments clearly show that all co-applicants have invested substantially in their financial monitoring systems. These results and experiences strengthen the confidence of the consortium that in 2011 they can primarily concentrate the implementation of the programmes, as each partner can build upon its firm organisational basis.

ICS has invested in its organisational development during MFS I to enable its organisation to properly manage the Change for Children consortium. As the essence of the programme and consortium will not change dramatically, the new consortium can build on and gain from the existing capacity, experiences and lessons learned.

The experience and lessons learned in the Change for Children consortium will form the basis for the management of the consortium beyond 2010. However, a few issues require specific attention to further improve and optimize management:

- ICS fulfills both the role of lead party (coordinating the consortium and managing the overall responsibility of all consortium programmes) and the role of consortium member striving to be an active within implementation and management of the programmes and to work with the other organisations on an equal basis. Over the past few years, ICS has learnt a great deal on how to avoid a conflict of interest between these two roles. This learning is the basis for designing the management structure for the MFS II consortium. ICS aims to anchor its role of lead party in its own organisation. In concrete, this means ICS will establish a separate unit for monitoring, which will monitor both ICS' own programmes as the implementation of the programmes managed by the co-applicants. ICS will strive to keep its flexibility and innovativeness and to avoid bureaucracy.
- Agreements and expectations amongst the consortium partners will be recorded beforehand in clear and formal documents. In the Consortium Partnership agreement (Appendix 27) a number of

formal issues have already been agreed upon. In 2010 these formal agreements will be extended with agreements on procedural, operational and programmatic level.

## V.1.2 Consortium based on a feasibility analysis (criterion 4.3.1b)

The consortium is based on a feasibility analysis. In Appendix 26 the full report – reflecting the process, the analysis itself and the outcome of the analysis - can be found. It includes an analysis of previous experience of working in a consortium and experiences of ICS being a lead party. The feasibility of the consortium is concluded based on the identified added value (in terms of strategy, programmes and efficiency gains), the identified success factors and opportunities as well as identified risk. Identified risks are in turn matched with practical and concrete measures to manage and reduce these.

### **Background**

The consortium consists of International Child Support (ICS), Wilde Ganzen (WG), Wereldkinderen (WK) and SOS Kinderdorpen. Whereas ICS and WG already have a longer collaborative relationship, WK and SOS Kinderdorpen are new relations in the context of this consortium. The establishment of the consortium has been fuelled by the process of formulating this grant application for MFS II, but is grounded in a conviction of unexplored opportunities and added value of collaboration. Each of the four organisations has a specific role in the consortium and brings specific expertise and experiences.

### **Process**

The explorative, transparent and participative process, and the manner in which the consortium members have reached an agreement, is illustrative of the core values which form the basis for the consortium: People and their organisations are put central, reciprocity, enterprising, transparency and accountability.

Starting with exploration of the strategic and programmatic scope for collaboration, the process continued towards assessing the organisational capacity of the individual organisations and of the total consortium (see previous section in relation to criterion 4.3.1.a on adequate financial management). These assessments also served as input for a joint analysis on the feasibility of the consortium. In this analysis identified risks and success factors were elaborated and weighed against each other, and concluded with a description of practical and concrete measures to manage risks.

### **Added Value**

The added value is jointly acknowledged by all consortium members. The most important added value is described in terms of strategy, programme and efficiency gains. In Appendix 26 the full analysis and explanation can be found (Consortium Feasibility Analysis). The Added value is also elaborately described in relation to criterion 4.3.2.a in section V.2.

### **Identified success factors and opportunities**

#### **a) Four experienced organisations joining forces for increased impact**

All four consortium members are experienced development organisations of acknowledged quality and with different expertise. In the previous five years all four organisations have also received subsidy funds from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Development Cooperation. The combination of this all together provides a solid basis for taking on and succeeding with a larger programme with a larger impact. The further conceptual development of new and innovative ideas consequently leads to the positioning of the consortium as a new and 'powerful' actor in the sector.

### **b) Experience of working in a consortium**

The experience of ICS and WG working together in a consortium is identified as an important success factor. In particular the experience ICS has as lead party. This relates to both the challenges and successes in the Change for Children consortium. Efficiency surveys, satisfaction surveys and other manners of evaluating the collaboration have been applied to draw learning from the current collaboration. This will contribute – as it already has – to the success of the consortium.

### **c) Synergy**

In identifying and describing what the consortium brings in terms of synergy, the consortium members have looked further than the four organisations themselves. The strategic partners – such as Context, international cooperation and ACPF – are essential in this regard. The role and contribution of these organisations are e.g. recognised in the manner in which they have contributed to the formation and strategic direction of the consortium. They bring on board specific experience and expertise. This also relates to the participation and contribution of Southern organisations with regard to strategic choices and substance of the various sub programmes.

### **d) Common philosophy on theory of change**

A shared and agreed vision and a common philosophy on theory of change forms the basis for the strategic and programmatic scope of the collaboration within the consortium. The process towards agreeing on this – as well as the commitment to look for new opportunities for collaboration – is acknowledged as a strong point, or pre-condition, for success.

### **e) Agreed core values for collaboration**

The collaboration within the consortium is based on a set of jointly identified core values. The members of the consortium acknowledge that different cultures possibly exist within the different organisations. Nevertheless, the commonality is larger than the identified variances and the members could easily agree on basic core values and principles for collaboration (people at the centre, transparency, reciprocity, accountability, enterprising). In Annex 27 (The Consortium Partnership Agreement and annexes) documentation and elaboration of the joint core values of the consortium can be found.

### **f) Commitment**

The consortium and the collaboration which falls hereunder go beyond the grant application for MFSII. Members of the consortium have agreed to make resources available in the form of time, human resources, organisational assets (policy, systems, logistical support etc) also for activities and programmes not covered within the grant application. Examples of this are joint fundraising and communication activities.

## **Identified Risks**

### **a) Difficulty in finding a balance between flexibility and structure/accountability**

In general all organisations experience some difficulty in finding a balance between flexibility, equal relationships etc. vs. control and accountability. The risk of setting up a bureaucratic structure for the consortium is acknowledged. This also relates to the struggle which ICS experiences in having a double role (see following bullet point).

### **b) ICS playing a double role**

In the consortium ICS is both a consortium member and the lead party. As a consortium member ICS strives to be active within implementation and management of the programmes and to work with the other organisations on an equal basis. As a lead party of the consortium, ICS will have to safeguard the overall objectives and planning and hold its partners accountable. These two roles can turn out to be conflicting.

### **c) Unequal stake in the consortium**

ICS is with all its programmes and activities and with its whole organisation involved in the consortium. This might form a risk with regard to the roles, expectations and contribution within the consortium. However, the other members of the consortium do invest and bring in other aspects which for them might form a risk too. In e.g. their name, reputation and capacity (e.g. on fund raising) or individual organisational change processes that might be at stake.

### **d) Controlling procedures and policies**

By means of the organisational assessments, absence of explicit policy documents was identified. This refers to e.g. sanction, anti corruption and diversity and integrity policies. Often procedures in this regard are incorporated in other policy documents such a Partner Policy, Human Resource Policy or Financial and Administrative Policies. The overall quality of the financial and administrative systems of all members of the consortium (including controlling procedures and policies) could be a risk for the success for the consortium, should these not comply with agreed standards.

The organisational assessments have indicated that the systems, structures and policies of each member of the consortium are of sufficient quality. However, differences in policies, interpretations and organisational culture may undermine the effectiveness of this at consortium level.

### **e) Capacity of the consortium members to deal with growth**

For some of the consortium members the approval of the grant application leads to a growth with relation to receiving subsidy. This requires enhanced capacity per consortium member in relation to Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) and control. At the same time it requires enhanced capacity of the lead party to be able to manage a larger consortium.

### **f) Maintained high level of commitment**

A high level of commitment to each other and to the consortium is present. Discussions on forehand acknowledging that 'things can go wrong' have taken place. The partners have all expressed their expectations with regard to the consortium. Each organisation is responsible for its own part of the total programme as well as ensuring the success of the whole consortium. All members of the consortium are aware that this commitment is a precondition and requirement to be able to succeed. Still, when the consortium starts, expressed commitment needs to be converted into action.

## **Concrete Measures**

In the table below a summary of the identified risks are matched with one or more concrete measure. Some of these measures have already been implemented while others remain points of attention throughout the coming years. ICS and the co-applicants will use these points for monitoring of the overall collaboration within the consortium.

<b>Identified Risk</b>	<b>Concrete Measures</b>
Difficulty in finding a balance between flexibility and structure/accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- ICS will establish a separate unit for monitoring, which will monitor both ICS' own programmes as well as the implementation of the programmes managed by the co-applicants.</li><li>- Agreements and expectations amongst the alliance partners will be recorded beforehand in clear and formal documents. In the partnership agreement for the consortium a number of formal issues are agreed upon. In 2010 these formal agreements will be extended with agreements on procedural, operational and programmatic level.</li><li>- Organisation and implementation of agreed management structure</li><li>- Organise meeting structures at strategic, programmatic and organisational level</li></ul>
ICS (lead party) playing a double role	

Unequal stake in the consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The commitment of each organisation towards the consortium is laid down in the partnership agreement.</li> <li>- Regular Directors Meetings</li> </ul>
Controlling procedures and policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consortium will establish a so-called 'monitoring desk' which will monitor the compliance of the consortium members with the contracts, joint policy documents and progress of its programmes.</li> </ul>
Capacity of the organisations to deal with growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the planning and budgeting for the new consortium, significant resources are reserved for PME and controlling functions.</li> <li>- ICS will invest in the Monitoring Desk (see measures mention in relation to above)</li> <li>- ICS will allocate resources to increase its capacity on programme management.</li> </ul>
Maintaining high level of commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ICS invests in its role as lead party</li> <li>- Regular Directors Meeting</li> <li>- Secure continued support of Supervisory Boards</li> </ul>

### V.1.3 Consortium Partnership Agreement (*criterion 4.3.1c*)

The consortium of ICS, SOS Kinderdorpen, Wereldkinderen and Wilde Ganzen have signed a Consortium Partnership Agreement (Appendix 27). In this agreement the consortium members lay down the terms for collaboration. The agreement consists of one central document and a number of appendices. In the central document the general agreements within the consortium are laid down. The appendices include more specific agreements and policy documents the central document refers to. The agreement states that the consortium has cross-programmatic objectives based on its joint philosophy of Civic Driven Change and its joint core values (Appendix 1 of the agreement).

#### *The contract addresses the following issues:*

##### **a) *The scope and aims of the partnership***

The 'Considerans' (page 2 of the contract, under 'Taking into considering the following') states that the consortium members intend to implement programmes jointly within the context of the MFS II subsidy scheme, in which regard both ICS and the co-applicants will be involved in at least one programme. The consortium members view the scope of their partnership as constituting more than merely applying for the MFS II subsidy. The members have formulated joint core values and subscribe to a joint philosophy of change which form the basis for the collaboration and determine its scope, which is explained in Appendix 1 of the agreement.

##### **b) *Each party's share of the tasks, the type of partnership and representation and the way decisions are made***

Article 2 and 9 of the agreement state the responsibilities of the different consortium members, separating the responsibilities of the lead party and the co-applicants. Article 2 and 7 sub 1 reflect the way

the consortium is represented towards the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.  
In article 8 the consultation and decision making structure of the consortium is laid down.

**c) *Co-applicants' commitment to the lead party of the consortium, who makes an application on behalf of the consortium and who acts as its point of contact and representative, with regard to the implementation of the programmes described in the MFS II grant application and compliance with the obligations attached to the grant award***

Article 9 of the agreement elaborates in detail on the commitment of the co-applicants towards ICS and its role as a lead party. It states explicitly that ICS is the lead agent and responsible for implementing the programmes (sub 1 and 2). ICS is responsible for compliance with any obligations attached to grant award (sub 1), unless the other members are made responsible explicitly (sub 1 and 3).

**d) *PME. Co-applicants' PME-systems should be consistent with each other***

Article 9 sub 5 states that the consortium members have made agreements regarding planning, monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the programmes and have laid those agreements down in a PME protocol, which forms an integral part of the agreement (Appendix 6 of the agreement).

**e) *Contextual analyses: these must be carried out jointly and in a coordinated manner in accordance with criterion 4.2.6 of the organisational check***

Article 9 sub 6 states that consortium members have laid down their agreements regarding the joint approach of context analysis in appendix 7 of the agreement.

**f) *A common partner policy, i.e. the parties should coordinate and explicitly describe the procedure for selection and building relations with partner organisations in the South***

Article 10 sub 2 states that the consortium members have agreed on a joint partner policy (Appendix 10 of the agreement) in which the selection method and specifics of the relationships with third parties in the South –defined as DAC countries- will be laid down.

**g) *Financial agreements, including the distribution of funds, administrative/overhead costs (rates and distribution), prepayments and settlements***

According to article 9 sub 4.3 the rules and regulations governing financial accounts are included in Appendix 4 of the agreement. This appendix elaborates amongst other things on the distribution of funds, prepayments and settlements (ICS receives subsidy from the Ministry and transfers cash to bank accounts of the co-applicants against specific criteria) and administrative and overhead costs (overhead expenses are included in a hourly rate, the basis for allocation of staff expenses to the programmes; any rate needs prior approval by ICS).

**h) *Other provisions, including a procedure for disputes, anti-corruption policy, sanctions policy, a complaints procedure and a exit strategy***

Article 9 states that the consortium members will pursue the anti-fraud and corruption policy (sub 7) and the sanction policy (sub 8), which are included in Appendix 8 and 9 of the agreement. In Appendix 5 of the agreement a complaints protocol is included (sub 4.4).

Article 19 caters for procedures if disputes arise, stating that first the consortium members will try to settle the dispute amicably. If this is not possible, the members will be entitled to request arbitration. Article 4 states that any consortium member is authorized to terminate the agreement; article 12 sub 10-12 state how ICS can exclude co-applicants from the programmes.

## V.2 The consortium's added value

(criterion 4.3.2)

### V.2.1 Consortium's strategic added value

(criterion 4.3.2a)

The added value has jointly been identified and formulated by the consortium members. It illustrates why the partners have chosen to work together. As mentioned in section V.1.1 the current Change for Children consortium will not proceed with the same composition. Some of the current members have chosen to either play a different role or to work with another consortium. The new members of this consortium bring on board new and additional expertise and experience, which can strengthen as well as deepen the collaboration.

All four organisations share a similar process of organisational development and change. Originally all four organisations were more or less focused around one specific issue, in which they were experienced and recognised for their capacity. SOS Kinderdorpen was focused on raising funds for the SOS Children's Villages; Wereldkinderen focused on inter-country adoption; Wilde Ganzen focused on fundraising for private initiatives and International Child Support focused on fund raising through a sponsorship programme. During the last five to ten years all four organisations have gone through considerable organisational and programmatic changes. A shift in core business and choice of strategies is characteristic of all four organisations. By means of this common background mutual understanding is more easily achieved.

The complete analysis on feasibility and explanation of added value can be found in the Feasibility Analysis, Appendix 26. In the following sections the added value is further elaborated in terms of strategy, programme and efficiency gains:

- **Strategic added value**

#### **Shared analysis, shared core values, shared ambition**

The diverse group of organisations joining hands in the consortium have the ambition to optimise their contribution to poverty alleviation while realising that innovation is required. At the basis of this collaboration is a set of shared and agreed core values which is laid down in the Partnership Agreement for the Consortium (see Appendix 27). Civic Driven Change is the umbrella philosophy which is translated into programmes and brings us together for exchange and joint learning. The members of the consortium further share a concern about the high level of neglect, abuse and exploitation of children and young people that prevent them from being or becoming active citizens. The effects of change are evaluated by the target group using mechanisms for downward accountability, such as Social Return on Investment (SROI). Moreover we make space for social entrepreneurship focusing on economic empowerment and tackling a social issue in a business-like manner.

#### **The contribution of the consortium to the overall ambitions of Dutch Development Cooperation and MFS II objectives**

The strategy of the consortium coincides with the three strategies identified in 2.1 of the Policy Framework 'Dutch Co-financing System II' and in the policy memorandum on civil society organisations 'Cooperation, Customisation and Added Value' as explained in the Outline Proposal Check and in Appendix 26. Main elements are listed below:

#### **Promoting sustainable economic development and achieving direct poverty reduction geared to strengthening people's ability to be self-reliant**

- Emphasis on the importance of economic empowerment of poor people because economic ability forms a key component of the factors that drive social change.
- Investing in social change processes in an economic viable manner.
- Stimulating economic activity to invest in long lasting social and economic change.

- Translation of the concept of social business into the programmes of ICS.

***Building civil society by strengthening pluralist, locally tailored democratic institutions and organisations with the aim of establishing a more equitable distribution of power***

- People are central in realising social change in their own lives and in society at large.
- Connect up and build upon existing initiatives, energies and structures - whether formal or informal, visible or less visible, small or big - initiated, lead and owned by people.
- Alter the asymmetric power relations within society in a pro-poor direction and strengthen the position of poor and marginalised people in social, financial, economic and political terms.

***Influencing policy by giving ordinary people a voice to bring about change in processes and structures that perpetuate poverty and inequality***

- Strengthen claim-making power of people and stimulate citizens' independent action towards realising their rights for themselves and their children.
- Supports civic voices and actions towards influencing processes of change and structures that maintain or exacerbate poverty and inequality.
- Calling governments to account and/or influencing policies at local, national and international level.

***Synergy***

Organisations that take on a special role within the consortium without being a co-applicant for the grant application are essential for the synergy of the total consortium programme. These organisations are offered the space and possibilities to identify desired ways and areas for collaboration. All organisations – co-applicants as well as collaborating organisations – jointly agree what collaboration entails and what the added value is. Each organisation defines for itself what it brings into the consortium and what the benefits are.

• ***Added value in terms of programme***

***Economies of scale***

There are a number of ways in which the consortium will collaborate programmatically. First and foremost, in a country where more consortium members implement a consortium programme, the partners will ensure that there are economies of scale in training, PME, advocacy and research/ analysis amongst others. Individual organisations can work on their own to contribute to social change, but it is firmly believed that the consortium will be more effective – and have a larger impact - working together. It is acknowledged that joint learning is essential, however requiring that it has to be organised, structured and nurtured. ICS will take on a leading role in organising this at a strategic level. The Centre on Civic Driven Change is facilitated by Context, international cooperation and contributes by organising for example Action Learning Case Studies.

***Cross-fertilisation***

The consortium members find the three programmes, developed under this consortium, important as stand-alone, but see added value when there is cross-fertilisation. To ensure this, there is shared responsibility within the consortium and its partners. In countries with more than one programme being implemented, there will be regular forums where the partner organisations will come together to share their programmes and identify learning points. To ensure cross-fertilisation for the other countries the consortium members will play a role in South-South learning and programme exchange.

• ***Added value in terms of efficiency gains***

The consortium provides the members with the opportunity to tap into each other's expertise, to learn from each other and to strengthen their own activities. By monitoring the points of improvement identified in the organisational assessments and the measures taken to address these, improved or-

organisational quality is expected. Consortium members will monitor progress and support each other towards improvement. As explained earlier ICS has experience being lead party of a consortium. The new consortium can hitch on to the existing organisation and build on the experiences already gained, thereby reducing start up time and efforts.

The members of the consortium will explore joint fundraising, advocacy, communication, research opportunities, sharing of systems and policy development. Not all parties are at the same level at all issues (programme, organisation, strategy) and therefore the collaboration provides a good chance to take a look in each other's 'kitchen' to learn and adapt. Consortium members will invite the other organisations to discuss relevant topics (to be identified along the way) or arrange for an exchange visit to one of the other partners. We aspire and are committed to collaborate and share beyond the boundaries of MFS II.

### *Specific added value of the four co-applicants and strategic partners*

It is important to note that the four main parties of the consortium are of equal value and strength – we all bring and learn, we all add value and in this our core value of 'reciprocity' is already coming alive. A short introduction and general information of all four organisations can be found in Appendices 5.1-5.4. In the following section the added value of each organisation is presented.

**International Child Support** has led the Change for Children consortium under MFS I and has the experience and systems in place that puts it in a good position to coordinate and manage the consortium and to take ultimate responsibility. ICS has considerable experience on the Civic Driven Change philosophy and application; in fact, has been a driver of this approach. The other consortium members have a lot to benefit from this experience; ICS, together with its strategic partner Context, will take the lead for sharing this with the other partners. This includes downward accountability mechanisms such as Social Return on Investment and linking economic development to social change – based on ICS' experience in Social Entrepreneurship/ Businesses which will be further developed under MFS II. Partners within the consortium have indicated their interest to learn from these initiatives.

**Wilde Ganzen** is currently a partner of ICS under MFS I and therefore also have experience operating as part of a consortium. Increased local capacity for fundraising and supporting civic initiatives are both areas of great relevance and importance to the other co-applicants, and the consortium sees great potential in tapping into the knowledge, experience and methodologies developed by Wilde Ganzen and their local partners in these areas. The 'Action for Children' programme will therefore strengthen the other two programmes. Furthermore, Wilde Ganzen has a platform within the Netherlands through which, amongst others, dialogue on Civic Driven Change in the Netherlands will be enhanced.

**Wereldkinderen** is in a process of reviewing its programmes, including the adoption activities. Wereldkinderen brings a wealth of experience and information to the consortium about child protection mechanisms and methodologies for contributing to their improvement. Wereldkinderen has initiated research to assess child protection mechanisms within their partner countries, to determine whether the steps are taken in alternative forms of care in the best interest of the child. Since 2006 Wereldkinderen has implemented the programme Capacity building for the benefit of Aids orphans with financial support from the TMF-subsidy. The strategy of Wereldkinderen is unique in relation to their emphasis on prevention of the need for adoption and the constant (re)search and lobby for ensuring ethics in intercountry adoption. The lessons learnt are combined in our strategy and programmes with the aim to stop unnecessary adoption while strengthening local child care support systems. The consortium members have indicated their interest in learning from the experiences of Wereldkinderen in incorporating the lessons learned into a changed philosophy on family strengthening and family replacement.

**SOS Kinderdorpen** has 60 years of experience with alternative forms of care of orphaned and abandoned children. It will provide specific expertise to the consortium in the field of skilful parenting which will be further developed and shared among the consortium members and beyond. Over the last decades, the organisation has been making the transition from service provision to strengthening

families, communities and existing services in order to contribute to a lasting improvement in the well-being of children. Its Family Strengthening Programmes have a lot in common and will be reinforced by the Civic Driven Change approach. Another area of contribution is Vocational Training. Experiences under TMF and MFS I have yielded valuable results and lessons on how to maximise the value of such training for economic self-reliance, which will be shared and further developed with the consortium members. As a member of an international network, present in 132 countries, SOS Kinderdorpen taps into a wealth of experience and vast network of local organisations. Furthermore, through engaging the international network, there is great scope for other countries, not included in this application, to benefit from programme development under MFS II, and for facilitating south-south exchange.

### **Other key consortium members:**

**African Child Policy Forum (ACPF):** Though not a co-applicant due to the threshold criteria of the Ministry, ACPF is a key partner in this consortium. The overriding mission of the Forum is to contribute to the effort to put African children on the public agenda, and, to that end, exert pressure where the political will is absent and provide support where it exists. Within the underlying consortium, ACPF fulfils a crucial role within the Child Protection programme. All consortium members will, within their programmes and with their partners, link to and learn from ACPF to add value to their own and ACPF's programmes. ACPF has a network throughout Africa where the consortium members can tap in to, as well as into their methodologies of evidence-based research.

**Context, international cooperation** (the Netherlands) is a social enterprise working in the area of international development. Core in Context's mission is 'capacity for development'. The organisation aims to enhance the learning and adaptation capacity of development actors. Context considers the link between theory, research and practice as an essential prerequisite for a sound practice. Facilitating learning processes and dialogue between policymakers, academics and development practitioners are central in Context's work. Context staff members work on three interconnecting fields: explorative research (exploration); facilitating and accompanying organizational change processes (adaptation); and dissemination of experiences and research findings through publications, workshops, et cetera (contribution to dialogue about global issues). The starting point of the methodologies used is to build upon existing experience and knowledge and to enlarge the problem solving ability of clients by facilitating critical self-reflection. In 2007, Context started a Centre for developmental practice and theory with regard to Civic Driven Change (CDC). The core purpose of the Centre for CDC is to conceptualise, develop and implement knowledge about the role of civic action in social and economic change processes towards a more just and equitable society.

Within the Consortium, Context will play a key role in further developing and deepening the understanding about Civic Driven Change for the wellbeing of children and youth, global citizenship, social business and social accounting. Furthermore Context will play a role in the area of capacity enhancement of staff members of the consortium members and in facilitating exchange and joint learning for the consortium as a whole.

## **V.2.2 Organisations for migrants and/or a 'young and innovative' organisation (criterion 4.3.2b)**

Neither the lead applicant (ICS) nor the co-applicants (SOS Kinderdorpen, Wereldkinderen and Wilde Ganzen) fall into the category of organisations concerning this criterion. However, a number of the partners of the consortium fall into this category. These key partners make a specific contribution as mentioned in previous section (V.2.1).

Aflatoun: The Aflatoun Network was officially launched in November 2005

Context, international cooperation: In 2008 legally registered as a Social Enterprise.

Het Groene Woudt: In January 2005 legally registered as a foundation, organised as a Social Enterprise.