



Together⁴Change

Appendix 26

Consortium Feasibility Analysis



Feasibility Analysis of Consortium Together4Change

International Child Support
(lead party)

SOS Kinderdorpen
Wereldkinderen
Wilde Ganzen
(co-applicants)

November 2009

List of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Previous experiences with collaboration in an consortium
3. Process until now
4. Added value of the consortium
 - 3.1 Strategic added value
 - 3.2 Added value in terms of programme/ substance terms
 - 3.3 Added value in terms of efficiency gains
5. Identified success factors , opportunities and risks of the consortium
 - 4.1 Identified success factors and opportunities
 - 4.2 Identified risks
 - 4.3 Overview of concrete measures
6. In conclusion

1. Introduction

International Child Support (ICS), Wilde Ganzen (WG), Wereldkinderen (WK) and SOS Kinderdorpen have engaged in an exciting journey of collaboration. This consortium is called *Together 4 Change*. We are four organisations with different history, expertise and experiences, different systems, procedures and organisational culture and different scope of work. These are four organisations and partners in the South bringing together a wealth and diversity of experiences and expertise, in order to optimise impact. Whereas ICS and WG already have a longer collaborative relationship, WK and SOS Kinderdorpen are new relations in the context of this consortium. However, WK and ICS are both members of the Dutch Better Care Network acknowledging the same principles of alternative care for children without parental care. SOS Kinderdorpen has recently also joined this network.

The establishment of the consortium has been fuelled by the process of formulating a grant application for MFSII, but is grounded in a conviction of unexplored opportunities and added value of collaboration. The purpose of this document is to describe and register the analysis that has been made on the feasibility of the consortium. Feasibility in this regard refers to: a) The added value of working together in a consortium; b) Weighing identified opportunities for success against the identified risks and c) Establish concrete measures in relation to identified risks.

This document starts with a description of ICS' previous experience in working in a consortium structure. In the second part the process towards establishing the consortium is described. The added value of the consortium in strategic and programmatic terms, as well as in terms of efficiency gains is elaborated in section three. In the course of the process success factors and opportunities and risks and challenges have been identified. A summary of these findings can be found in section four and five respectively. Concrete measures related to the identified risks are included in section five.

2. Previous experiences with collaboration in an consortium

ICS has about three years experience as lead agent of the *Change for Children* consortium, which receives MFSI subsidy for the period 2007-2010. When exploring further collaboration beyond 2010, ICS and the other consortium members evaluated their collaboration in the *Change for Children* consortium. Four out of five consortium partners of the current *Change for Children* consortium concluded that wanted to be involved in the consortium' programmes in the next period, running from 2011 until 2015.

ICS remains the lead party and Wilde Ganzen remains a co-applicant charged with the responsibility for the Action for Children programme. Both Net4Kids and KidsRights will be involved in the Action for Children programme beyond 2010. They will no longer be a co-applicant - due to their limited involvement in the programme as well as in the consortium – but a preferred partner of Wilde Ganzen. Zeister Zendingsgenootschap (ZZg) has decided not to continue as co-applicant in the consortium with ICS but to join another consortium.

In this section some of the experiences and lessons learnt are described and immediately linked to the new consortium.

I: In the *Change for Children* consortium, the initial focus of collaboration was on programmes, and less on the organisational and managerial aspects. The efforts and energy required to organise and enhance collaboration was underestimated. For the future consortium a more balanced division between programmatic and organisational aspects is sought.

II: In the *Change for Children* consortium, ICS is both a member and the lead party. ICS strives to be an active member of the *Change for Children* consortium and work with the other organisations on an equal basis. As a lead party, ICS has to safeguard the overall objectives and planning and hold its partners accountable. These two roles are sometimes conflicting. Hence, ICS is going to make these roles more explicit and will change the set-up of its organisation. This relates to both the internal organisation as well as to the overall management of the consortium programme.

III: In the current set-up, ICS is highly dependent of the *Change for Children* collaboration, because the whole ICS' programme is part of the *Change for Children* programme. The other organisations are only partly involved in the *Change for Children* programme, and have other programmes beside it. As a result, ICS is more dependent on the success of the *Change for Children* collaboration, and risks are unequally divided over the consortium. In the new consortium, these risks have been identified beforehand, and measures are taken to reduce them (see section 4.2). Furthermore, the other members of the consortium are expected not only to commit themselves to the overall programme but also to the organisational set-up and the procedures. Agreements on consortium structure are negotiated and included in the contracts for the consortium.

IV: When the *Change for Children* collaboration began, ICS had to invest heavily in its role as a lead party and at the same time had to build up its programmes. This was very demanding for the organisation and led to delays in the implementation of the programmes. In a new consortium, the roles and procedures in the consortium are clarified before the start of the MFSII period.

V: Exchange and learning between the three main programmes is essential to fulfil the overall ambition of a consortium. In 2008, the *Change for Children* consortium brought their partners together (local CBOs, NGOs, INGO's, network organisations, core partners of *CfC* etc.) for a partner conference in Naivasha, Kenya. This resulted in a deeper as well as broadened collaboration. New opportunities for collaboration were identified and the conference was used to kick-start ideas and projects still on the drawing table. The potential for networking and collaboration amongst the different partners – South-South, South-North, North-South – is huge but needs to be organised. In the new consortium exchange and learning is identified as a central added value, and incorporated within the programmes as well between the different programmes and partners.

VI: Collaboration brings along many opportunities. Nevertheless, opportunities do not automatically translate into success and achievement. Commitment is required of all parties in terms of time, setting priorities together, abide to agreements, respect for each others expertise and capacity, and granting each other space, time and success.

3. Process until now

The experiences gained in the past years with the *Change for Children* consortium have naturally guided the process of preparing for a new consortium. The preparatory process has been more intensive, more extensive and broader in scope. Planning for collaboration in the consortium has taken place over a longer period of time and covered more aspects than in the case of the *Change for Children* consortium.

The explorative process was initiated by informative bilateral discussions between ICS and current *Change for Children* members and other potential new partners. On the 18th of June 2009 a meeting between 20 Dutch child-focused organisations was organised by ICS and SOS Kinderdorpen. The basis of all these different meetings and discussions was sharing of information on current programmes and activities as well as vision, current developments and ambitions for the future. Another aspect in the discussions was the identification of strengths as well as gaps within the scope of each organisation, and consequently a search for how each organisation could contribute to collaboration within the consortium. This initial phase was mostly programme-oriented. During this process, ICS, WK, WG and SOS Kinderdorpen identified one another as serious candidates for partnership in a consortium.

The following step in the process was to bring all organisations together beyond the bilateral discussions. This phase was characterised by curiosity but also challenging questions to get a deeper understanding of each others 'being' and 'doing'. Three leading lines through the discussions were: a) the role and contribution of each organisation as individual participant in the consortium, b) the identification of the added value in terms of strategy and content of the consortium programme and c) the overall capacity of the consortium. This phase in the process resulted in a strong commitment from each consortium member towards the consortium and towards each other. In addition the conviction of a successful consortium - being far more than simply an adding up of programmes - became evident.

At this point the organisational aspects with regard to collaboration were put onto the agenda. As a starting point, organisational assessments were conducted of all four organisations, by ICS with assistance of an external consultant. The objective of the organisational assessments were: a) Providing ICS - as lead party - with adequate information to conduct an appraisal of the quality and capacity of all co-applicants; b) Identifying points for improvement per organisation; and c) Identifying opportunities and risks for the consortium from the point of view of each organisation. The assessments were conducted in an atmosphere of openness, enabling gathering of information and willingness to identify points of improvement. The assessment indicated strengths and weaknesses within each organisation, as well as risks and opportunities/success factors for collaboration.

In a joint meeting the separate assessments were presented to the whole group. Each organisation also presented their action plans with concrete measures for every identified point of improvement, addressing issues in the short - as well as the long term. A joint analysis was conducted on the risks and success factors of the consortium. The final point in this meeting was the identification of issues where each organisation could act as a 'role model' for the others.

Based on the results of the organisational assessments, ICS concluded that it is confident about the capacity of the alliance for adequate financial management and to guarantee effective and efficient programme implementation. In joint programme meetings the overall philosophy and theory of change for the consortium were formulated and agreed upon. Core values, overall strategic and programmatic directions for the consortium were further identified.

4. Added value of the consortium

The added value of the consortium can be formulated both in terms of strategy and programme. The thorough and participative process towards formulating the programme and agreeing on the scope and objectives of the collaboration has led to a consistent and convincing set of added values of collaboration within the consortium. A systematic assessment with regard to organisational quality and capacity of each consortium member has led to the identification of added value also in terms of efficiency gains.

4.1 Strategic added value

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' 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, and brings common understanding on organisational development.

Shared analysis, shared core values, shared ambition

The analysis and vision on poverty and marginalisation jointly performed by the consortium reaffirms the continued importance of poverty alleviation. It is acknowledged that business as usual does not suffice. There is a need for innovation and renewal, while acknowledging that poverty is not solely the domain of the development sector. Next to that, poverty alleviation should be contextualised in the broader international community, consisting of a variety of actors.

The diverse group of organisations joining hands in the consortium have agreed on collaboration with the ambition to optimise their contribution to poverty alleviation. 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. The collaboration stems from a *shared ambition* to contribute to an improved *development practice* in such a way that *people* - including children and young people - become central and empowered to *drive social and economic change*. Civic Driven Change is the umbrella philosophy which is translated into programmes which 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 becoming or being active citizens.

Consortium contributes to overall ambitions of Dutch Development and MFSII 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*' in the following ways:

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

The proposal of the consortium puts great emphasis on the importance of economic empowerment of poor people in rural and urban communities as a condition for breaking the poverty cycle by people themselves. Economic ability forms a key component of the factors that drive social change. That is why the consortium invests in services and products to stimulate people's independent civic action towards achieving economic and social equal positions. This is done by investing in social change processes in an economic viable manner as well as by stimulating economic activity to invest in long lasting social and economic change. ICS translates the concept of social business into its programmes while learning and knowledge development are shared within the consortium and collaborating partners. Supporting civic action for child rights and child protection receives specific attention.

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

Central to the philosophy of Civic Driven Change is the belief that it is people who can realise social change in their own lives and in society at large. People-centred social change requires that individuals and collectives of people take control and address the problems in their communities. Through a civic driven approach, we connect 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. Where relevant, people are organised and empowered in order to improve their living conditions in their own way. The aim is to alter the asymmetric power relations within society in a pro-poor direction and to strengthen the position of poor and marginalised people in social, financial, economic and political terms. It concerns normative behaviour of inclusion, respecting differences between people and care for the whole in line with principles of social justice and democracy.

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

Through a Civic Driven Change approach the consortium builds upon the capacities of people and their organisations to strengthen their claim making power and to stimulate citizens' independent action towards realising their rights for themselves and their children. The consortium 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. It supports, organises and strengthens practice based lobby and advocacy in particular for realising child rights and child protection. The focus on child protections stems from the analysis that there too few efforts and achievements are made by national government to put child protection on the political agenda of their countries.

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.

4.2 Added value in programmatic/ substance terms

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 partners implement a consortium programme, the partners will ensure that there are economies of scale in training, in advocacy and in research/analysis amongst others.

The overall objective of the consortium is to *contribute to lasting change processes towards poverty reduction, inclusion and the wellbeing of children and young people driven by people and their organisations*. Individual organisations can work on their own to contribute to this objective, 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 herein, however requiring that it has to be organised, structured and nurtured. ICS as a lead party will take on a leading role in organising this at a strategic level. The Knowledge Centre on CDC – facilitated by Context, international cooperation contributes by organising e.g. Action Learning Case Studies, linking practice with theory, consequently resulting in improved quality and effectiveness of programmes.

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 where more partners implement under one programme, or 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.

ICS, as lead party, will take on the responsibility to consciously organise and structure overall organisational and programmatic learning, to ensure the cross-fertilisation between programmes and organisations. Within the different programmes each organization takes on responsibility in organising learning and exchange, for example by means of so-called ‘reflection days’.

4.3 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 organisational quality is expected. Consortium members will monitor progress and support each other towards improvement.

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. This collaboration and sharing will go beyond the boundaries of MFS II.

As described in section 1 of this document, ICS has already 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.

5. Identified success factors, opportunities and risks of the consortium

In this chapter identified success factors, opportunities and risks are described. These issues have been identified through the organisational assessments of all co-applicants (see description of process in section 2 of this document) and joint analyses of strength, weaknesses, opportunities and risks.

5.1 Identified success factors and opportunities

a) Four experienced organisations joining forces

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. The combination of this all together provides a solid basis for taking on and succeeding with a larger programme with a larger impact.

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 agent. 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) Application of current partner policy; Walk the Talk

Both ICS and other consortium members have Partner Policies focusing on negotiation of relationships, reciprocal collaboration and transparency. The process towards establishing the consortium has confirmed this common approach. The way we relate to our partner organisations in

the South is similar to how we as Dutch organisations relate to each other. The members of the consortium have agreed on a Joint Partnership Policy in relation to partners in the South underlining this (see annex 34 of this application).

d) 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.

e) 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.

f) 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). For an elaboration on the core values of the Together 4 Change consortium, please be referred to appendix 1 to the contract.

g) Increased impact

Within the consortium we can further on conceptual development of new and innovative ideas and consequently position the consortium as a new and 'powerful' actor in the sector. The four core members – together with the strategic parties - have different expertise and hence are joining forces complementary to each other. This brings each others programmes and organisations to a higher level, with greater impact. This learning and sharing will continue and increase during MFS II and beyond, therefore increasing the qualitative and/ or quantitative impact of our programmes. Together we can cover more areas and link up in advocacy, hence create a stronger voice. At organisation level we learn from each other and adopt/ adjust where necessary, therefore spending time wisely.

h) 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.

5.2 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 etcetera vs. control and accountability. The risk of setting up a bureaucratic structure for the consortium is acknowledged. This also relates to the struggling with regard to playing a double role experienced by ICS as a lead party in a consortium (see following bullet point).

'Enterprising' is one of the core values identified for the consortium. Enterprising requires flexibility and innovation. These are important characteristics for programming, but could lead to conflict with structures and formal requirements.

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.

Concrete measure a) and b):

ICS has invested in its organisational development during MFSI to enable its organisation to properly manage the current consortium. The lessons learnt in the current consortium will result in adaption of the organisation for *Together 4 Change*.

- ICS aims to anchor its role of lead party in its own organisation. In concrete terms, this means 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.
- ICS will strive to keep its flexibility and innovativeness and to avoid bureaucracy.
- 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.

The agreed management structure will be supported by a large extent of informal discussions at different levels within the consortium.

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 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.

Concrete measures:

Various measures are planned to secure continued commitment and openness about the contribution each consortium member brings into the consortium.

- The commitment of each organisation towards the consortium is laid down in the partnership agreement.
- The Supervisory Boards of all consortium members give priority to the programmes of the consortium.
- Regular Directors Meetings.

d) Controlling procedures and policies

By means of the organisational assessments absence of explicit policy documents were 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.

Concrete measure:

ICS as the lead party carries the overall responsibility and accountability for the consortium. The organisation of the consortium and the agreed roles of lead party and co-applicants (see above) illustrate this. To uphold the required and expected quality the consortium will invest in its monitoring role, which needs to be more or less independent of the programme organisation within ICS. 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. In this manner ICS as the lead party puts itself under the same scrutiny as what relates to the co-applicants.

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 substantial 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.

Concrete measures:

The co-applicants have reserved funds for the management of the requested programmes. Moreover, in the planning and budgeting for the new consortium, significant resources are reserved for PME and controlling functions. ICS will invest in the Monitoring Desk (see measures mention in relation to d) above. ICS will also allocate resources to increase its capacity on programme management.

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:

Various measures already mentioned above – such as the Partnership Agreement for the consortium, the planned Directors Meetings and programme meetings - is expected to contribute to maintaining the level of commitment. In addition, ICS invests in its role as lead party to be prepared, sharp and alert from the start of the collaboration within the consortium, and to be accountable in relation to agreements made.

5.3 Overview of concrete measures

In the table below a summary of the identified risks are matched with one or more concrete measures. 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.

Identified Risk	Concrete Measures
Difficulty in finding a balance between flexibility and structure/accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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 – 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. – Organisation and implementation of agreed management structure – Organise meeting structures at strategic, programmatic and organisational level
ICS (lead party) playing a double role	
Unequal stake in the consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The commitment of each organisation towards the consortium is laid down in the partnership agreement – Regular Directors Meetings

Controlling procedures and policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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
Capacity of the organisations to deal with growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – In the planning and budgeting for the new consortium, significant resources are reserved for PME and controlling functions. – ICS will invest in the Monitoring Desk (see measures mention in relation to above – ICS will allocate resources to increase its capacity on programme management
Maintaining high level of commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – ICS invests in its role as lead party – Formal and informal dialogue amongst all consortium members (all levels) to ensure understanding – Regular Directors Meeting – Secure continued support of Supervisory Boards

6. In conclusion

ICS and the three co-applicants Wereldkinderen, Wilde Ganzen and SOS Kinderdorpen, together forming the consortium *Together 4 Change*, are convinced about the added value of joining forces. This conviction is grounded on a common vision to bring about lasting change in countries in the South. The joint core values and the other identified success factors and opportunities as indicated in section 5.1 contribute further to this. The partners all acknowledge that risks identified through the organisational assessments - and the joint brainstorm on risks and opportunities - require adequate measures which have already been concretised. Nevertheless, none of these factors are of such an extent that they can not be handled.

In essence, the programmes are an expansion/ continuation of the existing programmes under the *Children for Change* consortium, which enables the current consortium partners ICS and Wilde Ganzen, together with Net4Kids and KidsRights, to build on the experience and expertise gained in the MFS-I period. The new co-applicants, SOS Kinderdorpen and Wereldkinderen, have experience with MFS- and TMF-subsidies. The organisational assessments showed clearly that all co-applicants have invested substantially in the setup and improvement of their financial monitoring systems and will continue to do so year to come. Based on these results, ICS concludes it is confident about the capacity of the alliance for adequate financial management. Also, ICS recognises that the three co-applicants can guarantee effective and efficient programme implementation.

These results and experiences strengthen the confidence of the consortium that at the start in 2011 they can primarily concentrate the implementation of the programmes, as each partner can build upon its firm organisational basis.