

**REVIEW OF DFID'S BUILDING SUPPORT
FOR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY
IMPACT OF STRATEGY, EXPENDITURE
AND ACTIVITIES
AUGUST 2009**

**Paul Thornton, Hilary Thornton and Shaun Hext
Verulam Associates Ltd.**

Acknowledgements

This review was undertaken and the report prepared by Paul and Hilary Thornton of Verulam Associates Ltd. with support from Shaun Hext. Coordination within DFID was provided by Jenny Yates, Head of the Outreach and Stakeholder Relations Team within Communications Division. Thanks are due to Jenny, her team and all those within the Communications Division who provided support during the review.

A number of current and former DFID staff were interviewed together with key informants from a wide range of organisations. The authors are grateful to all those interviewed for giving so generously of their time and for sharing their views so openly. Thanks are also due to the consultants who undertook the four related reviews who shared information and provided mutual support at key points.

Two presentations were made to Mike Foster, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for International Development, his comments and the contributions of the DFID staff who attended those presentations gave a clear view from DFID towards the emerging conclusions. The authors are grateful for the open and frank discussions that took place.

For the synthesis some additional interviews were held and in particular a final round table discussion with a group of invited participants reflective of the wider spectrum of stakeholder interest. Special thanks are due to this group for providing a sounding board for the final reflections that have informed the conclusions and recommendations in this report.

Though the review was commissioned by DFID, full responsibility for the text of this report rests with the authors. In common with all reviews and evaluations commissioned by DFID, the views contained in this report do not necessarily represent those of DFID or of any of the people consulted.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
Contents	iii
Acronyms and Abbreviations	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Context	1
BSDS objectives and interventions	1
Assessment of Progress against the BSDS objectives	4
Findings	5
Developing the Strategy in the Future	7
Recommendations	9
1. INTRODUCTION	13
2. THE BUILDING SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY	15
Background to the BSDS	15
Building Support for Development Strategy (BSDS) Objectives	16
Implementing the BSDS	17
Complementary DFID Activities	18
3. RELEVANCE OF THE STRATEGY	20
Strategic Relevance	20
Policy Relevance	20
Relevance as Reflected in the Changing Language of Development	21
Relevance of Specific Objectives and Interventions	22
Overall assessment of relevance	24
4. EFFECTIVENESS OF ACTIVITIES	25
Formal Education	25
The Media	27
Businesses and Trade Unions	28
Faith Communities	28
Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Groups and Diaspora Communities	29
The Development Awareness Fund and Mini Grants Scheme	29
Overall Effectiveness of BSDS Activities	30
5 EFFICIENCY: EXPENDITURE AND MANAGEMENT	32
Alternative ways of Managing Interventions	34
Summary	35
6. IMPACT	36
7 TAKING THE STRATEGY FORWARD	39
Key successes to build on	39
Areas for improvement	39
White Paper Priorities	40
Towards a more holistic approach	40
A Roadmap for the Future	42
Outcome related objectives and targets	44
Monitoring and Evaluation	46
8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	47
Conclusions	47
Recommendations	49

Bibliography	53
Annexes	
Annex 1: Terms of Reference Review of the Impact of DFID’s Building Support for Development Strategy, Expenditure and Activities.....	55
Annex 2: People Interviewed.....	59
Annex 3: BSDS History	61
Annex 4: Programme Partnership Agreements.....	64
Annex 5: UK Government Policy in Relation to the Building Support for Development Programme (1997-2009)	71
Annex 6: Financial Analysis	76
Annex 7: Recommendations from Four Independent Reviews	78

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

BME	Black and Minority Ethnic Communities/Groups
BMS	Broadcasting Media Scheme
BSDSP	Building Support for Development Strategy Paper
CBA	Commonwealth Broadcasting Association
CfD	Connections for Development
CSD	Civil Society Department
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DAF	Development Awareness Fund
DAWG	Development Awareness Working Group
DCSF	Department for Children, Schools and Families
DEA	Development Education Association
DEC	Development Education Centre
DfES	Department for Education and Skills (now DCSF)
DFID	Department for International Development
DGSP	DFID Global School Partnerships
DVI	Diaspora Volunteering Initiative
EES	Enabling Effective Support
ESDGC	Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship
FBO	Faith Based Organisation
GSF	Global Student Forum
IBT	International Broadcasting Trust
LA	Local Authority
LG Alliance	Local Government Alliance
MGS	Mini Grants Scheme
NGO	Non Government Organisation
OFSTED	Office for Standards in Education
OWMA	One World Media Trust
PPA	Partnership Programme Arrangement
PRD	Policy and Research Division
RGBW	Rough Guide for a Better World
SGA	Strategic Grant Agreement
TUC	Trade Unions Congress
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
VSO	Voluntary Service Overseas
WAG	Welsh Assembly Government

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Context

- 1 This report reviews the impact of DFID's activities and funding to build support for development in the UK since 1999. In addition it takes a strategic look across what has been achieved to recommend where DFID should focus its funding in future in order to maximise the impact on UK public support for development.
- 2 Evidence is drawn from four independent reviews of DFID's work to build support for development through (1) education, (2) the media, (3) business and trade unions; churches and faith communities, Black and Ethnic Minority (BME) and Diaspora groups and (4) the Development Awareness Fund (DAF) and Mini Grants Scheme (MGS). Each review assessed the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of DFID's support over the 10-year period from 1999 to 2009 and drew on this information to recommend where DFID should focus its efforts in the future with particular reference to the target groups and interventions reviewed.
- 3 DFID's Building Support for Development Strategy (BSDS) was a bold attempt to reach a wide range of organisations, partners and individuals with the aim of promoting greater understanding of international development and the global interdependence of individuals and organisations across the UK. Published in 1999, it built on the commitment set out in the 1997 White Paper on International Development '*Eliminating World Poverty: A Challenge for the 21st Century*' that the Government would substantially increase support for the reduction of poverty and increase support for development. The BSDS specifically articulated the Government's commitment to building greater awareness and understanding of international development in the UK.
- 4 The top priority was to work through the formal education system. This priority reflected the commitment expressed in the 1997 White Paper for every child to be educated about development issues, so that they can understand the key global considerations that will shape their lives. A second priority was support to the media to raise awareness amongst the adult population. The BSDS also expressed a commitment to reach hitherto unreached parts of society through more innovative organisational partnerships with businesses and trade unions, churches and faiths.

BSDS objectives and interventions

The three priority themes within the strategy are covered by ten objectives, four related to education, three the support to the media, two focusing on business and trade unions and one churches and faiths. These ten objectives are:

Formal Education:

1. To ensure that global issues are adequately incorporated in curriculum provision and guidance across the UK.
2. To ensure provision of good quality materials and resources to facilitate teaching in schools.
3. To reinforce school-based work through the teacher training, inspection and awarding bodies.
4. To encourage whole school or community-based activities with a development focus.

Media:

5. To concentrate our own work with the media around key issues and themes.
6. To research and strengthen television coverage of development issues.
7. To promote debate within the development community on key messages

Business and Trade Union:

8. To raise awareness with the business community and among trade unions.
9. To seek ways to work with business and trade unions to raise public awareness of global and development issues.

Churches and Faiths:

10. To build and support a worldwide alliance with the Christian church and other faiths to eliminate poverty.
- 5 To deliver on the objectives DFID developed partnerships and instruments to deliver activities, specific to each of the BSDS target groups. DFID also sought to target civil society more widely, beyond the sectors where specific objectives were articulated. This included BME groups, professional associations and Local Government, and more recently the Diaspora. The interventions were:
 - 6 In **education** - policy work undertaken by the Development Education Association in England and its sister organisation, Cyfanfyd in Wales; Enabling Effective Support (EES) which coordinated regional networks of education providers; DFID's Global School Partnerships Programme (DGSP); the Global Student Forum (GSF); and the youth volunteering scheme, Platform 2. The majority of DAF and MGS awards were also for projects in the education sector.
 - 7 In **the media** - grants to producers through the Commonwealth Broadcasting (CBA)-DFID Broadcast Media Scheme (BMS); research into television coverage of the developing world by the International Broadcasting Trust (IBT); and support to the One World Media Awards. A limited number of DAF grants also focused on the media.
 - 8 With **business and Trade Unions, churches and faith communities and BME and Diaspora groups** - Strategic Grant Agreements (SGAs) with organisations who were not traditionally engaged in development including the TUC; the Diaspora Volunteering Initiative; and grants through the DAF and MGS for civil society groups. DFID also engaged through the Partnership Programme Arrangements, a number of which have an objective focused on building support for development.
 - 9 Support to not for profit organisations representing all target groups was provided through small and medium sized grants awarded through two competitive funding mechanisms, the **Development Awareness Fund (DAF)** and **Mini Grants Scheme (MGS)**.
 - 10 In addition to these specific BSDS interventions other DFID support complements the strategy. For example many of the NGOs supported under Programme Partnership Agreements (PPAs) provide development education and development awareness activities and DFID's Business Alliance Team engages with the business community through the Business Call to Action. Thus building support for development has a broad base of engagement across DFID.

Expenditure and Management

- 11 From 1997 the budget for activities focused on building support for development has risen from £1.3 million to £19 million in 2008/9 (see Annex 4 for details), a rate of increase above that of DFID's overall budget but still relatively modest for the whole of the UK focused activities. Levels of expenditure on media and civil society related objectives (business, trade unions and faith) have remained low with some 75% of the total BSDS budget of £90 million (and spend of about £70 Million) devoted to education across the whole ten years. Support to BME and Diaspora groups has similarly remained low, although expenditure on Diaspora is increasing due to the funding of the volunteering schemes.
- 12 The staffing for BSDS in the first five years was relatively stable and grew in proportion to the activity base. However, from 2005 staff changes became more frequent, and with fewer staff available the emphasis moved away from close engagement with partners, including those from civil society who were the key access points with business, trade unions, churches and other networks. The focus of staff attention subsequently shifted, with more time spent on managing the growing DAF and MGS grant arrangements and subsequent contracting out of the DAF, and the Diaspora and youth volunteering and community links schemes. In addition the education and media programmes have made increasing project management demands as budgets have grown. The net effect of staff reductions and turnover has reinforced this emphasis on the more traditional project management roles.
- 13 The Building Support for Development team has never had the benefit of adviser expertise in education, the media, social inclusion, social development or governance; skill sets that would seem appropriate to the task.

Impact

- 14 Assessing the impact of the BSDS interventions is problematic given that no impact studies, systematic monitoring or evaluation have been carried out since 1999. Each review did, however, attempt to draw conclusions from the limited evidence available about impact and sustainability of interventions undertaken. Much of the evidence comes from discussion with key stakeholders engaged with activities supported by DFID and hence is based on opinion as opposed to firm evidence. The table below summarises the assessment of progress made under all ten objectives.
- 15 Whilst achievement at activity level has been good, impact in terms of the objectives is mixed. Aside from education where there has been marked success in getting development onto the curriculum, there has been only moderate success. In part this is due to the overambitious nature of some of the objectives and in part to the lack of strategic focus of the implementation. Resources have been well used but more could have been achieved, especially if greater attention had been paid to regular monitoring and stakeholder engagement with key partners, and less attention given to often relatively small scale interventions and funding programmes.

Assessment of Progress against the BSDS objectives

BSDS Objective	Progress Since 1999
Formal Education	
To ensure that global issues are adequately incorporated in Curriculum provision and guidance across the UK	New curricula have incorporated global issues explicitly and implicitly. The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority has issued guidance to schools to support Global Learning. DFID direct support and engagement through DEA have contributed to this achievement
To ensure provision of good quality materials and resources to facilitate teaching in schools	Some good materials through EES, DEA and DAF projects but limited sharing of resources.
To reinforce school-based work through the teacher training, inspection and awarding bodies	No real engagement with the Training and Development Agency or Ofsted (and equivalents in Scotland and Northern Ireland). Good work underway in Wales.
To encourage whole school or community based activities with a development focus	Improvements in recent years through DGSP and some EES practice – could do more.
The Media	
To concentrate our own work with the media around key issues and themes	DFID's own approach to the media is developing a clearer focus but the links to the BSDS have not to date been included
To research and strengthen television coverage of development issues	Research commissioned with IBT has contributed to the survival of serious developing world content on television
To promote debate within the development community on public key messages	No engagement with the wider development community around the issue of communications, public opinion and awareness
Business and Trade Unions	
To raise awareness of development issues within the business community and among trade unions	Awareness increasing with response to globalisation, climate change. The SGA with the TUC has contributed
To seek ways to work with business and trade unions to raise public awareness of global and development issues	Only ongoing relationship is with TUC and that has been slow to develop into an effective partnership
Faith Communities	
To build and support a worldwide alliance with the Christian church and other Faiths to eliminate poverty	INAPPROPRIATE OBJECTIVE – But no sustained institutional relationship established with any faith community - outcome (faith action on poverty) but no DFID output

Findings

- 16 In **education**, the four objectives provided a focused set of appropriate objectives which, if realised, would ensure the integration of the global dimension into the formal education system. There were some useful project-level outputs but DFID's work was not sufficiently visible or strategically focussed. With respect to the particular interventions, the regional networks for educational providers and local authorities set up under EES showed inconsistent, and in some cases, poor performance. DEA proved to be an effective partner at policy level. The impact of support to the similar body in Wales, Cyfanfyd, was less marked though there was acknowledgement that the policy situation in Wales was particularly positive with the global dimension well integrated into the curriculum and institutionally within the education system.
- 17 DGSP appeared to be well managed, but the review found mixed views on its effectiveness. An impact assessment will be commissioned in 2009 which should provide the evidence to draw firm conclusions. Of the smaller interventions funded, the GSF appeared to be effective but it only covered a limited range of schools that were not representative of the wide range of the schools in the UK.
- 18 Specific achievements identified by the review include:
- The integration of the global dimension into the secondary school curriculum in England
 - The institutionalisation of Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship across the education and youth sectors in Wales
 - A significant impact on school children throughout the UK who now have a better understanding of their place in the world and how other countries impact on them
 - A wealth of high quality educational resources produced
 - An estimated 3.3 million learners across the UK and developing countries linked through DFID's Global School Partnerships Programme (DGSP)
- 19 The three **media** objectives, focusing on DFID's own media agenda, television coverage of development and public debate around development, lacked the coherence of the education objectives. Media interventions supported were all sound and in some cases the individual projects punched above their weight. However, media activities focused on building support for development as a whole have not punched above their weight and DFID has not succeeded in making its portfolio of projects more than the sum of their parts.
- 20 Whilst some of the funded schemes helped to build support for development there could have been more emphasis on initiatives to increase awareness of development and more attention could have been paid to measuring the impact that individual media activities and the overall programme had on public opinion and awareness. More attention should have been paid to steering the overall direction of the media strategy and coordinating it with DFID's in house operations. A further positive move would have been to extend its priority media targets to include new media alongside television.

21 Significant achievements identified with respect to the media include:

- The seed funding of over 60 broadcast programmes on the developing world to millions of British Viewers (including on mainstream channels)
- The securing of new primary purposes of BBC and Channel 4 to 'bring the world to the UK' and 'challenge people to see the world differently'
- The production of influential broadcasting research on media coverage of the developing world and engagement with broadcasters, regulators and producers around this agenda
- The holding of prestigious media awards aimed at maintaining the visibility of development within the media industry

22 Objectives focused on **civil society** were restricted to **business and the Trade Unions and churches and faith communities**. Whilst those for business and the trade unions were tangible the objective for working with churches and faiths was too ambitious and an inappropriate objective for the BSDS. Less broad objectives for an initial exploratory phase and more investment in relationship building, especially with the non development and new actors within civil society, would have been more relevant.

23 **Business and Trade Unions** The SGA with the Trade Unions Congress (TUC) was the most successful of the 8 SGAs supported by DFID and the relationship with the TUC continues through a Partnership Programme Arrangement (PPA). No significant relationships have developed with business in the UK on the building support for development agenda despite 'Fairtrade', 'Rough Guide' and the 'Call to Action' successes. Overall there has been a lack of understanding of the respective roles and commitments between DFID and its partners in business and the Trade Unions.

24 **Faith Communities** Whilst DFID had links with major Christian Churches on global campaigns and advocacy, there was no specific work focused on building support for development with faith communities. DFID seems to have limited knowledge of faith communities and this objective was never really addressed. However interfaith engagement around development is now emerging. This can provide DFID with an opportunity to engage and offer support.

25 **BME and Diaspora Groups** The complexity of the relationship between UK BME communities and development does not appear to have been well understood by DFID and attempts to identify significant institutional points of contact and invest in relationship building and mutual understanding were limited. Hence relationships were not effectively developed. Of interventions supported the Connections for Development (CfD) SGA had too broad a focus and was DFID driven. As a result it was not successful. However, the interest of Diaspora groups in development is growing and a number of CfD actors and new groups are now involved in Diaspora volunteering and have been successful in securing DAF and Mini Grant funding.

26 Achievements identified with respect to civil society include:

- An increase in public awareness of the global agenda and the interconnectedness of political and social processes

- Engagement of organisations whose main business is not development with the international development agenda
- Action to raise awareness for development amongst civil society organisations at the local level

27 The DAF existed prior to the BSDS as the main instrument for funding development education and development awareness activities. Under the BSDS the **Development Awareness Fund (DAF) and Mini Grant Scheme (MGS)** were expanded and many good ideas were supported. However, with no mechanism for capturing learning, the focus on supporting innovative projects for a maximum of 3 years has continued resulting in a plethora of ‘pilot projects’ which have not linked strategically to other DFID support to BSDS target groups.

28 The formal education sector has dominated the DAF and MGS (60% of each) with funds providing opportunities for organisations to explore different approaches to integrating the global dimension into schools. However, this emphasis on formal education has led to the crowding out of other target groups, including faith groups, business and Trade Unions, and media groups. For smaller organisations, particularly faith, BME and Diaspora groups the competitive funding process itself has been challenging and capacity building is needed to enable them to engage effectively and present successful applications.

Developing the Strategy in the Future

29 The aim of the BSDS as expressed in the 1999 strategy paper was *‘to promote public understanding of our interdependence, of the need for international development and of the progress that has been made and that is possible’*. This aim and the hope expressed in the BSDS that ‘this should help raise awareness and probably change behaviour and attitudes’ still remains relevant 10 years after the strategy was developed and as we have seen it is reiterated in the recent White Paper.

30 In the intervening period there have been changes in the broader context of international development – climate change, globalisation, the post 9/11 conflict agenda, and wider issues of peace and security. These changes have influenced public perceptions of global issues including development and have resulted in changes in government policy and practice. There has been increased engagement centred around major campaigns (e.g. Make Poverty History) and more active involvement complementing public awareness. The changing context has informed development policy reflected in the subsequent White Papers and wider government policy with a focus on community involvement, social cohesion, and other linkages between domestic and international policy and understanding.

31 The 2009 White Paper and the work of the reviews suggest revised outcome statements that could form the basis of a revised strategy:

- British people know that their taxes are being used by the Government to tackle global poverty
- The present level of support (above 50%) for this policy and the 0.7% target the Government has set is sustained

- Every child becomes an adult with an awareness of development and global interdependence

32 Such outcomes suggest:

- a focus on secondary education that broadens and deepens basic understandings established at primary level;
- work with children and young people that encourages critical engagement with development issues;
- public engagement through a wide range of entry points including but not limited to the media that give consistent messages;
- a common set of communications messages shared by all committed stakeholders that provides information that can promote deeper understanding and informed debate;
- effective engagement with stakeholders that can reinforce these outcomes and provide practical opportunities for involvement and action at all levels.

33 As has been identified work in the formal education sector has dominated the strategy. The four objectives specifically related to formal education provide tangible targets which can clearly be met if the right strategies are pursued. Other objectives remain less tangible and meeting them presents a greater challenge than with education.

34 If the BSDS is to be effectively delivered then greater consideration needs to be given to the balance between target groups. The overarching aim of the education interventions are to ensure that every child has the opportunity to engage with the global dimension through formal education. This assumes that if children engage at school they will become more responsible citizens with greater awareness of the developing world and the impact that it has on them as individuals and collectively. However, to meet objectives in the medium term equal attention needs to be paid to adults who represent an increasingly large proportion of the population. Further, children are as influenced by what they hear at home and through the media as by what they learn at school. Hence it is vital that the delivery of the BSDS in the future gives greater emphasis to the media and to the partnerships with civil society than it has in the past.

35 In addition to build effectively on understandings developed through education and carry them through to adulthood there should be increased attention paid to support for opportunities for involvement by young people through the formal and informal youth sector. Youth volunteering provides one avenue but this route is only appropriate for some young people. Support for a wider range of involvement and action would build on the global understanding developed in school and carry through engagement as adults.

36 The report sets a road map for reframing the strategy for the future with this emphasis on stakeholder engagement and strategic direction for building support for development rather than the established focus on instruments and funded activity. Funded activities should continue building on the successes achieved but if the strategy is to succeed the focus must be on working with partners to increase awareness, involvement and action in support of development together.

Recommendations

37 Each of the four independent reviews gave recommendations related to their specific area of focus. These recommendations are set out in Annex 7. Here we present the recommendations arising from this review. These complement and extend the recommendations of the earlier reviews and form a coherent and comprehensive set of recommendations that reflect the findings of all five reports.

Vision

The BSDS sets a clear vision and direction for DFID commitment to build support for development that is congruent with the 2009 White Paper. ***It is recommended that:***

1. the BSDS be reframed based on the White Paper priorities with a more equitable balance between support to education (children and young people) and support to interventions targeted at the adult population directly (media support and wider communications) and through civil society engagement (faith, trades union, business, BME and Diaspora groups).
2. the reframed BSDS include specific outcome statements that are focused, clear, measureable, and time bound; and form the basis of a new programme with an integrated set of objectives related to identified target groups.
3. the new BSDS be approved for an initial five year period (2010 – 2016) with an evaluation after three years.
4. a monitoring framework and a budget for regular programme and strategy level evaluation be built in from the outset.

Strategy

To ensure an effective strategic focus ***it is recommended that:***

5. the reframed BSDS build support for development specifically:
 - within the next generation by engagement through the formal education system;
 - within the general public through the media, its own communications and those of partner stakeholders notably UK NGOs; and
 - through partnerships to engage at a deeper level with civil society to promote understanding, involvement and action.
6. engagement with formal education be based on a strategic partnership between DFID and the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) in England together with the education departments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. These partnerships should include agreements on individual and joint programmes, including:
 - support to policy engagement at the national level including curriculum and assessment, teacher training and inspection
 - support at the regional level for embedding the global dimension in schools, linked to local authority providers
 - school linking through DGSP, subject to the planned impact study, linked to DCSF's global gateway scheme
 - cross departmental working to address common agendas related to community cohesion, sustainable schools etc.

- research to capture lessons learned to support the embedding of the global dimension throughout the education system
7. support for the media should be integrated within DFIDs overall approach to communications. DFID's in-house communications and its support to the media should all focus on increasing public awareness and support for development through:
 - the generation and dissemination of key development messages through in-house (e.g. media relations, website) and outsourced media, shared with partner stakeholders (e.g. PPA recipient CSOs)
 - enhanced funding to BMS to develop compelling content about development activity and the development process as opposed to the developing world using its present approaches together with a grants scheme to replace the present media allocation through the DAF
 - research to assess viewing trends and explore improved ways of engaging with the general public through the media through the IBT and other channels
 8. partnerships with civil society should focus on building relationships with key stakeholders from Trade Unions, Faith Communities, BME and Diaspora groups, community and local voluntary organisations and the private sector. The identification of partners should be based on a continuous stakeholder mapping process based on a deeper appreciation of the institutional dynamics of the various networks. Whilst the OSRT should lead on the stakeholder engagement other departments may lead on managing the relationships and financial support (e.g. CSD would continue and expand its responsibility for PPAs and other funding instruments including those recommended in the 2009 White Paper). Thus the provision of funding should be seen as supportive of but separate from the stakeholder engagement which will address the common BSD agenda in each case.

Management

To improve the implementation of the strategy **it is recommended that:**

9. as part of the monitoring framework effective monitoring and reporting arrangements for all programmes are established with regular reporting against indicators related to outcome targets
10. a new regional delivery model be developed to implement recommendation 6 replacing the present EES arrangement with an integrated and simplified management arrangement
11. a member of the OSRT should be the link for each civil society stakeholder or stakeholder network (faiths, trade unions, business/private sector, local government, etc) with a focus on:
 - mutual partnership – building trusting relationships which promote understanding of each other's standpoints vis-à-vis development and maximise learning
 - based on each relationship identify shared objectives and a common set of outcomes related to the BSD agenda

- agreement on any financial or other support from DFID not already covered by existing funding agreements with a particular focus on support of network development and increased leverage
 - coordination across other DFID divisions and departments to ensure a harmonised approach and effective stakeholder management
12. DFID should strengthen the level of expertise within the responsible staff team/s (across the Policy and Research Division and the Communications Division) with a particular focus on UK civil society, social inclusion, and institutional analysis.
 13. a mechanism for the management of stakeholder relationships with civil society institutions beyond traditional NGOs/CSOs should be developed jointly by CSD and Communications Division to ensure that DFID's civil society expertise and strategic communications skills are combined.
 14. CSD should review the links between the UK and international programmes of NGOs and CSOs and ensure that the synergies are reinforced through the support provided by all the various funding arrangements with specific targets related to building support for development in all cases.
 15. DFID's Management Board should ensure Communications Division and Civil Society Department work together effectively to reframe the BSD Strategy and the related stakeholder relationships.

Portfolio review and adjustment

16. The present BSD portfolio should be reviewed in the light of this report to reduce the number of funding channels and programmes by cancelling or retendering contracts, merging programmes, outsourcing management or transferring responsibilities to other departments so that the OSRT staff can focus on strategic development and stakeholder engagement.

Specifically **it is recommended that:**

17. The Development Awareness Fund (DAF) should be phased out over the next 3 years and replaced with larger longer term grant support for key target groups who are central to the BSD strategy and who are currently supported under the DAF.
18. The Mini Grant Scheme (MGS) should be expanded to provide BSD support to smaller locally based organisations including BME groups, faith based groups and voluntary organisations including capacity building support and the provision for longer term relationships between grantees and DFID. The new MGS should be fully contracted out and consideration should be given to linking it with the proposed Development Innovations Fund and therefore managed through CSD.
19. The Diaspora and Youth Volunteering work should be integrated within the respective PPAs with VSO and Christian Aid and managed by CSD with monitoring indicators and processes for stakeholder engagement agreed with OSRT.
20. All support to trade unions should be integrated through the TUC PPA and managed by CSD with OSRT developing the stakeholder relationship.

New interventions

To enhance the delivery of the BSDS outcomes **the following new interventions are recommended:**

21. Communications Division and Regional Programmes Division should pilot one or more Development Communications Hub based in a suitable country office. The role of the hub would be to:
 - source good quality content by commissioning local video producers, journalists or participants in the development process to produce material for DFID to publish
 - facilitate media access to development projects in the region
 - facilitate training and support for project workers, volunteers or other participants to produce 'user-generated content' such as films or blogs about their involvement in the development agenda
 - share expertise with other DFID business units outside the UK
22. Engagement with the private sector should be developed with a specific objective and set of targets within the reframed strategy. This engagement should be coordinated more effectively across DFID, including a focus on building support for development through business linkages.
23. A new BSD objective and outcomes for work with faith communities should be developed by OSRT working collaboratively with the network through a mutually agreed institutional framework and linking with CSD to ensure synergies with other support to faith communities and faith based organisations.
24. DFID should consider providing more support to programmes targeting the youth sector as a department wide initiative linking with DCLG and DCSF in order to extend awareness engendered at school into adulthood and open up opportunities for involvement and a deepening of global understanding.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This is the report of a review of the impact of DFID's Building Support for Development Strategy (BSDS) which was published in 1999. The BSDS set out how DFID would seek to raise public awareness and understanding of international development issues within the UK. Its higher aim was to generate political will within the UK for the eradication of poverty worldwide.

1.2 The focus of the review is on the Strategy, Expenditure and Activities of the BSDS; its objectives¹ are:

- to draw together and summarise the available evidence on the impact of DFID's activities and funding to build support for development in the UK since 1999; and
- taking a strategic look across what DFID has funded and the evidence regarding the impact of this, to recommend where DFID should focus its funding in future in order to maximise its impact on UK public support for development.

1.3 The review draws on the findings of four independent reviews covering different aspects of the BSDS which were separately commissioned by DFID earlier in 2009. These reviews culminated in four reports:

- *Review of DFID's work to build support for development through the formal education system*, prepared by Andrew Griffin and Oli de Botton of PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
- *Review of DFID's work to Build Support for Development through the Media*, prepared by Paddy Coulter of Oxford Global Media and Amanda Barnes of The Partnership
- *Review of DFID's Building Support for Development: Businesses, Trade Unions, Faith Communities, Black and Minority Ethnic Communities and Diaspora Groups*, prepared by Paul Thornton and Shaun Hext of Verulam Associates Ltd
- *Review of DFID's Building Support for Development Strategy: Development Awareness Fund (DAF) and Mini Grants (MGS) Programme*, prepared by Dr Hilary Thornton and Shaun Hext of Verulam Associates Ltd

1.4 As well as the four reports the present review had access to the survey results and other data from the four reviews. These included a survey completed by 18 of the 43 Development Education Centres (DECs) conducted as part of the DAF and MGS review and a questionnaire circulated by the Development Education Association (DEA) to its network covering all four review themes. In addition, interviews with DFID staff, including those responsible for the implementation of the strategy over the ten years; interviews with key informants from DFID's partners; and a roundtable discussion with an invited group representative of all aspects of the BSDS were undertaken². Finally in order to address the question of expenditures and human resources mobilised by DFID to implement the BSDS a review of the available financial data and the levels of staffing over the full ten years was undertaken.

¹ Full Terms of Reference are given at Annex 1.

² A list of those interviewed specifically for the purposes of this review is given as Annex 2.

1.5 The report comprises seven further chapters. Four focus on the first aim to draw together and summarise in one report the available evidence on the impact of DFID's activities and funding to build support for development in the UK since 1999. Following this introduction chapter 2 reviews the BSD Strategy and its development over the ten years since 1999. All the interventions supported by DFID to deliver the strategy are presented together with a summary of other DFID activities that complement the BSDS. Chapter 3 considers the relevance the strategy to DFID's policies and those of target groups and interventions selected to the BSDS whilst Chapter 4 assesses their effectiveness. Finally chapter 5 goes on to look at efficiency in terms of management and expenditure.

1.6 The remaining three chapters address the second aim taking a strategic look across what DFID has funded and the evidence regarding the impact of this, to recommend where DFID should focus its funding in future in order to maximise its impact on UK public support for development. Chapter 6 reviews the impact against the ten objectives and also assesses the more general impact achieved by the interventions and the partnerships developed. Chapter 7 take a holistic look at the strategy bringing together the conclusions from the four earlier reviews as the basis for considering how to take the strategy forward in the future. Chapter 8 presents the conclusions of the review and recommends where DFID should focus its support in the future to maximise UK public support for development.

1.7 There are seven annexes providing background information and more detailed evidence. The Terms of Reference for the review are at annex 1 and a list of all those interviewed specifically for this review is given as annex 2. Annex 3 supports chapter 2 with a summary history of the development of the strategy, the management arrangements and significant events within DFID during the ten years. Given the significance of the role of those NGOs supported by Programme Partnership Arrangements (PPAs), PPAs are discussed in chapter 2 (paras. 2.15-2.16) and a full list and a description of the contribution of these civil society organisations to the BSDS is provided in annex 4. Annex 5 provides an analysis of the links between UK government policy since 1999 and the BSDS which is drawn on in the policy relevance section of chapter 3. The financial data to support the analysis in chapter 5 is provided at annex 6. Finally annex 7 sets out in detail the recommendation of each of the four reviews of separate aspects of the BSDS which inform this review and in particular its conclusions and recommendations.

2. THE BUILDING SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Background to the BSDS

2.1 The Department for International Development (DFID) was set up in 1997, it made fighting world poverty its top priority. This marked a turning point for Britain's aid programme, which until then had mainly involved economic development. Among its key objectives, DFID set out to make global development a national priority and promote it to audiences in the UK and overseas, while fostering a new 'aid relationship' with governments of developing countries.

2.2 DFID's policy was initially spelt out in *Eliminating World Poverty: A Challenge for the 21st Century*³, the first of the four White Papers on International development published between 1997 and 2009⁴. This first White Paper had high ambitions, setting out the government's policies to 'achieve sustainable development for this planet'. In so doing it committed DFID to increasing public understanding of 'our mutual interdependence and the need for international development'. It emphasised the need to 'give people the facts about the forces that are shaping the world – and their lives', and further stated that 'the British people should have accurate, unbiased, accessible information about the causes of poverty and inequality in developing countries and about what the international community can do' (DFID, 1997:77).

2.3 One of the four sections of the 1997 White Paper focused specifically on Building Support for Development and three of the White Papers' twelve commitments related to this theme. They were to:

1. Increase public understanding of our mutual dependence and the need for international development.
2. Ensure that resources made available for development are only used for the purposes intended, and consider the case for a new development act.
3. Provide the necessary resources for the development programme: the government will start to reverse the decline in UK spending on development assistance, and reaffirm the UK commitment to the 0.7% UN target.

2.4 The BSDS was intended to deliver on the first commitment and support delivery of the other two. DFID convened a Development Awareness Working Group (DAWG)⁵ to develop the strategy with participation from a wide range of groups including the education sector, the business sector, the trade unions, the churches, the voluntary and NGO sectors, BME groups and the media. The DAWG, chaired by the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, advised on the developing Building Support for Development Strategy (BSDS) and then on its initial implementation. It embodied the enthusiasm for the White Paper's commitment to reverse the long-term decline in UK aid expenditure and champion a better domestic understanding of the importance of global public goods such as poverty reduction and social justice. The DAWG, like its wider constituency, brought together a range of interests and approaches which encouraged the development of a wide ranging and ambitious set of objectives together with a variety of modes for delivering the strategy.

³ DFID (1997) *Eliminating World Poverty: A Challenge for the 21st Century*, White Paper on International Development.

⁴ DFID (2000) *Eliminating World Poverty: making globalisation work for the poor*, and DFID (2006) *Eliminating World Poverty: making governance work for the Poor*, DFID (2009) *Eliminating World Poverty: Building Our Common Future*

⁵ For DAWG membership see http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/written_answers/1998/mar/31/development-awareness-working-group

Building Support for Development Strategy (BSDS) Objectives

2.5 The BSDS was published in April 1999. It set out the aim of promoting public understanding of interdependence, of the need for international development and of the progress that had been made and that was possible. The overall objectives were broad, and expected to promote:

1. Knowledge and understanding of the major challenges and prospects for development, in particular the poverty reduction agenda; but also of the developing countries themselves.
2. Understanding of our global interdependence and in particular that failure to reduce global poverty levels will have serious consequences for all of us.
3. Understanding of and support for international efforts to reduce poverty and promote development including the international development targets. Recognition of progress made, and that further progress is both affordable and achievable.
4. Understanding of the role that individuals can play; enabling them to make informed choices.

2.6 Ten specific objectives spelt out the priorities of the BSDS. Four covered the top priority which was to work through the formal education system. This reflected the commitment expressed in the 1997 White Paper for every child to be educated about development issues, so that they can understand the key global considerations that will shape their lives. A further three objectives related to the second priority - support to the media to raise awareness amongst the adult population. The remaining three objectives were focused on the BSDS commitment to reach hitherto unreached parts of civil society through more innovative organisational partnerships with businesses and trade unions, churches and faiths. these civil society groups.

2.7 The ten objectives were:

Formal Education:

1. To ensure that global issues are adequately incorporated in curriculum provision and guidance across the UK.
2. To ensure provision of good quality materials and resources to facilitate teaching in schools.
3. To reinforce school-based work through the teacher training, inspection and awarding bodies.
4. To encourage whole school or community-based activities with a development focus.

Media:

5. To concentrate our own work with the media around key issues and themes.
6. To research and strengthen television coverage of development issues.
7. To promote debate within the development community on key messages

Business and Trade Union:

8. To raise awareness with the business community and among trade unions.
9. To seek ways to work with business and trade unions to raise public awareness of global and development issues.

Churches and Faiths:

10. To build and support a worldwide alliance with the Christian church and other faiths to eliminate poverty.

Implementing the BSDS

2.8 In order to implement the BSDS DFID increased the staffing and budget with a total commitment over the ten years from 1999 – 2009 in excess of £90 million (expenditure details and staffing will be discussed in chapter 5). Key changes and events since 1999 are recorded in annex 3 which provided a brief historical record of the implementation of the BSDS. Over the ten years a range of activities were supported with a variety of funding instruments and key partnerships.

2.9 In order to deliver on the objectives DFID supported a number of organisations and interventions, specific to each of the target groups identified. DFID also sought to target civil society more widely, beyond the sectors where specific objectives were articulated. This included BME groups, professional associations and local government, and more recently the diaspora communities.

2.10 For education specifically these were:

- The Development Education Association (DEA), an England-wide network and policy development organisation, and a similar body for Wales, Cyfanfyd. Funding to DEA has included support to run the 'Global Dimension' website which provides free on-line resources to teachers.
- Enabling Effective Support (EES), which comprises 12 regional education networks focused on building the capacity of the education sector locally to ensure global issues are taught in schools, to support teachers to gain the necessary skills and to build links between schools, Non-government Organisations (NGOs) and Local Authorities.
- The DFID Global School Partnerships (DGSP) programme which offers support and guidance to teachers and grants to schools to realise the benefits of partnering with schools in developing countries.
- Other interventions supported in the education sector included; the 'Global Student Forum', which brings Sixth Form students to build support for development through their peers; Platform 2, which provides volunteering placements in developing countries for 18-25 year olds who wouldn't otherwise be able to afford to visit a developing country and get involved with global issues of justice and poverty; DFID publications for school leaders and educationalists and the Development Education Research Centre, a research base for the development education community.

2.11 For support to the media interventions included:

- The Commonwealth Broadcasting Association (CBA)-DFID Broadcast Media Scheme (BMS), set up in 2001. The objective of BMS is to improve awareness and understanding of the developing world in the UK through the mainstream broadcast media, specifically TV. Two separate funding schemes were set up; the Programme Development Fund for established broadcast producers to develop an idea for TV or radio and the Travel Bursary Fund to enable UK television producers or journalists to visit developing countries to

extend their knowledge and experience of the developing world. The maximum grant available under each funding scheme is £10,000.

- Support to the International Broadcasting Trust (IBT), an educational and media charity that promotes high quality television coverage of the developing world through research, lobbying and dialogue with the main public service broadcasters. DFID funding has supported four research studies undertaken by IBT.
- The One World Media Awards (OWMA), an award giving body which gives annual awards for outstanding UK print, radio, television and online reporting related to developing world. DFID support is for the UK Local Media prize.

2.12 For Businesses, Trade Unions, Faith Communities, Black and Minority Ethnic Communities and Diaspora Groups support was given through:

- Strategic Grant Agreements (SGA) focused on supporting organisations whose primary purpose was not development but which had a contribution to make to development. The SGA instrument covered the trade unions relationship through an agreement with the Trade Union Congress (TUC) and several professional bodies. The BME relationship was covered by Connections for Development (CfD), a body set up explicitly to deliver the SGA, whilst a similar body, Local Government Alliance (LG Alliance) was set up to deliver the SGA with local government.
- Diaspora Volunteering Initiative (DVI), a programme which provided opportunities for people from the Diaspora communities to become volunteers in their countries of heritage.

2.13 In addition to these specific interventions the Development Awareness Fund (DAF) and Mini Grants Scheme (MGS) were developed as competitive funding mechanisms that do not focus on one specific target group but provide opportunities for not-for profit organisations to secure funding for projects focused on building support for development. Organisations can apply for grants of up to £100,000 per year for the DAF and £10,000 per year for the MGS for a maximum of 3 years. Whilst the emphasis has been on education, grants have been awarded to all of the target groups mentioned above; formal education, the media and Trade Unions, Faith Based Organisations, BME and Diaspora groups, as well as to others including civil society and voluntary organisations.

Complementary DFID Activities

2.14 Other DFID activities contribute directly or indirectly to build support for development in addition to the specific resources applied to the BSDS implementation. The wider work of the Communications Division puts information about DIFD's policies and programmes into the public domain. DFID's Business Alliance Team engages with the business community through the Business Call to Action. There is also support through other teams in Policy Division around specific issues e.g. migration, that have an impact on wider support for development and through relationships with local government and other government, private and civil society actors.

2.15 The largest single channel of support outside of BSDS itself is that provided by the Civil Society Department. Most of these resources provide support to civil society organisations for international development activities but often the support

relates, at least in part, to building support for development. In particular major UK NGOs engaged in international development were supported through the Joint Funding Scheme (JSF) in 1997. This provided unrestricted funding which was mainly used to support their international activities, but some chose to use the funds to support UK based development education and awareness raising.

2.16 In 2000 the JSF was replaced by Partnership Programme Arrangements (PPAs) and the number of CSOs supported has increased from 10 to 27. Primarily focused on supporting the international programmes of major civil society organisations (e.g. Oxfam, Christian Aid, Action Aid) as unrestricted grants, the PPA funds can be applied to all activities of the recipient CSOs including those that are building support for development related. As part of the mutually agreed strategic objectives, DFID now expects PPAs to include objectives focused on development awareness or development education. Particularly relevant to this review are the 5 PPAs held with Faith Based Organisations (FBOs) and the four held with other civil society organisations. (further details related to PPAs are included as Annex 4).

3. RELEVANCE OF THE STRATEGY

3.1 This chapter assesses the relevance of the Building Support for Development Strategy to DFID's policy at that of the UK government overall in 1997 and as it has developed subsequently. It also considers whether the specific objectives and the targeting of education, media, business and trade unions, churches and faith communities were appropriate to the realisation of the strategy and remain so. It discusses the significance of the inclusion of BME groups, diaspora communities, other sectors of society as additional targets for the delivery of the strategy. The chapter moves on to assess whether the specific interventions undertaken represented relevant ways of engaging and whether engagement with each of the target groups remained relevant to the developing BSDS over the ten years.

Strategic Relevance

3.2 The BSDS was highly relevant at the time of its publication in 1999, given the emphasis in the 1997 White Paper on increasing public understanding of international development and on providing them with clear information on the causes of poverty. Its emphasis on formal education, which sought to encourage school pupils to critically engage with global issues and understand the factors that shaped their lives, was appropriate; it would enhance understanding of development for future generations. Engagement with the media was relevant since this would have the potential to provide a vehicle for reaching the wider population, with a focus on building support for development, and support DFID to engage more strategically through the media.

3.3 The focus on other groups representing civil society, business and the trade unions, churches and faith communities, was also appropriate but had some limitations; it was narrowly conceived and insufficient to ensure that the building support for development agenda reached the communities represented by these groups and the wider public. The later engagement of BME groups and diaspora communities together with other civil society actors such as professional bodies and local authorities addressed the gaps but still lacked a sufficiently strong public engagement⁶ focus that could promote development awareness more widely.

Policy Relevance

3.4 The decade from 1997 saw dramatic changes in the international development agenda. Underlying these policy shifts were deeper factors – climate change, globalisation, the post 9/11 conflict agenda, wider issues of peace and security – which have influenced government policy and changed public perceptions. These changes have influenced the public perceptions of global issues including development and have resulted in changes in government policy and practice.

⁶ The terms **public engagement** and **stakeholder engagement** are both used in the field of public participation and policy influencing. The term stakeholder is a generic name for somebody who takes an active and legitimate interest in a particular topic. Although the general public can often be said to fall into this category, by virtue of having a legitimate stake in a public decision for example, it is useful to make a distinction between the (less interested) public and (more interested) stakeholders in the context of participation.

Here the term stakeholder is more narrowly defined as somebody who is affected by an issue in a more formal sense - through their professional role or through their involvement in a formal group or organisation. The term **public engagement** in contrast refers to engagement with members of the public in their capacity as **citizens** rather than in a professional, formal or institutional role. Engagement with stakeholders can give very different results from engagement with members of the general public. In particular, stakeholder groups may be better informed or have more resources available to devote to taking part in engagement processes or otherwise influencing decision making.

Annex 4 identifies key milestones in UK Government policy and their relationship to the building support for development agenda.

3.5 Of particular note are the links between international development and national responses to the conflict agenda. The Home Office's Prevent Strategy (2003), a specific post 9/11 initiative, and the focus on social cohesion that developed following disturbances within the UK resulted in a greater emphasis on cross Whitehall working around these issues. DFID's engagement has been more at the international level but there were implications for building support for development given the links with community groups and the focus on overall development.

3.6 The 2006 White Paper saw a shift in emphasis and strategic thinking with regard to the approach to the building support for development agenda. The paper sought to build on and respond to public support for poverty eradication expressed in the 2005 Make Poverty History Campaign, and saw *involvement*, rather than simply *awareness*, as the best way of promoting understanding of development issues. Commitments were made to volunteering and community linking. One of the most marked changes in strategic direction with respect to building support for development was around BME engagement. The term 'Diaspora' became more established in the development vernacular with BME groups valued more for the contribution they could make to economic and political development in their 'countries of origin or heritage'. The BME focus thus turned to diaspora volunteering. Volunteering as a way of involving young people in development followed together with exploring strategies to promote community linking.

3.7 This focus on *involvement* also related to the community cohesion agenda as it provided entry points for related volunteering and also built on links with BME and faith communities. This aspect of the building support for development agenda has been relatively slow to develop in part due to the time taken for the volunteering and community linking schemes to be developed. Community involvement and participation are functions of civil society agency and government's role should be limited to providing encouragement and support. DFID could work more closely with the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) to connect the global and domestic agendas for involvement and ensure more coherence in the provision of support and information.

3.8 Despite UK policy, in terms of equal opportunities and discrimination having a particularly rich tradition, diversity was largely absent from the BSDS. In particular the gender dimension both in the sense of organisational policy and strategic focus was missing. The publications of the DFID Gender Equality Action Plan and the Gender Duty Requirements in 2007 seem to have done little to stimulate change. More generally diversity only extended to BME groups and failed to consider other potentially excluded groups such as organisations focused on the elderly or the disabled.

Relevance as Reflected in the Changing Language of Development

3.9 The strategy did not articulate a particular definition of development and left the terms 'building support for development' and 'development awareness' open to interpretation. With respect to work with civil society an integrated approach was taken with development education (school and adult based knowledge and information); development awareness (support for a deeper understanding of the

nature and causes of poverty and the need for international development); and subsequent action (charitable fund raising, twinning/linking arrangements, campaigning) seen as part of an holistic understanding of support to development.

3.10 As noted above the 2006 White Paper articulated a shift from *awareness* to *involvement* (para 3.5). For many civil society actors there is a natural progression from *awareness* through *involvement* to *action*. The 2008 Call to Action and the 2009 White Paper endorsed this perspective which sets support for development way beyond simple awareness.

3.11 There has also been a new set of terms used, in education in particular, taking account of climate change and globalisation. In many contexts the terms *global dimension* and *global citizenship* are being used. Again this is reflected in the 2009 White Paper with its focus on interdependence.

3.12 The differing emphases and consequent use of language seemed to result in a degree of confusion amongst those interviewed and responding to the surveys used during the BSD reviews. Whilst the reflection of the broader sense of interdependence is significant there is still an overarching relevance in the commitment to build support for development. However, the success of that support needs to be measured today in terms of involvement and action not simply awareness. The 2009 White Paper clearly sets this direction and provides a new basis for assessing the relevance and ultimately the impact of the BSDS.

Relevance of Specific Objectives and Interventions

3.13 In education, the four objectives focused on incorporating global issues into the curriculum; provision of resources to support the curriculum; the institutionalisation of the global dimension through teacher training, inspection and awarding bodies; and whole school approaches. Together they provided a focused set of appropriate objectives which, if realised, would ensure the integration of the global dimension into the formal education system. Interventions undertaken supported the objectives to some extent.

3.14 In particular, the emphasis on targeting regional working and building relationships across schools and local authorities as intended in the EES was appropriate, especially when combined with working at policy level to encourage the integration of the global dimension into the curriculum. This happened in both England, through DEA's work in England around the secondary curriculum, and in Wales related to DFID's direct engagement with the Welsh Assembly Government around the Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship (ESDGC) curriculum. Another contribution to this strategic approach was the requirement laid out in the call for proposals that projects supported through the DAF and MGS that focused on the formal education sector should link to the EES. This seemed logical and particularly relevant.

3.15 However, this approach was not complemented by DFID's Global School Partnerships (DGSP) programme, which targeted individual schools, or by the Global Student Forum and volunteering schemes. Whilst these activities furthered knowledge of and interest in development, they did not have the potential to support the strategic approach of the EES and policy work, but acted as standalone interventions. To some extent the DGSP did have the potential to meet the fourth objective through promoting whole school approaches to development through the links with schools in developing countries.

3.16 For the Media, the three objectives focused on; DFID's own work with the media around key issues and themes, strengthening television coverage of development issues; and promoting debate within the development community on key public messages. As a whole they lacked the coherence of the education objectives. In particular, the relevance of the first objective to build support for development amongst the public is unclear as it seems to be inward rather than outward looking. The second and third objectives were more relevant with the emphasis on television, as the foremost provider of information in international affairs to the British public, being complemented by the engagement over media issues with the development community; both had the potential to reach wider audiences and promote development awareness with the public more widely.

3.17 In the event, the primary focus of interventions was on the second objective and virtually all support was channelled to television related objectives. With regard to relevance of the specific interventions, they can all be seen to contribute to this focus on the medium of television with:

- a. The BMS supporting the production of programmes screened on BBC (e.g. Geldof in Africa, Chinese School, Indian School, The Hospital: Gambia, Tribe and Storyville), Channel 4 (e.g. 3 Minute Wonders, Made in India) and Lion TV (e.g. African School)
- b. IBT's research focusing on television coverage of the developing world, including how audiences respond to different types of programming, how effectively broadcasters cover the real world with a specific focus on adult factual, children's and news broadcasting and on how international context is reflected in news reporting.
- c. The One World Media Awards providing awards for outstanding television reporting – though as one of a wider range of media including UK print, radio and on-line reporting.
- d. The targeting of media through the DAF and MGS had no specific focus, and included awards related to television, local radio and the print media.

3.10 For civil society, the specific objectives were focused only on business and the Trade Unions, and churches and faith communities. Those for business and trade unions were tangible and presented a two step approach, firstly focused on raising awareness amongst business and trade unions followed by working with them to raise public awareness. By contrast the objective for working with churches and faiths, centred around building a worldwide alliance with the Christian churches and other faiths, was too ambitious and an inappropriate objective for the BSDS.

3.11 However, the relevance of the initial selection of civil society target groups and the objectives selected for the BSDS is less clear. A wide range of civil society bodies including, churches, trade unions, businesses, local government and professional bodies had been increasingly engaged in development education, awareness and action over the previous twenty years, yet the BSDS only set objectives for business and the trade unions and churches and faith groups. At the outset the understanding of UK civil society, its institutional forms and the nature of public engagement was new for DFID and it has increasingly included new policy areas. Less broad objectives for an initial exploratory phase and more investment in relationship building, especially with the non development and new actors within civil society, would have been more relevant.

3.12 Interventions with civil society groups, including business and Trade Unions, faith based groups and BME groups, appeared to be much less relevant for the delivery of BSDS objectives than for education and the media. The SGAs only targeted the Trade Unions, through the TUC, and BME groups, through CfD. Approaches to targeting business and faith communities were, as will be explored later in this report, more ad hoc and lacked the strategic focus needed to meet even the specific objectives laid out in the BSDS.

3.13 The decision to consider all target groups identified in the BSDS as potential recipients of DAF and MGS grants was appropriate. However, there was little consideration of the potential linkages between the DAF and MGS supported projects and the interventions specifically related to each of the key target groups. In this respect a more restricted set of target groups, with consideration given to links across to other interventions, like the proposed link between formal education projects supported through the DAF and EES, would have been more appropriate.

Overall assessment of relevance

3.14 The Building Support for Development Strategy was a highly relevant and ambitious strategy that reflected the strong commitment to international development taken by the UK government in 1997. The original aim 'to promote understanding of our interdependence, of the need for international development and of the progress that has been made and is possible' continues to be relevant and has been adjusted in practice in response to the changing policy emphasis as first *involvement* and subsequently *action*, which were seen as essential complements to awareness in the 2006 and 2009 White Papers.

3.15 However the overall aim did not translate into a practical purpose against which to implement the strategy and thus failed to give clear direction to the programme. The objectives for key target groups were more tangible but the absence of clear outcome focused vision statements at this level resulted in implementation that focused on the target groups identified and the delivery instruments with little sense of progress against the overall aim. Thus the objectives lacked clarity and were thus not effectively delivered despite quality at activity level.

4. EFFECTIVENESS OF ACTIVITIES

4.1 This chapter reviews the effectiveness of the interventions and partnerships supported under the building support for development agenda. These activities with formal education, the media, business and trade unions, and faith communities were developed from the outset of the Building Support for Development Strategy. Subsequently interventions with BME groups and diaspora communities, youth volunteering, and most recently community linking were introduced. The performance and effective delivery is assessed in each case and the contribution to the objectives set in the BSDS assessed. The chapter further considers the strategic linkages between interventions and the extent to which these linkages enhanced the overall effective delivery of the strategy. The DAF and MGS are commented on with respect to each target group throughout the narrative.

Formal Education

4.2 The approach to implementation taken, that combined networking of education providers at the local level with a policy focus at national level, had the potential to deliver the BSDS education related objectives. The development of the ESDGC in Wales highlights the effectiveness of the approach. However, aside from Wales, DFID did not engage adequately with the key statutory education bodies. Instead it chose to fund the voluntary sector to lobby the statutory sector. This failure to capitalise on the inter-departmental relationship weakened the achievement of a common policy approach. Working predominantly through civil society actors limited DFID's agency as a government department.

4.3 Of the individual interventions supported in the formal education sector, the education review considered that the support given to the DEA represented best value for money. For a budget of approximately £320,000 per year DEA has been successful in building strong relationships with key national education departments and agencies and engaged in influential policy research which has furthered the Global Learning agenda. It is likely that this in turn has contributed to the inclusion of the Global Dimension in the new secondary school curriculum. Further, DEA is now delivering resources directly to teachers through the Global Dimension website, though the effectiveness of this intervention was yet to be assessed. Support to the similar body, Cyfanfyd in Wales, of £40,000 per year, was considered by the review to be less effective.

4.4 For EES the story is mixed and there were significant inconsistencies in how the funding, of approximately £160,000 per region per year (£1.9m in total per year), was utilised and how well the networks performed. The most successful EES networks were those that focused on three areas of activity; statutory and voluntary sector (DECs) collaboration; teacher/tutor engagement; and work with schools and colleges. However such holistic engagement is limited to a small number of EES networks. A focus on the voluntary sector only was insufficient to fulfil the objectives of the EES or the higher level BSDS objectives.

4.5 Primary importance for the strategic delivery of EES was sustained engagement with the statutory sector that built on existing priorities. A particular example of good practice in this regard was the East Midlands Network for Global Perspectives in Schools which has funded nine locality groups, comprising educationalists with an interest in Global Learning, to mirror each of the nine Local Authority areas in their regions. Work in Rutland, in particular, has led to the Local

Authority providing £35,000 to fund a post which will focus on Global Learning interventions.

4.6 Whilst there was evidence of good practice, there were a significant number of EES regions that focused purely on the voluntary sector or who did not use funds efficiently. There was clear evidence that good practice needed to present more widely if EES was to meet its objectives and contribute more effectively to the wider BSDS education objectives. Overall the delivery model was too fragmented with some regions taking a strategic approach whilst others worked with a small group of enthusiasts only.

4.7 The expected links between education projects supported through the DAF and EES were only established in a few cases, despite over 60% of DAF and MGS funding (about £2m in 2007/08) being used to support projects in the formal education sector each year. Many of the DAF and MGS supported education projects engaged effectively with teachers, children and schools, delivering high quality resources and supporting teachers to deliver the global dimension in schools. However few engaged with Local Authorities (LAs) or networks of schools more widely. One of the exceptions was in Wales, where a number of projects funded under the MGS focused on working with LAs to support the delivery of the ESDGC. Further, these projects complemented one another and engaged effectively with the EES coordinator for Wales.

4.8 The DEC's played a significant role in the formal education sector, through their engagement with EES coordinators – who in a number of cases were based in DEC offices – and as implementers of DAF and MGS projects focused on the formal sector (about 35-40% of total grants per year are awarded to DEC's, most of them focused on education). However, this did not necessarily support the building of effective relationships with the statutory sector, and the LAs in particular. One contributory factor has been the emphasis in the DAF guidelines on innovation for projects of up to 3 years, which has detracted from building more sustainable partnerships between different stakeholders through DAF supported projects. This said, a number of DEC's have built partnerships with the statutory sector locally and are receiving funding directly from them.

4.9 Spending on the DFID Global School Partnerships (DGSP) Programme represented the highest spend on formal education; at £2.5 million this was approximately half of the spend on education in 2007/08 and funding will increase to approximately £22 million for 3 years from 2009. The programme has reached a significant number of schools since its inception in 2003 and an estimated 3.3 million learners across the UK and in developing countries.

4.10 The DGSP has proved an effective way of engaging teachers and pupils through active partnerships between schools in the UK and schools in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean. This approach, which helps schools to develop and sustain links and then use them to develop whole school engagement in global issues, can be seen to contribute to the achievement of the fourth BSDS objective. However, the cost has been high and it has acted very much as a standalone intervention. Little evidence of links across schools or regionally was identified and the scheme did not appear to link to the DCSF's Global Gateway service which provides opportunities for schools to find link schools in developing countries.

4.11 There seems to be even less evidence related to the effectiveness of other interventions supported in the education sector. The volunteering scheme, Platform 2 is relatively new (launched in 2008) and focused more on youth than on formal education. The Global Student Forum, run by the Damaris Trust, seems to have been effective but reach has been limited to a small number of schools. Of the publications and research undertaken with DFID support, the joint Department for Education and Skills (DfES)/DFID 2005 publication *Developing the Global Dimension in the School Curriculum* has proved to be most effective. Local Authorities and school teachers interested in Global Learning found the advice practical and valued the clarity around the aspects of the Global Learning dimension.

The Media

4.12 For the Media, the main focus was on television, through work with the CBA-DFID Broadcast Media Scheme (BMS), the International Broadcasting Trust (IBT) and the One World Media Awards (OWMA). All three interventions were reported to have been effective. In particular the BMS, for a relatively modest £2.2 million, has yielded an estimated £10 million worth of television programming since its inception in 2001. With a broadcast success rate of 70% for those awarded travel bursaries and 55% for programme development beneficiaries, the scheme appears to have punched above its weight. It has succeeded in bringing the developing world to UK television screens and earned a credible reputation in the broadcast industry. However, it is not clear whether there has been a critical mass of programmes sufficient to increase levels of concern about poverty amongst the UK public.

4.13 Longitudinal research, undertaken by the IBT, has complemented the opportunities given through the BMS to increase the coverage of development work in the media. By providing objective evidence it has supported lobbying for a broadcast development-friendly broadcast environment. IBT has been able to lobby senior figures in the broadcast industry to whom DFID would find it difficult to gain access. It is likely that the survival of what serious developing world context (outside conflict and disaster coverage) remains on UK television owes no small debt to the research and lobbying of the IBT.

4.14 The OWMA are well established within the UK media. They have encouraged editors, producers and reporters to focus on the international agenda and the generation of media content about the developing world. DFID's support of a £10,000 grant for the last 5 years has been specifically for the UK Local Media Award. However, this does not seem to have had a significant impact on expanding the base of local media coverage and DFID has not been proactive in promoting the prize amongst potential applicants. Strategically DFID has benefitted by being associated with a relatively high level award, but the actual outputs, split as they are across regions, do not support a particularly strategic approach to engaging with the media or complement the DFID supported interventions with BMS and IBT.

4.15 Finally, projects supported by DAF funding focused on the media, have not been integrated with the three key media interventions supported by DFID. The two projects focused on use of the media currently supported under the DAF, as against the use of media in formal education, appear to have been effective in raising awareness of development in the press and with local radio. However, engagement was too limited to impact strategically on DFID's support for the media focused on building support for development.

Businesses and Trade Unions

4.16 There was little engagement by DFID with business in the early years of the BSDS despite the fact that there were a number of movements engaging with business at the time to promote more ethical working practices including; encouraging businesses to improve the level of corporate responsibility in the workplace; and campaigning and advocacy to put pressure on business to ensure ethical sourcing of products. The exception was the production by DFID in 2004 of the 'Rough Guide to a Better World (RGBW). This was an effective move which resonated well with the business community. However, there has been no follow-up action with the businesses concerned.

4.17 DFID (through the Business Alliance Team) has since engaged with the business community within the framework of the eighth Millennium Development Goal (MDG) on developing the right partnerships to reduce global poverty. They have developed initiatives which have been institutionalised within the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). There is also a strong link to the Prime Minister's Call to Action at the summit in New York. However these initiatives have not been coordinated with the BSDS and overall there has not been sufficient engagement with business through building support for development initiatives to make an assessment on effectiveness.

4.18 With Trade Unions, the story has been more successful. The Trade Unions, with their clear policy perspective on aid and trade together with a strong history of engagement through the TUC with the civil society development agenda, were a prime target group to engage with over the building support for development agenda. The Strategic Grant Agreement (SGA) with the TUC aimed to contribute towards a better informed UK trade union movement which would place it in a strong position to make an effective strategic contribution to international development. Overall the SGA proved effective; it provided a vehicle for small grants to individual unions focused on development awareness and helped build the project planning and development capacity of affiliate members, particularly to enable them to access grant mechanisms such as the DAF. Relationship difficulties between DFID and the TUC have emerged, with the TUC feeling that DFID has not played as supportive a role as it might have done. However, the trade union perspective on development has grown and a new Partnership Programme Arrangement (PPA) points to a positive future for the DFID-TUC partnership.

4.19 There were a few DAF and MGS awards made to business and Trade Unions. However, the TUC did provide capacity building support to Trade Unions for preparing DAF applications for submission to DFID using funds from the SGA with DFID. Whilst this strategy appears to have been effective in a number of cases, there is little evidence regarding the effectiveness of the individual projects or about how effectively they were linked to other activities undertaken under the TUC SGA.

Faith Communities

4.20 The rationale for engaging with the Faith Communities at the outset of the strategy was linked to the significant role played by the churches and by international development Faith Based Organisations (FBOs), such as Christian Aid, in raising the awareness of development in the UK. However, as discussed in Chapter 2, the BSDS objective for the faith community was ambitious in its scope and scale and set an agenda that was beyond the remit of DFID. The presence of such an ambitious

objective explains, to some extent, why DFID did not engage effectively with Faith Communities through its building support for development agenda. DFID has engaged with FBOs through PPAs (e.g. with Christian Aid and Islamic Relief). However, this has not led to significant dialogue with faith communities.

4.21 Very few DAF or MGS awards were made to Faith Communities and those that were mostly targeted the formal education sector; including groups working with Jewish Schools and Muslim Schools. Evidence points to these projects being successful, and to them linking to the wider Jewish and Muslim communities. However, the links were not capitalised upon and explored as part of DFID's engagement with faith communities more widely; an opportunity to think out of the box and gain greater traction across faith communities would seem to have been missed.

Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Groups and Diaspora Communities

4.22 The concept of exploring the potential for setting up an SGA with a BME Civil Society Organisation (CSO) focused on information sharing and capacity building of UK BME civil society, around strategies for poverty reduction in poor countries, was sound. However, Connections for Development (CfD), the organisation set up by DFID to deliver the SGA did not have sufficient influence within the wider BME community to meet the ambitious targets set in the SGA. This included the aim to 'bring together diverse segments of UK BME civil society, providing leadership and enabling debate, shared learning and collaboration for actions on international development issues' (CfD SGA, 2003). In addition the limited time frame was insufficient for DFID to effectively engage with the BME community around the building support for development agenda.

4.23 DFID's support for volunteering schemes, though relatively recent, is showing potential. The development of the Diaspora Volunteering Initiative (DVI) run by VSO has taken an organic approach which has engaged effectively with BME partners including those who were previously CfD members. DFID funding has enabled scale-up from a base of five foundational partnerships: AFFORD, Africa Foundation Stone, Asian Foundation for Philanthropy, Africa Recruit, and Rebuild. The programme has now grown to 18 partnerships and can be judged a success as many returned volunteers become active agents in building support for development with their own communities and beyond. Diaspora initiatives seem to have benefited from the lessons of early experience and have potential as entry points for DFID engagement.

4.24 Engaging with BME and Diaspora groups through the DAF and MGS has presented a challenge since the outset and it is only in the last few years that DAF projects targeting BME groups have been consistently approved. Increasingly ex-CfD and DVI partners are applying for DAF and MGS funding suggesting links across BME and Diaspora organisations interested in raising development awareness. A further more recent step towards engaging BME and diaspora communities has been the awarding of DAF grants to the managing agents for the MGS in Northern Ireland (2008/09) and Wales (2009/10) to build the capacity of locally based BME and Diaspora groups to help them access Mini Grant funding.

The Development Awareness Fund and Mini Grants Scheme

4.25 The effectiveness of the DAF and MGS has been captured in the sections above with respect to the individual sectors. As a whole they have proved effective tools for opening up opportunities for organisations to engage in raising awareness

of development, and the decision to consider all target groups identified in the BSDS as potential recipients of DAF and MGS grants was relevant to some extent. However, as explored above, the links between DAF and MGS projects and other interventions undertaken with the key target groups of the BSDS are tenuous. Moreover, the requirement to continually come up with 'new ideas' for projects lasting up to 3 years has resulted in a plethora of 'pilot' projects which last for up to 3 years, then disappear to be replaced by the next 'pilot'. For the DAF and MGS to be more effective they should have linked more strategically to the interventions being undertaken in all the target sectors that DFID was working in.

4.26 A further constraint to the effectiveness of the DAF was that there was no mechanism for capturing learning from the projects funded and identifying which approaches and projects did and did not work well. Such an approach could have informed the project selection process for the following year and led to more strategic selection of projects more generally. Whilst some excellent projects were funded, with no learning shared across them, few lessons from the DAF and MGS funding projects have been captured and a vital opportunity to disseminate this learning has been lost.

Overall Effectiveness of BSDS Activities

4.27 Overall most of the individual activities supported were appropriate to the respective objectives and many, especially through DECs, the media schemes, the DAF and MGS, achieved significant impact. However given the lack of strategic synergy within and between the various schemes and objectives the aggregate level effectiveness was limited.

4.28 Within the network of committed individuals and organisations DFID's profile was enhanced as it became a key funder of development awareness and development education activities. However the emphasis on these civil society entry points was not effectively complemented by more structured engagement and action at the policy level. A more integrated approach that linked information provision, strategic interventions, and policy engagement across a wider range of, public, private and civil society stakeholders would have been more effective. For example in the formal education sector DFID focused on funding voluntary sector activity rather than applying its agency as a government department within the policy arena. Similarly in the case of the media the work done by Communications Division on the messages DFID wished to communicate was not linked to the funding schemes and insufficient attention was paid to engagement with the Department of Media Culture and Sport, and the management of television and other media companies. Effective delivery of the BSDS objectives would have been enhanced if policy level engagement had been given more attention, linkages made with a wider range of stakeholders and a more strategic approach taken.

4.29 With faith, BME, and diaspora communities the depth of DFID institutional understanding and commitment to relationship building limited effectiveness. The investment of time to establish and sustain regular institutional engagement would have been much more effective than financial support. Indeed in some cases funding from DFID was the least effective strategy.

4.30 Whilst not one of the ten objectives, diversity and inclusive practice was identified explicitly in the BSDS. In implementation this was mainly restricted to engagement with BME groups and diaspora communities with the BSDS having no

specific gender focus or clear approach to other aspects of exclusion. There were examples of interventions with a specific gender focus such as the commissioning of programmes under the BMS with strong gender themes and funding of women's groups under the MGS. However, the approach to addressing gender was not strategic and remains an area of weakness in the implementation of the BSDS.

4.31 As will be explored in more detail in chapter 6, which looks at impact, the absence of a monitoring framework or of any regular evaluation of the strategy limits a more detailed assessment of effectiveness particularly at objective level.

5 EFFICIENCY: EXPENDITURE AND MANAGEMENT

5.1 Efficiency in this case relates to the level and utilisation of resources, both human and financial, to achieve the BSDS objectives. The review looked at overall budgets for BSDS and associated activities. An assessment is made of the spread of financial resources across the BSDS objectives and target groups. The specific application of human and financial resources is reviewed together with an assessment of the necessary skills and competencies.

5.2 Prior to 1997 activities focused on building support for development had a very modest budget. From 1997 the budget rose from £1.3 million to £19 million in 2008/9 (see Annex 6 table 6.1), a rate of increase above that of DFID's overall budget but still relatively modest for the whole of the UK focused activities, other than general information and communications. In total expenditure of specific BSDS activities amounted to over £70 million of an allocated budget of £90 million over the ten years. This is understood to have been the largest commitment to development education and awareness in Europe⁷.

5.3 Until 2006 budget and expenditure reporting was not disaggregated other than to identify the SGA element. Thus the budget line shown as development awareness in table 6.2 of annex 6 accounts for all the BSDS spend (aside from the SGAs). Table 6.2 also shows the growth of PPA expenditures and the other spending lines for activities of the Civil Society Department (CSD). Given the contribution to building support for development from NGOs funding under PPAs the actual expenditure directly or indirectly supporting BSDS was over £100 million between 1999 and 2009.

5.4 Table 6.2 also reflects the changing management arrangements as the BSDS developed. The key points are that:

- The original BSDS activities were developed within the Information Department with one person responsible for the initial programme in 1997/98 supported by an information officer – effectively DFID's press office.
- By 1999 when the BSDS was published the team had grown to seven members, four staff in what was called the DAF Team and three in the Publicity Team reporting direct to the Head of Department. Together the two teams comprised the Information Department managed alongside the CSD.
- Following an internal review of DFID's communications strategy in 2003 the DAF, Public Enquiry Point and External Communications Teams were organised within the Building Support for Development Team with an External Communications & Development Education Head of Department.
- In 2005 SGA management moved into the team from CSD and the establishment increased to some 19.6 full time equivalent staff.
- DFID's building support for development work has remained within communications division and, with the publication of a further internal Communications Strategy (in 2007) the division expanded and was consolidated in the London office. The BSD Team became the Outreach and Stakeholder Relations Team with 6 staff focusing exclusively on the building support for development agenda. Meanwhile CSD has remained in the East Kilbride office becoming part of the Policy and Research Division (PRD).

⁷ Information from Doug Bourn Director, Development Education Research Centre

5.5 The review has been able to track expenditures back to 2004 and a summary of this data is presented in Table 1 below which shows the trends within the building support for development programme over the last five years (a more detailed analysis of expenditure is included as Table 6.1 of annex 6). As can be seen education continues to have the lion's share of the budget. The reduction since 2007 is due simply to the introduction of the new volunteering programmes and education continues to grow significantly in cash terms. In fact about 80% of the Mini Grants (MGS) are also for educational activities but this budget line has not been disaggregated here.

Table 1: Approximate Spend in £millions

	1999/00		2004/5		2008/9		2009/10 Budget	
Media			£0.28	4%	£0.43	3%	£0.74	3%
Dev Ed			£5.50	73%	£8.60	64%	£15.20	63%
SGA			£0.85	11%	£0.06	1%		
DAF (not ed)			£0.30	4%	£0.80	6%	£1.00	4%
Mini Grant Scheme			£0.44	6%	£0.55	4%	£0.69	3%
Trade Unions			£0.13	2%	now supported by a PPA with CSD			
Youth/Diaspora Vol & Linking					£3	22%	£6.13	26%
Other							£0.24	1%
Total	£3.70	100%	£7.50	100%	£13.44	100%	£24.00	100%

- Notes: 1. 1999/00 details not available
- 2. Dev Ed includes education share of DAF and for 2009/10 new DGSP budget
- 3. Mini Grant Scheme figure is total. Over 75% is education

5.6 Levels of expenditure on media and civil society related objectives (business, trade unions and faith) have remained low with some 75% of the total BSDS budget devoted to education across the whole ten years. Support to BME groups and diaspora communities have also been low although expenditure is increasing due to the funding of the volunteering scheme. For the specific business, trade unions and faiths objectives the expenditure has been very small indeed, and outside the SGAs was not based on a strategic engagement with these civil society networks but relied on the competitive funding through the DAF and MGS.

5.7 The staffing for BSDS in the first five years grew in proportion to the expanding budget and activity base. However the pressure on administrative costs limited subsequent growth and staffing levels have reduced relative to the continued budget increases. In addition whilst there was a degree of stability in the BSD team during the early years, from 2005 staff changes became more frequent. The net effect has brought increased pressures on staff time. There was also a shift in the balance of work with more time required to manage the growing DAF and MGS grant arrangements diverting attention away from partner engagement. The schemes still take a disproportionate amount of time despite the contracting out of the DAF management. Other priorities now include an increased focus on the diaspora and youth volunteering, and community links schemes reflecting the commitment expressed in the 2006 White Paper to promote more active citizenship and involvement, particularly in terms of links between civil society in the UK and those in developing countries. In addition the education and media programmes have made increasing project management demands as budgets have grown.

5.8 The net effect of staff reductions and turnover has reinforced this emphasis on the more traditional project management roles. The emphasis since 2005 has moved away from close engagement with civil society partners, who had been supported through SGAs or who were the key access points with business, trade unions, churches and other networks. Building support for development, by its very nature, requires engagement around that agenda. Seeking to reach new constituencies required specific skills in engagement and also skills and understanding of civil society and its composition. There also seems to have been a reduction in policy engagement with other government departments since the early years. Again this runs counter to the requirements of the strategy.

5.9 The BSD team (now the Outreach and Stakeholder Relations Team- OSRT) has never had the benefit of adviser expertise in education, the media, social inclusion, social development or governance; skill sets that would seem appropriate to the task. In addition stakeholder engagement with the complex network of civil society actors; sectoral knowledge across for example formal education, faith, BME, and the business communities; and policy engagement require a range of specific expertise and skill relevant for the teams current functions.

Alternative ways of Managing Interventions

5.10 A fast growing and broad range of activities have generally been managed in an administratively efficient manner. Most grants from the smallest MGS to the largest education programme have been administered well and where problems have occurred DFID usually handled the issues sensitively and in a transparent way. Given the limits on staffing the efficient management of resources and programmes is commendable. The price paid has been in not having sufficient space to take a more strategic approach, engage with partners other than around funding arrangements and monitor the achievement of the strategy.

5.11 In an attempt to reduce the management burden DFID has sought to contract out some of the administrative responsibility. The MGS was contracted out, almost from the outset, with managing agents in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. This has been a relatively efficient way of managing the scheme though limited monitoring by DFID has led to some anomalies which have not been picked up. The small size of the development community in Northern Ireland, and to an extent in Wales, has resulted in conflict of interests where, at worst, the same organisation has acted as managing agent and assessor whilst submitting and being awarded funding. A further issue is the variation in management costs ranging from 4.5% in Wales in 2008/09 to 21.7% in N Ireland in 2007/08.

5.12 The contracting out of the DAF, from 2007, by contrast, has led to greater efficiency without any of the problems of the MGS. The managing agent has given high levels of input to the appraisal, project assessment and day to day management processes, all tasks that would previously have been carried out by DFID staff, for a relatively low management fee, representing good value for money. DFID still remain too involved in day to day management and the use of a third party (the Crown Agents), through whom payments to grant recipients are made, reduces the efficiency. Learning from other competitive funding schemes run by CSD could help to improve efficiency further.

5.13 In education, the DGSP is contracted out to a British Council led consortium and Platform2 is managed by Christian Aid with BUNAC. Both schemes appear to be

well managed. However, the EES places a heavy management burden on DFID; firstly because the funding cycles are out of sync and secondly due to having 11 contracts, each with quarterly payments. Reporting remains particularly problematic, with no systems for accountability of performance.

Summary

5.14 The BSDS has been efficiently managed throughout in terms of fund administration and programme operation. Flexibility and enthusiasm in the early years enabled rapid growth and strong engagement with civil society and government partners. The scope for flexibility has reduced over time and the very success of the strategy has introduced new challenges which have stretched staff capacity. The ease of working in a small team resulted in close liaison across departments which is more difficult as DFID has grown and the agenda and relationships have become more complex.

5.15 Policy level engagement has reduced and increasingly time is devoted to administrative oversight and reporting. Further, the skills required for engagement around building support for development do not seem to have been taken into account. Relevant professional expertise, with a strong policy perspective, is essential if senior managers, policy makers and decision makers in these spheres are to be effectively engaged.

5.16 More extensive contracting out of the organisational and capacity building activities should give the space for the team to focus on stakeholder engagement and policy level functions. To do this effectively will require a review of the staffing and skill mix in order to address the emerging agenda.

6. IMPACT

6.1 The final three chapters address the second objective of the review. This chapter reviews the evidence regarding the impact and presents a summary of impact in relation to each sector and the ten objectives. Chapter 7 takes a strategic look across the ten years and the conclusions from the four earlier reviews as the basis for considering how to take the strategy forward in the future. Chapter 8 presents the conclusions of the review and recommends where DFID should focus its support in the future and how the strategy can be developed to maximise UK public support for development.

6.2 Assessing the impact of the BSDS interventions is problematic given that no impact studies, systematic monitoring or evaluation have been carried out since 1999. Each review did, however, attempt to draw conclusions from the limited evidence available about impact and sustainability of interventions undertaken. Much of the evidence comes from discussion with key stakeholders engaged with activities supported by DFID and hence is based on opinion as opposed to firm evidence. The extent to which the objectives have been met is evaluated for each sector in turn. The table below gives the assessment of progress made under all ten objectives.

6.3 The most significant ***impact in the formal education sector*** has been where DFID support has helped to ensure that the global dimension is reflected in the curriculum. There has been significant impact in Wales, through direct DFID engagement with the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG), in the framing of the ESDGC strategy, which is now fully integrated into formal education and the youth service. Further, there is now a requirement that delivery of ESDGC be subject to evaluation through the inspection body, Estyn in Wales. The global dimension has become a statutory requirement throughout education in Wales with WAG showing strong commitment to ensure its delivery. The curriculum in both Scotland and Northern Ireland reflect the global dimension to a certain extent, but there is no evidence to suggest that DFID influenced this and there is still some way to go before the global dimension is fully integrated in the way ESDGC is in Wales.

6.4 In England, progress has been made through the partnership with DEA. The global dimension is now included in the secondary school curriculum. Indications are that the review of the primary school curriculum is likely to recommend more flexibility and cross curriculum work which may include a global dimension; DEA's work is continuing the thrust on promoting such an approach. Progress is still to be made on the integration of the global dimension into teacher training and the inspection service Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED).

6.5 It is likely that there has been a significant impact on school children who now have a better understanding of their place in the world and how other countries impact on them, brought about through DAF projects and EES supported activities, and through the links to schools in the developing world through the DGSP. Resources have been produced, some of a very high quality, and ad hoc evidence suggests that these have been put to good use and had a significant impact on some teachers and children. However, progress is patchy and more evidence is needed to gauge the impact more widely and on the school community as a whole.

Progress since 1999 against BSDS Objectives

BSDS Objective	Progress Since 1999
Formal Education	
To ensure that global issues are adequately incorporated in Curriculum provision and guidance across the UK	New curricula have incorporated global issues explicitly and implicitly. The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority has issued guidance to schools to support Global Learning. DFID support to DEA has helped to facilitate this.
To ensure provision of good quality materials and resources to facilitate teaching in schools	Some good materials through EES, DEA and DAF projects but limited sharing of resources.
To reinforce school-based work through the teacher training, inspection and awarding bodies	No real engagement with the Training and Development Agency or Ofsted (and equivalents in Scotland and Northern Ireland). Good work underway in Wales.
To encourage whole school or community based activities with a development focus	Improvements in recent years through DGSP and some EES practice – could do more.
The Media	
To concentrate our own work with the media around key issues and themes	DFID's own approach to the media is developing a clearer focus but the links to the BSDS have not to date been included
To research and strengthen television coverage of development issues	Research commissioned with IBT has contributed to the survival of serious developing world content on television
To promote debate within the development community on public key messages	No engagement with the wider development community around the issue of communications, public opinion and awareness
Business and Trade Unions	
To raise awareness of development issues within the business community and among trade unions	Awareness increasing with response to globalisation, climate change. Some attribution to DFID through the TUC SGA
To seek ways to work with business and trade unions to raise public awareness of global and development issues	Only ongoing relationship is with the TUC and that has been slow to develop into an effective partnership
Faith Communities	
To build and support a worldwide alliance with the Christian church and other Faiths to eliminate poverty	INAPPROPRIATE OBJECTIVE – But no sustained institutional relationship established with any faith community - outcome (faith action on poverty) but no DFID output

6.6 Within **the media** there is evidence that interventions have had an impact on the knowledge and perceptions of global issues in the broadcast industry. The BMS intervention has been instrumental in bringing about a change in attitudes towards commissioning programmes about the developing world together with an understanding that there is a UK audience for these programmes and that stories about the development world can be made in ways that produce interesting and engaging programmes. IBT research has played a part in convincing broadcasters, Ofcom and the BBC Trust to make commitments to international programming.

6.7 Whilst there appears to have been impact on the broadcasters and decision makers within the industry, there is no audience research which captures the impact that programming has had on the public. The wider development community does not seem to have been targeted through the interventions and hence no impact is recorded with respect to the third media objective (To promote debate within the development community on key messages).

6.8 Impact for **civil society groups, including business and the trade unions, faith communities and BME groups and diaspora communities** has been less than in education and the media. Whilst less marked than in formal education, DFID support to civil society focused on building support for development has resulted in engagement at the local level and, though short lived in some cases, the SGA support to local government, trade unions and other networks has also impacted locally. However, small disconnected activities, no matter how good, are unlikely to be sustained and are unable to be taken to scale and impact on larger communities. The failure to develop effective partnerships with the initial target audiences and groups, especially businesses and faith communities, has weakened the impact.

6.9 **DAF and MGS funding** have provided significant opportunities for a wide variety of groups, from the formal sector in education to local level community and voluntary groups, to access funding; in this respect a ‘thousand flowers’ have been encouraged to bloom and many organisations have engaged with the BSDS agenda. However, again the lack of an impact assessment study has resulted in little being known about whether the DAF has had a significant impact on the groups it has worked with. As indicated before the emphasis in the DAF on innovation and short term projects has impacted on sustainability and the fund as a whole has not aggregated up to more than the sum of the projects supported.

6.10 **Overall** at activity level there has been considerable impact but this has been limited by the broad scale and lack of focus of the interventions. In particular the funded programmes (BMS, DAF, MGS) have supported a wide range of activities delivered through a variety of partners with little attention paid to monitoring. Awareness raising amongst this large audience and the involvement of a significant network of civil society actors appears to have been significant but the impact achieved is less tangible. If the DECAs, schools and other actors involved in the formal education sector are included the scale of support is even greater. However the emphasis on funding of activities has detracted from relationship building and the achievement of more strategic impact on the general public and the specific target groups. As the table shows impact at objective level has been limited. More focused, targeted and strategic development of the BSDS could have greater impact and be more sustainable in achieving DFID’s overall aim.

7 TAKING THE STRATEGY FORWARD

7.1 This chapter assesses where DFID should focus its efforts to build support for development in the future. The analysis is based in particular on the findings in terms of impact of DFID's activities, funding and partnerships summarised in the previous chapter. It draws on the recommendations of the four independent reviews covering support for formal education, through the media, to specific target groups within society through businesses, trade unions, faith communities, black and minority ethnic communities and diaspora groups, and through the development awareness fund and mini grants scheme (annex 7). The review has also taken account of DFID's current commitments and approach as set out in the 2009 White Paper.

Key successes to build on

7.2 The review process has identified the strengths that have been realised through the BSDS since 1999. The following areas provide a basis for improving the implementation of the strategy:

- There is a strong network of voluntary organisations (DECs, other DAF and MGS recipients, PPA partners etc) with a wealth of energy and commitment
- There is considerable interest amongst other civil society networks (churches and faith communities, trades unions, professional bodies, local government) most of which have yet to be strategically engaged
- There is a strong established base of 'active enthusiasts' who support the development process and the government's commitment to it
- Sustainable development and the global dimension have been embedded in the school curriculum
- There is strong interest in the media amongst programme makers and managers which has given international development a platform
- Interest in the business sector that has been effectively catalysed when given a specific focus (e.g. the marketing of Rough Guide to A Better World, the Business Call to Action)

Areas for improvement

7.3 From the overall review process the key areas where the BSDS implementation can be improved include the need to:

- Review the vision and direction of the BSDS with clear outcome statements for the funding and strategic relationships
- Establish a monitoring framework with measurable indicators and scope for regular evaluation at strategy and programme level
- Focus staff resources more strategically with priority given to stakeholder engagement and policy level activity
- Reduce the number of grants and schemes and wherever possible work through intermediaries to maximise the space for more strategic stakeholder engagement
- Establish more effective partnerships with other government departments around shared areas, notably but not only education and youth

White Paper Priorities

7.4 The 2009 White Paper renews the UK government's commitment to eliminate poverty and address the new challenges of economic turmoil, conflict and climate change stressing the need to work together⁸. In this context the need to build understanding of global interdependence in the UK is reaffirmed. To achieve this the White Paper reaffirms that:

- The government will continue to focus on promoting learning about development through the UK education system.
- British people should know that their taxes are being used to tackle global poverty, deal with issues that will affect us all such as climate change, and help some of the most vulnerable people on the planet and be proud of our development programme.
- DFID will expand collaboration with business to widen the number of international and domestic companies taking action.
- DFID will build a more strategic partnership with civil society (including faith communities, trade unions and others) covering their engagement internationally, connecting with communities here and abroad, and taking the power and value of international voice and advocacy to new levels⁹.

7.5 The concluding sentence of the White Paper states that “Today, we need a new call to action. Times are tougher, the way forward harder. But the need is no less. If we all contribute, we can build a common future that is in all of our interests.¹⁰” This reaffirmation of *taking action together* echoes the vision of the 1999 Building Support for Development Strategy. The vision is still valid and the lessons of the last ten years identify where it can be more effective. The reviews have shown that whilst much has been achieved a more focused, holistic and strategic approach can have greater impact. They have also identified the strong commitment amongst stakeholders who are supportive of DFID's direction and effort. Improved engagement with these stakeholders, including more collaborative approaches to public engagement to increase general awareness and support, and more effective policy level activity can deliver a reframed BSDS.

Towards a more holistic approach

7.6 One of the limitations of the BSDS is that it naturally divides into support to a number of sectors by virtue of the specific objectives set. This has fragmented the implementation with a focus on the instruments related to each sector rather than any higher order objectives. The result seems to have been a tendency to focus on what the funding mechanisms can achieve. Whilst there are four overarching objectives they have not guided the programme, except to act as a definition of the various aspects of development awareness. To move forward a more holistic approach is needed that considers the relationship between and across the various sectors and interventions with clearer outcome level statements.

7.7 The aim of the BSDS as expressed in the 1999 strategy paper is:

⁸ Building Our Common Future 2009 White Paper on International Development, p 6

⁹ DFID 2009, paras. 7.42, 7.43, 7.50, 7.52

¹⁰ DFID, 2009, para 8.7 p.142

‘To promote public understanding of our interdependence, of the need for international development and of the progress that has been made and that is possible’.

This aim and the hope expressed in the BSDS that ‘this should help raise awareness and probably change behaviour and attitudes’ still remains relevant 10 years after the strategy was developed and as we have seen it is reiterated in the recent White Paper. The White Paper and the work of the reviews suggest similar outcome statements that could form the basis of a revised strategy:

- British people know that their taxes are being used by the Government to tackle global poverty
- The present level of support (above 50%) for this policy and the 0.7% target the Government has set is sustained
- Every child becomes an adult with an awareness of development and global interdependence

7.8 Such outcomes suggest:

- a focus on secondary education that broadens and deepens basic understandings established at primary level;
- work with children and young people that encourages critical engagement with development issues;
- public engagement through a wide range of entry points including but not limited to the media that give consistent messages;
- a common set of communications messages shared by all committed stakeholders that provides information that can promote deeper understanding and informed debate;
- effective engagement with stakeholders that can reinforce these outcomes and provide practical opportunities for involvement and action at all levels.

7.9 As has been identified work in the formal education sector has dominated the strategy. The four objectives specifically related to formal education provide tangible targets which can clearly be met if the right strategies are pursued. Other objectives remain less tangible and meeting them presents a greater challenge than with education.

7.10 However, if the BSDS is to be effectively delivered then greater consideration needs to be given to the balance between target groups. The overarching aim of the education interventions are to ensure that every child has the opportunity to engage with the global dimension through formal education. This assumes that if children engage at school they will become more responsible citizens with greater awareness of the developing world and the impact that it has on them as individuals and collectively. However, to meet objectives in the medium term equal attention needs to be paid to adults who represent an increasingly large proportion of the population. Further, children are as influenced by what they hear at home and through the media as by what they learn at school. Hence it is vital that the delivery of the BSDS in the future gives greater emphasis to the media and to the partnerships with civil society than it has in the past.

A Roadmap for the Future

7.11 For DFID, this means that decisions need to be made as to where to target support, rather than pursuing a 'business as usual' approach. It is important, in this respect, that the concept of building support for development is seen as an integral part of DFID's overall policy and that the Outreach & Stakeholder Relations team, together with CSD and Communications Division are all engaged in the decision making process and setting the new direction of the strategy. The key stages indicated by the review are:

- Develop a reframed BSDS, based on the commitments in the 2009 White Paper, that reflects a balance between support to education (children and young people) and support to interventions targeted at the adult population (media, civil society, BME and Diaspora groups etc).
- Ensure the reframed BSDS takes a more comprehensive approach to equal opportunities and the importance of gender equality for development at all levels.
- Based on this reframed overall vision (a reworking of the original aim and four objectives) specific outcome statements similar to those in para 7.7 can form the basis of a new programme with an integrated set of components similar to those in para 7.8
- The identification of specific target audiences and related partners together with a more limited and realistic set of objectives for each group selected
- A shared approach to monitoring, evaluation and regular review should also be developed to ensure that lessons learnt are captured and acted upon and that the strategy evolves and is not static
- As the process of reframing the strategy is developed the present BSD portfolio should be reviewed and restructured with a separation of the programme management responsibilities from the strategic direction and stakeholder engagement
- The focus should be on strategic stakeholder relationships related to the objectives, policy level interaction, the identification of new targets of support and the monitoring of the strategy.
- Engagement with and support for media activities (television, film, new media and the communications activities of other stakeholders) should be integrated with the internal communications work of DFID so that relevant expertise and shared messages are developed.
- Civil society funding instruments should be transferred to the CSD including the youth and diaspora volunteering programmes
- Other programme management and funding should be channelled through other government departments or intermediary agents so that the Outreach and Stakeholder Relations Team can develop the expertise and capacity to lead on the development and monitoring of the strategy and the related stakeholder engagement.
- Staffing for the OSRT should be reviewed as part of this process to ensure staff levels and skills are appropriate to the redefined task and workload.

7.12 This whole process should take no more than a year. As indicated the intention is to focus attention on outcomes rather than inputs. For example the key question in education should be - How does DFID ensure those responsible for education policy and implementation address development? - rather than how can DFID support that delivery itself?

7.13 The selection of interventions should be informed by the new outcomes identified. If outcomes similar to those indicated in paras 7.7 and 7.8 are agreed then the implications for support may include:

- more emphasis on support to the media and work with other stakeholders (e.g. UK based NGOs) communications departments
- support to civil society through PPAs and similar instruments with BSD objectives included in any new agreements
- support to education channelled through DSCF or other intermediary agencies agreed jointly with DCSF

7.14 Those responsible for the BSD Strategy (currently the OSRT within Communications Division) should focus on stakeholder engagement and should limit funding to specific support to interventions to develop new outcome related activity e.g. support for the co-ordination of interfaith activity related to development, support to one-off private sector/business initiatives related to BSD outcomes. Any such support should be time limited and monitored for impact. Continued support should not be managed by the OSRT but integrated/transferred to other DFID departments or managing agents.

7.15 Requests for or the initiation of such interventions should be assessed against specific criteria:

- Which outcome related objective does it contribute to?
- Is this a one-off intervention that leverages the influence or programming of identified stakeholders?
- Are other stakeholders able to support the activity themselves or make contributions to it?
- Is there identifiable policy impact?
- How will the intervention be monitored against BSDS targets?

7.16 The reviews suggest that in terms of value for money the media interventions have achieved most (level of programming and potential audience) whereas school linking is least cost effective. It would therefore be likely that relative spending on media interventions would increase whereas spending on school linking may reduce. Overall the commitment to education is disproportionately high compared to the support to civil society (especially faith and business) interventions. Rather than suggesting new interventions the review proposes that the budget is more closely linked to outcomes with a rebalancing in favour of media and communications activity and civil society stakeholder support including strengthening emerging networks and encouraging alliances within and across key civil society groups.

7.17 The reviews did not look in detail at the content of BSDS activities and messages. However the impression was gained that there is often less attention paid to developing understandings of the more complex aspects of the development

process. Sustaining and supporting 'active enthusiasts' and encouraging more discerning views amongst the wider public leads naturally to addressing questions about aid instruments, aid effectiveness and the respective roles of the UK Government, multilateral agencies and civil society actors. DFID should ensure that it stimulates wide understanding of the nature and processes of development. Stakeholders should be encouraged to maintain and develop a critical stance, balancing the 'pride' in the commitment of government sought by the 2009 White Paper with an appreciation of the limits and constraints faced by governments and the need for diversity in development with strong civil society engagement.

7.18 Building a stronger commitment to development investment is predicated on an appreciation of the strengths and weaknesses of particular approaches and agencies. This has not been a feature of the BSD activities to date but could usefully be explored through engagement with specific stakeholders amongst the more committed.

7.19 The reviews found little evidence of active linkages between BSD activities and wider UK Government agendas. Whilst the 2006 White Paper marked a change of direction for DFID which in part reflected the new aspects of the global agenda and this in turn resulted in the increase in opportunities for involvement through volunteering and community linking these potential connections to the community cohesion agenda have not been built on through links with DCLG or other departments. Even the links with DSCF around the education agenda have not been as actively pursued as might have been expected. As noted this may in part be a function of the focus on programme delivery and consequently less space to focus on policy aspects of the strategy. As more space is made available for the attention to focus on strategic development and stakeholder engagement the wider policy context of the BSD agenda can be explored. However there is a risk of trying to address too many agendas at once. The priority should be to reframe the strategy, re-order the portfolio and focus on stakeholder engagement. As those dialogues develop however the OSRT and Communications Division as a whole should give more attention to links with other government departments and should be prepared to set support for development within the broader policy and social context.

Outcome related objectives and targets

7.20 Those targeted through formal education remain relevant targets. However as the strategy moves forward civil society should be more broadly represented, in line with the broader conception of UK Civil society outlined in the 2009 White Paper and greater emphasis on media and other modes of public engagement are essential to maximise public awareness and support. As indicated in para. 7.7 the outcomes relate to children and young people, the adult population directly (especially active enthusiasts, the interested mainstream and family first¹¹), and indirectly through civil society stakeholders and network (faith communities, interest groups, CSOs, BME and diaspora groups etc.)

7.21 The objectives related to each of these outcomes, should be focused, clear, measurable and time-bound for the next three years of BSDS, i.e. 2009-2012. DFID should build support for development:

¹¹ DFID's *Communications Strategy: Communication Matters* adopts an audience segmentation analysis which breaks the UK population down into six audience segments according to their attitude towards global poverty. The focus of DFID communications and BSDS intervention is on those who are positive or likely to be positive.

1. within the next generation by engagement through the formal education system;
2. within the general public through the media, its own communications and those of partner stakeholders notably UK NGOs; and
3. through partnerships to engage at a deeper level with civil society to promote understanding, involvement and action. Partnerships should be two-way and

7.22 Engagement with formal education should be built on strategic partnerships between DFID and the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) in England together with the education departments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, as the responsible government agencies. These partnerships may be used as the entry point to agree action by these agencies and where DFID support should be channelled, which may include:

- support to policy engagement at the national level including curriculum and assessment, teacher training and inspection
- support at the regional level for embedding the global dimension in schools, linked to local authority providers
- school linking through DGSP, subject to the planned impact study, linked to DCSF's global gateway scheme
- research to capture lessons learned to support the embedding of the global dimension throughout the education system

7.23 Support for the media should be integrated within DFID's overall approach to communications since the target audiences are the same. DFID's in-house information and communications and its support to the media should both focus on increasing public awareness and support. To this end it may focus on:

- the generation and dissemination of key development messages through in-house and outsourced media, shared with partner stakeholders (e.g. PPA recipient CSOs)
- enhanced funding to BMS to develop compelling content about development activity and the development process as opposed to the developing world using its present approaches together with a grants scheme to replace the present media allocation through the DAF
- research to assess viewing trends and explore improved ways of engaging with the general public through the media through the IBT and other channels

7.24 Partnerships with civil society should focus on building relationships with key stakeholders from Trade Unions, Faith Communities, BME and Diaspora groups, community and local voluntary organisations and the private sector. The identification of partners should be based on a continuous stakeholder mapping process based on a deeper appreciation of the institutional dynamics of the various networks. Whilst the OSRT should lead on the stakeholder engagement other departments may lead on managing the relationships and financial support (e.g. CSD would continue and expand its responsibility for PPAs and other funding instruments including those recommended in the 2009 White Paper). Thus the provision of funding should be seen as supportive of but separate from the stakeholder engagement which will address the common BSD agenda in each case.

7.25 A member of the OSRT should be the link for each stakeholder or stakeholder network with a focus on:

- mutual partnership – building trusting relationships which promote understanding of each other’s standpoints vis-à-vis development and maximise learning
- based on each relationship identify shared objectives and a common set of outcomes related to the BSD agenda
- agreement on any financial or other support from DFID not already covered by existing funding agreements with a particular focus on support of network development and increased leverage

Monitoring and Evaluation

7.26 A monitoring framework should be set up for the whole programme from the outset. This should include a robust logframe for the next three years of the BSDS with clear outputs for each of the objectives/outcomes identified together with verifiable indicators related to each output. The budget should include sufficient funds for regular evaluations at programme and overall BSDS level.

8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

8.1 The Building Support for Development Strategy was a bold and ambitious commitment to seek to work with public, private and civil society actors in support of international development. It was an initiative that was of its time. In 1999, a recent change of Government, a new international development policy framework, and a strong commitment to increase resources and broaden the agenda resonated with DFID's identified partners.

8.2 This alliance and the common agenda, however, could not be maintained; indeed it would have been surprising if such a wide spectrum of interests and commitments had continued to focus around the DFID programme. What was required was an intense period of relationship building so that a range of partnerships and institutional networks could be established to take forward the strategy in ways that affirmed the differences.

8.3 The relationship with the formal education sector was strong at the outset, led by the influential development education community represented by the DECs and International Development NGOs. Hence it is not surprising that the formal education agenda has dominated the DFID interventions focused on building support for development since the inception of the strategy in 1999. However, despite, or perhaps because of, the strong relationship, encompassing a wide variety of interests, the approach adopted was not sufficiently focused. More specifically it was inappropriate to put such a strong emphasis on supporting the voluntary sector (particularly the DECs) compared to more effective and sustained engagement as the government's international development department with the lead education department (now DCSF) and relevant statutory bodies.

8.4 Where DFID has engaged at policy level on education there have been successes. In particular the policy work, initially undertaken through DFID directly in Wales, and more recently through DEA in England, has been effective and to a certain extent been complemented by the emphasis on regional networking through EES. However, the DGSP and other activities supported have acted more as standalone interventions. Further, new partnerships need to be made with service providers (e.g. DCSF, OFSTED) for the global dimension to become statutory throughout the UK, following the example of ESDGC in Wales.

8.5 For the media, there was a history of collaboration¹², examples of good practice and a willingness to think creatively. Partnerships developed, and were instrumental in steering the strategy. However, there has been no evidence of a strong DFID 'hand on the tiller' to continue to guide the strategy. As a whole the interventions complemented each other; many of the individual media projects were sound and in some cases have punched above their weight and the research agenda provided evidence to enhance the position of international development with key media personnel and creating space for development content to be shown (e.g. the commitment in the BBC charter to bringing the world to the UK, that IBT played a role in getting inserted). Less attention has been paid to integrating support to the media with DFID's own in-house communications agenda and DFID needs to give more thought as to how to integrate BSDS media interventions more effectively.

¹² DFID's predecessor the Overseas Development Administration (ODA) first gave support to the International Broadcasting Trust in 1982 to support programme making with a development focus.

8.6 For the other audiences and target groups identified in the strategy insufficient attention was paid to understanding the institutional architecture and building relationships of mutual trust before moving into joint activities and funded work. The strongest relationship developed has been with the trade unions through the TUC SGA but no significant relationships have emerged in the case of business, despite successful engagement over the 'Rough Guide to a Better World'. With respect to churches and faith communities the lack of appreciation of the institutional complexities has resulted in no sustained relationships being established.

8.7 There is a lot of positive interest in development, and more recently issues of sustainability and climate change in the private sector, but DFID's relationships with businesses were not built on to develop sustainable joint initiatives to build support for development. The funding agreement with the TUC complements the TUC's own international development agenda and can be the basis for a shared programme of more extensive trade union support for development. The Christian churches have deepened their commitment to social justice and have developed policies and programmes of action in addition to their support for faith based NGOs. There has also been marked growth in interfaith dialogue and engagement. Amongst faith leaders in the UK there are emerging formal linkages with the potential for more structured engagement. Now is an opportune time to seek a new engagement with faith communities based on the commitment in the 2009 White Paper to double support to faith groups.

8.8 The later focus on BME communities was appropriate but relied too much on the CfD initiative. However key players in the same network have remained engaged through the diaspora based initiatives and there is increasing interest in development within UK BME communities. Working with these specific programmes to build trust and understanding with BME organisations and communities may be more profitable in the next phase of engagement.

8.9 The DAF and MGS have provided an opportunity to explore the ways in which development awareness can be delivered in a variety of contexts. Formal education has dominated since the outset, and whilst there have been many successful projects they have not been strategically linked with other education initiatives, such as EES and policy work carried out by DEA. To ensure these links a more integrated approach should be developed with all financial support for education co-ordinated replacing the DAF support with longer term grant support to key actors and agencies. Similarly there is scope for projects with media and the trade unions to be better integrated with initiatives supported by DFID focused on building support for development in their respective sectors. Taken together these moves would replace the DAF as a standalone competitive funding source with sector based funding.

8.10 For smaller locally based organisations including BME groups, faith based groups and voluntary organisations, accessing funding has proved a challenge. However, these are the very groups that DFID needs to engage with if the broader remit of reaching the public at large is to be met. The continuation of a small scale (MGS) competitive funding scheme together with capacity building support would have the potential to further this engagement with civil society and the public more widely. This could be through continuation of a dedicated BSD MGS or it could be linked to the proposed Development Innovations Fund proposed in the White Paper making the links between awareness, involvement and action. In either case DFID

should seek ways to develop longer term relationships with grant recipients to deepen their commitment and engagement.

8.11 The review has been impressed with the extent of support for DFID's efforts overall and with respect to implementation of the BSDS in particular. Whilst the public may not know the name or the policy, those who are committed, and the institutions they work within, appreciate what was done in 1997 and what has been achieved since. There is a desire to work together and to ensure continuity. The BSDS has played a part in inviting this response and DFID should continue in a more strategic and focused way to play its part in building support for development as part of wider public awareness, involvement and action in response to the challenge of tackling global poverty.

Recommendations

8.12 Each of the four independent reviews gave recommendations related to their specific area of focus. These recommendations are set out in Annex 7. Here we focus on the recommendations arising from this review. Where appropriate cross references to the detailed recommendations in annex 7 are given. Overall these complement and extend the recommendations of the earlier reviews and as presented form a coherent and comprehensive set of recommendations that reflect the findings of all five review reports.

Vision

The BSDS sets a clear vision and direction for DFID commitment to build support for development that is congruent with the 2009 White Paper. ***It is recommended that:***

25. the BSDS be reframed based on the White Paper priorities with a more equitable balance between support to education (children and young people) and support to interventions targeted at the adult population directly (media support and wider communications) and through civil society engagement (faith, trades union, business, BME and Diaspora groups).
26. the reframed BSDS include specific outcome statements that are focused, clear, measurable, and time bound; and form the basis of a new programme with an integrated set of objectives related to identified target groups.
27. the new BSDS be approved for an initial five year period (2010 – 2016) with an evaluation after three years.
28. a monitoring framework and a budget for regular programme and strategy level evaluation be built in from the outset.

Strategy

To ensure an effective strategic focus ***it is recommended that:***

29. the reframed BSDS build support for development specifically:
 - within the next generation by engagement through the formal education system;
 - within the general public through the media, its own communications and those of partner stakeholders notably UK NGOs; and
 - through partnerships to engage at a deeper level with civil society to promote understanding, involvement and action.

30. engagement with formal education be based on a strategic partnership between DFID and the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) in England together with the education departments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. These partnerships should include agreements on individual and joint programmes, including:
- support to policy engagement at the national level including curriculum and assessment, teacher training and inspection
 - support at the regional level for embedding the global dimension in schools, linked to local authority providers
 - school linking through DGSP, subject to the planned impact study, linked to DCSF's global gateway scheme
 - cross departmental working to address common agendas related to community cohesion, sustainable schools etc.
 - research to capture lessons learned to support the embedding of the global dimension throughout the education system
(see recommendations 1.2, 1.3, and 1.6 in annex 7 for details)
31. support for the media should be integrated within DFID's overall approach to communications. DFID's in-house communications and its support to the media should all focus on increasing public awareness and support for development through:
- the generation and dissemination of key development messages through in-house (e.g. media relations, website) and outsourced media, shared with partner stakeholders (e.g. PPA recipient CSOs)
 - enhanced funding to BMS to develop compelling content about development activity and the development process as opposed to the developing world using its present approaches together with a grants scheme to replace the present media allocation through the DAF
 - research to assess viewing trends and explore improved ways of engaging with the general public through the media through the IBT and other channels
(see recommendations 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.9-2.13 and 2.14-2.16 in annex 7 for details)
32. partnerships with civil society should focus on building relationships with key stakeholders from Trade Unions, Faith Communities, BME and Diaspora groups, community and local voluntary organisations and the private sector. The identification of partners should be based on a continuous stakeholder mapping process based on a deeper appreciation of the institutional dynamics of the various networks. Whilst the OSRT should lead on the stakeholder engagement other departments may lead on managing the relationships and financial support (e.g. CSD would continue and expand its responsibility for PPAs and other funding instruments including those recommended in the 2009 White Paper). Thus the provision of funding should be seen as supportive of but separate from the stakeholder engagement which will address the common BSD agenda in each case.
(see recommendations 3.1 and 3.2 in annex 7 for details)

Management

To improve the implementation of the strategy **it is recommended that:**

33. as part of the monitoring framework effective monitoring and reporting arrangements for all programmes are established with regular reporting against indicators related to outcome targets (see recommendations 1.4, 2.5, and 2.6 in annex 7)
34. a new regional delivery model be developed to implement recommendation 6 replacing the present EES arrangement with an integrated and simplified management arrangement (see recommendations 1.5 and 1.7 in annex 7)
35. a member of the OSRT should be the link for each civil society stakeholder or stakeholder network (faiths, trade unions, business/private sector, local government, etc) with a focus on:
 - mutual partnership – building trusting relationships which promote understanding of each other's standpoints vis-à-vis development and maximise learning
 - based on each relationship identify shared objectives and a common set of outcomes related to the BSD agenda
 - agreement on any financial or other support from DFID not already covered by existing funding agreements with a particular focus on support of network development and increased leverage
 - coordination across other DFID divisions and departments to ensure a harmonised approach and effective stakeholder management
(see recommendations 3.2, and 3.3 in annex 7 for details)
36. DFID should strengthen the level of expertise within the responsible staff team/s (across the Policy and Research Division and the Communications Division) with a particular focus on UK civil society, social inclusion, and institutional analysis.
37. a mechanism for the management of stakeholder relationships with civil society institutions beyond traditional NGOs/CSOs should be developed jointly by CSD and Communications Division to ensure that DFID's civil society expertise and strategic communications skills are combined.
38. CSD should review the links between the UK and international programmes of NGOs and CSOs and ensure that the synergies are reinforced through the support provided by all the various funding arrangements with specific targets related to building support for development in all cases.
39. DFID's Management Board should ensure Communications Division and Civil Society Department work together effectively to reframe the BSD Strategy and the related stakeholder relationships.

Portfolio review and adjustment

40. The present BSD portfolio should be reviewed in the light of this report to reduce the number of funding channels and programmes by cancelling or retendering contracts, merging programmes, outsourcing management or transferring responsibilities to other departments so that the OSRT staff can focus on strategic development and stakeholder engagement.

Specifically it is recommended that:

41. The Development Awareness Fund (DAF) should be phased out over the next 3 years and replaced with larger longer term grant support for key target groups who are central to the BSD strategy and who are currently supported under the DAF. (see recommendations 4.3-4.7 and 4.12-4.13 in annex 7)
42. The Mini Grant Scheme (MGS) should be expanded to provide BSD support to smaller locally based organisations including BME groups, faith based groups and voluntary organisations including capacity building support and the provision for longer term relationships between grantees and DFID. The new MGS should be fully contracted out and consideration should be given to linking it with the proposed Development Innovations Fund and therefore managed through CSD. (see recommendations 4.8-4.11 in annex 7)
43. Diaspora and Youth Volunteering should be integrated within the respective PPAs (VSO and Christian Aid) and managed by CSD with monitoring indicators and processes for stakeholder engagement agreed with OSRT.
44. All support to trade unions should be integrated through the TUC PPA and managed by CSD with OSRT developing the stakeholder relationship.

New interventions

To enhance the delivery of the BSDS outcomes **the following new interventions are recommended:**

45. Communications Division and Regional Programmes Division should pilot one or more Development Communications Hub based in a suitable country office. The role of the hub would be to:
 - source good quality content by commissioning local video producers, journalists or participants in the development process to produce material for DFID to publish
 - facilitate media access to development projects in the region
 - facilitate training and support for project workers, volunteers or other participants to produce 'user-generated content' such as films or blogs about their involvement in the development agenda
 - share expertise with other DFID business units outside the UK
(see recommendation 2.7 in annex 7 for details)
46. Engagement with the private sector should be developed with a specific objective and set of targets within the reframed strategy. This engagement should be coordinated more effectively across DFID, including a focus on building support for development through business linkages.
47. A new BSD objective and outcomes for work with faith communities should be developed by OSRT working collaboratively with the network through a mutually agreed institutional framework and linking with CSD to ensure synergies with its support to faith based organisations.
48. DFID should consider providing more support to programmes targeting the youth sector as a department wide initiative linking with DCLG and DCSF in order to extend awareness engendered at school into adulthood and open up opportunities for involvement and a deepening of global understanding.

© Verulam Associates Ltd. 2009.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AFFORD (2003) *Diplomats and diaspora dialogue for development: Proposal to create channels of communication between representatives of African governments in the UK and African communities in the UK*, London: AFFORD
- Amis, P.(2007) *Financing Decentralisation and Local Government to Meet the MDGs* Paper by Commonwealth Local Government Forum and ComHabitat submitted to Commonwealth Finance Ministers Meeting 2007.
- Mary Barber (2005) *Mapping Trade Unions British and International Trade Union Organisations* Edited from an original report by Labour and Society International, DFID: London
- Barder, O. (2005) *Reforming Development Assistance: Lessons from the UK Experience*, Working Paper 70, Center for Global Development: Washington DC
- Bonney R. and Hussain A. (2001) *Faith Communities and the Development Agenda*, Centre for the History of Religious and Political Pluralism, Leicester University
- Bourn, D. (2008) Development Education: Towards a re-conceptualisation, *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning* 1(1), 2008, Trentham Books
- Chikezie, C & Thaker, B (2005) *Framework for DFID-Diaspora Engagement, A report for DFID*, AFFORD and AFP
- Christian Aid/DFID (1999) *Target 2015*, Christian Aid/DFID: London
- Connections for Development (CfD) (2007) *Joint EU-Africa Strategy Consultation: Responses from a Collection of UK African Diaspora Stakeholders*, 29 May 2007, CfD: London
- CfD (2007) *The Partnerships Programme Arrangements (PPAs): The Way Ahead DFID Public Policy Consultation Diaspora and Stakeholder Perspectives*, CfD: London
- Darnton, A. (2007) *Driving Public Engagement in Global Poverty: report 1 of Global Poverty and the Public Desk Research*, for DFID and COI, October 2007
- Darnton, A. (2007) *The UK Public's Perspective on Global Poverty: Report 1 of Global Poverty and the Public Desk Research*, for DFID and COI, December 2007
- Department for Communities and Local Government (2008) *Face to Face and Side by Side A framework for partnership in our multi faith society*, London: Communities and Local Government Publications
- DFID (1997) *Eliminating World Poverty: A Challenge for the 21st Century*, White Paper on International Development, Cm 3789. London: The Stationery Office.
- DFID (1999) *Building Support for Development Strategy Paper: Raising Public Awareness and Understanding of International Development Issues*, DFID Strategy Paper. Crown
- DFID (2000) *Eliminating World Poverty: making globalisation work for the poor*, White Paper on International Development, Cm 5006. London: The Stationery Office
- DFID (2001) *Getting It Right Together: Black and Minority Ethnic Groups and DFID's Development Agenda Scoping Study*, mimeo DFID
- DFID (2005) *Public Attitudes towards Development*, Office for National Statistics, Omnibus Survey. Crown.
- DFID (2006) *Eliminating World Poverty: making governance work for the poor*, White Paper on International Development, Cm 6876. London: The Stationery Office
- DFID (2006) *Civil Society and Development How DFID works in partnership with civil society to deliver the Millennium Development Goals*, DFID: London
- DFID (2008) *Communication Matters: Our Communications Strategy*, DFID
- DFID (2009) *Eliminating World Poverty: Building Our Common Future*, Cm 7656. London: The Stationery Office

- James, R. (2009) *What is Distinctive About FBOs? How European FBOs define and operationalise their faith*, Praxis Paper 22, INTRAC: Oxford
- van Heerde, J. and Hudson, D. (forthcoming) 'The righteous considereth the cause of the poor'? Public attitudes towards poverty in development countries, *Political Studies*
- Hudson, D. and van Heerde, J. (2009) 'A mile wide and an inch deep': A review and critique of existing surveys on public opinion on development, unpublished draft previous versions presented at the 2008 BISA Annual Conference, Exeter, UK and 2009 ISA Annual Convention, New York, USA
- International Volunteer Cooperation Organisations (IVCO) (2007) *Global Citizenship and Effective Aid, IVCO 2007 Annual Conference Report*, 17-19 September 2007 Montréal, Canada, International FORUM on Development Service: Canada
- Lowe, B. (2008) Embedding Global Citizenship in Primary and Secondary Schools: developing a methodology for measuring attitudinal change *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning* 1(1), 2008, Trentham Books
- Mckenzie, D. (1997) *Review of DFID Funding of Development Education: A submission to the Information Department of DFID*, mimeo DFID
- Murray, P. (2007) *Profile of UK Diaspora Civil Society Groups Involved in International Development Interests, Attitudes and Involvement: A Mapping Exercise*, CfD: London
- Naru, F., Condy, A. and Humphries, N. (2007) *Department for International Development: Evaluation of Strategic Grant Agreement (SGA) with Connections for Development (CfD)*, DAI Europe Ltd.
- ODPM (2004) *Social Cohesion, Sixth Report of Session 2003-04*, HC 45-1 London, The Stationary Office
- Page, B., Mercer, C., and Evans, M. (2007) Expanding the evidence base: policy recommendations from recent research, presentation
- Sfez, P. And Sherlock, K. (2008) *General Evaluation of Actions to Raise Public Awareness of Development Issues in Europe /Development Education: Final Report*, Europe Aid: Brussels
- Spooner, D. (2000) *A View of Trade Unions as part of Civil Society*, European Workers' Education Association: Manchester
- Wroe, M. and Doney, M. (2004) *The Rough Guide to a Better World*, London: Rough Guides/DFID

Terms of Reference

Review of the Impact of DFID's Building Support for Development Strategy, Expenditure and Activities

Background

1999 Building Support for Development Strategy

1. In 1999 DFID produced a Building Support for Development Strategy Paper (BSDSP) setting out how DFID would seek to raise public awareness and understanding of international development issues within the UK. The higher aim of the strategy is to generate political will within the UK for the eradication of poverty worldwide:

"... I believe that it is important that an informed public opinion helps ensure that the UK plays its full role in generating the international political will necessary to meet the international poverty eradication targets." [Clare Short, BSDSP, 1999]
2. Targeted at literally building support for development across the UK, the strategy focuses on four key areas:
 1. **The education sector** aiming to: ensure that global issues become part of the school curriculum; provide good quality teaching materials; reinforce school-based work through the teacher training and inspection bodies; and encourage school linking with developing countries.
 2. **The media** aiming to strengthen television coverage of development issues and promote debate within the development community on public messages on development.
 3. **Business and Trade Unions** aiming to raise awareness of development issues within businesses and among trade unions and to work with them on raising public awareness.
 4. **Churches and Faith groups** aiming to build and support an alliance to eliminate poverty.
3. Since 1999, this strategy has basically guided DFID's efforts and spending to build development awareness within the UK and it remains DFID's key strategy document for this area of work. It is still available on DFID website at <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/buildingsupportdevelopment.pdf>
4. To implement the strategy, DFID has funded a number of initiatives, together with a range of smaller activities. Key initiatives for which funding has been on-going for some years include the following:
 - to raise development awareness generally, the Development Awareness Fund (DAF) and the Mini Grants programme;
 - to meet the strategy objectives in the education sector, support to the DEA, the Enabling Effective Support (EES) initiative and the DFID Global School Partnership (DGSP);
 - to meet the strategy objectives in relation to the media: the Commonwealth Broadcasting Association (CBA) DFID Broadcast Media Scheme.

More recent initiatives since 2006

5. The emphasis of the 1999 BSDSP is on promoting *understanding* of development issues and international interdependence. In contrast, the 2006 DFID White Paper, seeking to build on and respond to public support for poverty eradication expressed in the 2005 Make Poverty History Campaign, emphasises the need for *involvement* - as the best way of promoting understanding of development issues. So while DFID's commitment to development education is reconfirmed in the 2006 WP, it also commits DFID to taking a number of initiatives to enable UK citizens to get involved: expanding school linking, a scheme to help community groups establish links with developing countries, and increasing opportunities for young people and diaspora communities to volunteer in developing countries. These commitments were taken forward by the BSD Team

through the development of youth and diaspora volunteering programmes which started in early 2008, a community linking scheme which will start in early 2009, and the expansion of the DGSP.

6. More recently still DFID has become concerned that the role of the UK Government in supporting international development is insufficiently understood within the UK. This has led to efforts to give greater prominence to the role of the Government in development assistance within DFID's projects and programmes in the UK to build development awareness and to provide opportunities for involvement.

Objective of the Review

7. The review has two main aims:
 - to draw together and summarise in one report the available evidence on the impact of DFID's activities and funding to build support for development in the UK since 1999;
 - taking a strategic look across what DFID has funded and the evidence regarding the impact of this, to recommend where DFID should focus its funding in future in order to maximise its impact on UK public support for development.

Recipient

8. The recipient of the consultancy services is DFID.

Scope

9. The review should cover the following issues:
 - **the history of DFID's efforts in the building support for development area** covering: briefly why and how the BSDSP was developed; the background and rationale to the new focus and commitments within the 2006 White Paper, including how the new focus linked to other initiatives / concerns within DFID;
 - **the implementation of the BSDSP:** Where were efforts focussed and why? What human and financial resources were employed to implement the strategy, giving a breakdown of funding by year and in total over the review period and by major sector e.g. education, media, DAF etc. How much progress has been made against the objectives set out in the BSDSP?
 - **definitions:** in the interventions that DFID has funded how have 'development awareness' and 'support for development' tended to be defined? How should DFID define them in future (taking into account the success measures in DFID's internal communications strategy);
 - **the impact of the DFID's efforts to date.** What do we know about this? How have activities been monitored and evaluated? What positive changes have occurred as a result of DFID efforts (taking into account the changing climate of UK knowledge and perceptions of global issues)? Particular activities which have led to positive achievements should be highlighted as good practice examples. Shortfalls and any unforeseen achievements or unexpected outcomes should be noted;
 - **gender:** have DFID funded interventions to build support for development drawn attention to the importance of gender equality for development? How could and should this be done better in future?
 - **the changing context for DFID's building support for development work.** Have key changes taken place within British society since 1999 that should impact on how DFID seeks to build support for development activity in the future? What pointers / evidence do we have about this?
 - **knowledge and understanding of aid institutions and the UK Government's role:** to what extent have DFID funded initiatives attempted to generate understanding of aid policy and architecture and specifically of the UK Government's and DFID's own roles and how successful have any such efforts been? How realistic is it to attempt to generate such understanding? How could this best be achieved within what DFID is funding now and could fund in future?

- **other UK Government agendas and roles:** how does DFID's work to build development support fit with these e.g. the community cohesion agenda? Could coordination and synergies be improved and if so, how?
- **Recommendations for the future.** These should include recommendations on the following as well as recommendations in response to questions noted above e.g. on gender, definitions etc.:
 - What does the above tell DFID about where it should focus its efforts to build support for development in the future? The consultant should take a view on which interventions are likely to offer the best value for money i.e. which interventions are likely to have the most impact on support for development per £ spent and why?
 - Specific recommendations on how DFID might increase the impact of its current funding are expected as well as recommendations on whether there are new / different initiatives and approaches that DFID should take and / or different institutions that DFID should seek to work with.
 - Evaluation: how and where should this be built better into DFID funded interventions to build support for development?
 - Recommendations on the criteria DFID should apply in assessing ad hoc funding requests for work within the building support for development area.

Method

10. DFID is commissioning separate and independent reviews of its work over the last 10 years to build support for development within the education sector, in the media sector, through the DAF and mini grants competitive funding mechanisms, and through other activities, such as through faith groups and trades unions.
11. This review will draw together the findings of the four separate reviews and the consultant is expected to hold discussions with the consultants undertaking these other, separate reviews. In addition, the consultant should interview a number of key actors who have contributed to DFID's efforts to build support for development over the past decade, and review documents pertinent to the building support for development agenda as a whole.
12. Indicative lists of key stakeholders and documents are provided below. However, it is important that the consultant takes a proactive approach to identifying additional documents and stakeholders for review / interview.

Deliverables

13. These are as follows:
 - A draft report no more than 50 pages long covering the issues and questions listed under Scope above with an executive summary of no more than 10 pages. This should be submitted to DFID electronically. It must be clearly laid out and easy to read.
 - A final report taking into account comments from DFID. DFID will provide comments on the draft report within four weeks. A final report taking into account DFID's comments should then be submitted within one week of the consultants receiving the comments. Three hard copies of the final report as well as an electronic version should be provided to DFID.
 - A presentation of the draft report findings to DFID.

Inputs and Timing

14. Up to 30 days of work by consultant/s with the following skills and experience:
 - a good knowledge of methods for increasing awareness among the UK public of international development issues;
 - a proven ability to grapple with ideas, strategies and activities that aim to create change in 'external' institutions and amongst individuals;

- experience of evaluating large, complex and diverse strategies.

DFID Co-ordination

- The consultant/s will report to Jenny Yates, Head of the Outreach and Stakeholder Relations Team in DFID's Communications Division.
- DFID may also establish a Steering Group for the review to provide input, guidance and overall direction.

Stakeholders for Interview and Documents for Review

- The following are indicative lists only.

Stakeholders for Interview

Name	Position & Organisation	Contact Details
Mike Green	Head of DFID Information and Civil Society Dept. 2003-7	M-Green@dfid.gov.uk 07787 775139
Frances Burns	Former Head of BSD Team, ICSD	Frances.burns2@ntlworld.com
Scott Sinclair	Director of TIDE	scott@tidec.org Tide Centre, Millennium Point Curzon Street, Birmingham, B4 7XG 0121 202 3294 www.tidegloballearning.net
Doug Bourn	Director, DERC	d.bourn@ioe.ac.uk
Joy Hutcheon	Former Head of DFID Communications Division (2005-2007?), now Head of DFID Zambia	J-Hutcheon@dfid.gov.uk +260 211 423347
John Murray	Development Awareness Programme Manager 1998-2004 (now Head of Evaluation and Compliance Team in Evaluation Dept. DFIF)	J-Murray@dfid.gov.uk 01355 843851
Diana Dalton	Head of BSD Team 2005-2008 (now in Evaluation Dept.)	D-Dalton@dfid.gov.uk 01355 843997
Paul Mylrea	Head of Communications, DFID	p-mylrea@dfid.gov.uk
Natalie Acton	Head of Strategic Communications, DFID	n-acton@dfid.gov.uk
Richard Calvert	DFID	TBC

Key Documents for Review

DFID White Papers 1997, 2000 and 2006

DFID Building Support for Development Strategy Paper 1999

DFID Communications Strategy

DFID Gender Action Plan

Andrew Daunton report on public attitudes to development (to be supplied by DFID)

Building Public Awareness of Development: Communicators, Educators and Evaluation, Annette Scheunpflug and Ida McDonnell, OECD Development Centre Policy Brief No. 35

EuropeAid Evaluation of DE funding – Development education and awareness raising (DE-AR) : Evaluation Report on EC-Funded Actions [Error! Bookmark not defined.](#)

People Interviewed

Name	Position
DFID	
Mike Foster	Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for International Development
Nemat "Minouche" Shafik	Permanent Secretary
Roy Trivedy	Head Civil Society Dept (CSD); Team Leader 2009 White Paper
Peter Kirby	Acting Head CSD
Paul Mylrea	Director Communications, Communications Division
Natalie Acton	Deputy Director Strategic Communications, Communications Division
Jenny Yates	Head Outreach and Stakeholder Relations 2008 – date, Communications Division
Shirley Addies	Former Programme Manager BSD Team 2004-2008; Now Research Manager, Human Development Group, Central Research Dept.
Daniel Graymore	Former Head Business Alliance Team; Now Deputy Head Africa Regional Dept
Margaret Robinson	Policy Officer Civil Society Department, Policy and Research Division
Lone Sorenson	Team Leader Civil Society Department, Policy and Research Division
Steve Nally	Team Leader Civil Society Department, Policy and Research Division
Peter Gordon	Equity and Rights Team (lead on migration) Policy and Research Division
Previous Post Holders	
Richard Calvert	Director Information Department and subsequently Information and Civil Society Department 1998-2002
Mike Green	Head Information and Civil Society Department 2003-2007
Frances Burns	Head Building Support for Development (BSD) Team 1998 - 2005
Diana Dalton	Head BSD Team 2005-2008; Now Evaluation Dept
John Murray	Former BSD Team 1998 Now Evaluation Dept.
James Medhurst	Former BSD Team 2005-2008

Name	Position	Organisation
Belinda Aguilas	Policy and Campaigns Director	Action Aid
Abdul Aziz Rajab Ali	Deputy Manager	Islamic Relief (UK)
Gill Amas	Head of Communications and Campaigns	CARE International UK
Shoa Asfaha *	International Development Consultant	Adviser to DAF
James Beadle	International Programme Manager	UK Local Government Association
Doug Bourn	Director	Development Education research Centre, Institute of Education, London University
Richard Bradley *	Managing Director	Lion Television
Rohini Corfield *	Project Manager (and EES coordinator)	East Midlands Network for Global Perspectives in Schools (EMNGPS)
Peter Davis	GB Education and Youth International Coordinator	Oxfam
Gemma Freedman *	International Programmes Officer	TUC
Peter Grant	International Director	TearFund

Cathryn Gathercole *	Education Manager	Practical Action
Jennifer van Heerde *	Lecturer in Research Methods	University College London
David Hudson	Lecturer in International Relations and Political Economy	University College London
Muhammad Imran	Manager Development Education	Islamic Relief International
Celia Mather	Consultant	Advisory Boards DEA
Jude Mckenzie *	Director Advocacy and Communications	Christian Aid
Alache Ode *	Manager Diaspora Volunteering	VSO
Joseph O'Reilly	International Development Project	Association of Teachers and Lecturers
Charles Reed *	Secretary International Development	Church of England
Matthew Reed	Director Stakeholder Relations	Christian Aid
Nick Roseveare	Chief Executive	BOND
Hetan Shan *	Chief Executive	Development Education Association
Scott Sinclair	Director	TIDE
Glen Tarman *	Advocacy and Representation Manager	BOND
Gillian Temple	Head of Education	Oxfam
Mark Vyner	Manager Platform2	Christian Aid

* participants at RoundTable on June 9th 2009

BSDS History

- Pre 1997** “many organisations working in schools and across society to help teachers and others deliver development education. However there was no Government support for this work.” Frances Burns 9 Sept 2005 DFID Minute
 “External Communications/Publicity consisted primarily of publications and DFID representation at a small number of events (e.g. Education Shows, County Agricultural Shows). Information to the general public was left to NGOs and DECs. Messages were not consistent, sometimes inaccurate and frequently critical of Government’s International Development Policy” Burns 2005
 Development Awareness was carried out by civil society, local government and faith groups e.g. NGOs, DECs, CLGF, LGIB. There was little Govt support or direct involvement other than core funding under the Joint Funding Scheme (JFS) for NGOs who used part for education and campaign work. ODA had been providing support to international development NGOs
 1982 International Broadcast Trust set up by consortium of over 50 aid and development organisations.
 By the mid 1990s ODA was spending about £500k on development education/awareness activities through four key organisations. Worldaware (previously the Centre for World Development Education CWDE) which had been funded by DFID (then ODA) to support development education since its establishment in 1977. DEA established in 1995 from NADEC used part of its funding to provide minigrants support to Development Education Centres (DEC). IBT and SEAD. This was limited funding and maintained the nominal government support for development education. Worldaware was funding until 2004 under the DAF. Support to DEA, SEAD and IBT continues.
- 1997** DFID formed by new government; Clare Short Minister (May 1997 – May 2003); 1st White Paper
- 1998** Development Awareness Fund (DAF) budget doubles to £1.5m in .1998/99 “Bulk earmarked for to support work of organisations delivering development education, particularly in the formal education sector. However polling and other DFID instigated research such as the well respected study into UK televisions coverage of the developing world – *Viewing the World* – were also supported through the DAF as was expenditure on publications and events.” Burns 2005
 Mini-grants (previously managed by Worldaware) opened up and a separate mini-grant scheme established to target BME
 3 members of DAF Team with A2 team leader reporting to Head of Dept
 3 members of Publicity Team directly managed by HoD. “*Publicity teams share of £1.5m budget was relatively small*” Burns 2005
- 1999** Building Support for Development Strategy Paper
- 2000** 2nd White Paper. *Viewing the world* Report identifies funding gap in TV/radio programming for development
- 2001** Commonwealth Broadcasting Association – DFD Broadcast Media Scheme set up.
 Enabling Effective Support (EES) launched – a partnership initiative developed and funded by DFID and supported by education ministries and development education networks across the UK. Developed following DFIDs commitment to establish locally owned networks designed to achieve comprehensive, high quality support to teachers for the delivery of the global dimension across the curriculum.” Burns 2005

EES budget of £50,000 to 11 UK regions to consult widely and develop a strategy. Then £100,000 per year for 5 years. Regions had to raise matched funds from non DFID sources. Always envisaged it would take 10 years to deliver. By 2005 each region had carried out consultation and all except Northern Ireland had a strategy in place.

2002

2003

Clare Short resigns. Baroness Amos Minister May – October 2003; Hilary Benn Minister October 2003 – June 2007.

SGAs established £1.2m rising to £1.8m in 2005 *“to work with organisations whose primary purpose was not development but which had a contribution to make to development. Building understanding of development within each organisation was seen as the first step of each SGA.”* Burns 2005

British Medical Association (BMA), Trades Union Congress (TUC), Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accounting (CIPFA), Connections for Development (CfD), Groundwork UK, Co-operative Movement, Local Government International Bureau (LGIB), National Union of Journalists (NUJ)

DAF, Publicity, Public Enquiry Point, and External Communications Teams organised under BSFD managed by A1 head of Dept.

Mike Green Head of Information and Civil Society Dept. to 2007

2004

Work with Dept of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) to ensure that International and Development issues featured in the 2004 Communications Act and that the BBC Charter review took cognisance of DFID’s agenda.

Two funding schemes administered by Commonwealth Broadcasting Association (CBA) cost £280,000 per annum; one enables broadcast journalists to work in the industry in a developing country and the other offers seed funding to develop ideas to pitch to commissioning editors.

04/05 round of DAF attracted 90 applications, a total of £4.7m in 05/06 but only £1m available.

04/05 Budget for development education, SGAs and external communication was £9.2m rising to £11.1m in 05/06

04/05 breakdown:

£850,000 SGAs

£6.7m activities under 1999 BSFD Strategy Paper:

Education sector - £5.5m

Trade Unions - £133,000

Media - £280,000

Polling £38,000

Mini grants - £44,000

More general applications to DAF - £300,000

£400,000 proactive publicity including Developments Magazine and ICSD generated publications

£174,000 on non ICSD generated publications

£960,000 on campaigns (in effect Rough Guide to a Better World RGBW)

2005

“EES has in some instances been an agent of change. EES seen by DfES and the Scottish and Welsh Depts for Education as one of the means by which they deliver their International Strategies; which include a commitment to the inclusion of the global

dimension in every school. This is a marked difference to the situation in 2000 when Departments for Education saw the global dimension as marginal to the educational needs of children. Sustained lobbying by DFID together with the increasingly global nature of society have convinced Education Depts that a balanced education that fits children to live and work in the globalised world, must include the global dimension.” Burns 2005

“Funding for Development Education from non DFID sources almost disappeared. EU which fully endorses EES, now directs development education funding to projects which include building the capacity of New Member States (NMS) to generate support for development within their populations. This means that development education providers in the UK must work in partnership with a partner in an NMS to attract funding. With a few exceptions Development NGOs have not increased their development education budgets in recent years leading to a fall in real terms. Because of the fall in funds available the lottery had stopped funding development education completely.” Burns 2005

“Activities with Faith Groups patchy. Tailored booklets regional Visits to include faith groups and launch of new Position Paper.” Burns 2005

“Mori schoolchildren’s poll shows an increase of 6% (since 2000) of pupils who want to find out more about developing countries in school lessons and a fall of 6% (since 2004) of pupils who do not want to find out more.” Burns 2005

EES Evaluation

SGA team came under BSFD. Sept 19.6 fte in BSFD managed by an A1 team leader.

Diana Dalton Head of BSD Team to 2008, Joy Huchon Head of Communications Division

“Development came of age as an issue in 2005. The Department is coming of age as a Government Department. We have everything to gain by taking out our experience, our analysis, our knowledge, our expertise – your experience, your analysis, your knowledge, your expertise – because we have a great deal to contribute. But the foundation of this is an effective organisation.” Hilary Benn, talking to DFID staff, December 2005

2006 3rd White Paper

DAF management contracted out. Triple Line awarded contract initially Dec 06-April 07 and amended to run to Dec 2009.

2007 Government reshuffle Hilary Benn moves to DEFRA and Douglas Alexander appointed DFID Minister, June 2007.

2008 Communication Matters DFID communications Strategy produced. BSD moves to Palace Street as Outreach and Stakeholder Relations within new Communications Division, Jenny Yates head of OSR Team, Natalie Acton Head of Strategic Communications, Paul Mylrea Head of Communications Division.

2009 Review of BSDS

4th White Paper Summer 2009

Programme Partnership Agreements

Prior to 2000 major UK NGOs engaged in international development were supported by DFID through the Joint Funding Scheme (JSF). This provided unrestricted funding for established UK international development agencies by way of block grants. The funds were mainly used to support for their international activities but some chose to use the funds to support UK based development educational and awareness raising. The JSF was administered by the Civil Society Department managed alongside the Information Department which had responsibility for Building Support for Development. The JSF built on earlier individual agreements and covered the 10 major UK development agencies.

In 2000 the JSF was replaced by the Partnership Programme Arrangements (PPAs) to improve the funding arrangement and open it up widely. PPAs now provide unrestricted funding to 27 civil society organisations (CSOs) with which DFID has a significant working relationship, a common ethos and vision and a strong match in priority areas. These include both UK and non-UK organisations. Total PPA funding amounts to some £90m a year.

PPA funding is linked to a set of strategic level indicators – which the organisation is accountable for delivering over the 3-6 year time frame.

Primarily focused on supporting the international programmes of these major CSO' (e.g. Oxfam, Christian Aid, Action Aid) since they are block grants the funds can be applied across all areas of activity. The 3-6 strategic level indicators all include at least one related to building support for development either through development education or awareness raising and campaigning. Table 4.1 lists the current PPAs and identifies the strategic objective that is integrated with building support for development together with the results and outcome indicators suggested by the CSO.

More recently the Civil Society Department has been looking to expand the number of PPAs. The original Strategic Grant Agreement with the TUC has been replaced by a PPA and PPA are being discussed with additional CSOs.

Whilst the PPA's are managed by the Civil Society Department there are strong overlaps with the BSD Strategy. Many UK NGOs have traditionally been major providers of development education and the PPA strategic objectives related to the BSD are closely linked to other BSD activities. School based development education and the provision of resources through these CSO's needs to be linked to the other activities under the BSDS education objectives. Similarly wider civil society engagement by CSOs relates closely to other BSDS objectives. Some coordination takes place through the DEA, BOND and other networks but DFID could improve its stakeholder engagement and management across the different funding streams and divisional/departmental relationships.

There are similar though smaller scale issues related to the Civil Society Challenge Fund (CSCF) where DFID has indicated that future grantees should commit a proportion of the funding to BSD activities. DFID has multiple relationships with the private sector, local government, other government departments and civil society. In many cases these include an element at least of awareness raising and wider BSD activity. Closer working and a single focal point for stakeholder mapping and management related to BSD engagement across the whole of DFID would be appropriate as discussed in the main report.

Table 4.1: Building Support for Development Objectives of PPA recipient CSOs

No	CSO Name	CSO descriptors	Total Amount	BSD integration objective: Link to Dev Education & Dev Awareness	BSD Results/outcome indicators
1	Action Aid	Rights, Education, Voice and accountability	13.82m	SO3 (of 5): Civil society organises and mobilises in solidarity with poor and excluded people for their rights	<p>Increase from X to Y of young people who take action with action aid or action aid partners as a result of UK development education programmes</p> <p>Increase from X to Y in the number of UK supporters joining target poverty campaigns, take actions and attend forums</p> <p>Number of people mobilised by Action Aid to take part in the GCE Action Week (as a contribution to making the case for development)</p>
2	Action on Disability in Development (ADD)	Rights, disability, equity	3.03m	SO4 (of 4): increased development awareness in the UK disability sector and ADD supporters on the links between disability, poverty and the achievement of MDGS	Continued collaboration between ADD and UKDPC to influence UK public, donors and development NGOs based in UK to adopt an inclusive approach to development in the south
3	Aga Khan Foundation (AKF)	Livelihoods, water governance	2.39m	No Evidence	No Evidence
4	International HIV/AIDS Alliance	HIV/AIDs networks	13.34m	SO4 (of 4): Strengthen the Alliance as a partnership of strong national linking organisations	Greater awareness of HIV/AIDs and development issues in the UK achieved through an increase in number of UK public events, print, online, radio and broadcast coverage aimed at UK audiences from 60 pieces in 2008, 90 in 2009 and 120 in 2010
5	CAFOD	Faith Social justice	13.18m	SO5 (of 5):CAFOD will increase development awareness in England and Wales working through the catholic schools network with a focus on global social justice and the MDGs	20% of six formers attending Live it conference achieve live it award, 10% of those who have achieved live leader award remain active in their diocese for a further two years, by 2011 number of schools attending INSET to support global social justice in their school life and curriculum will increase to at least 280 in CAFOD's four focus dioceses, changes in childrens' knowledge and activities over three year period – surveyed in collaboration with catholic education service
6	CARE International	Humanitarian Aid, Conflict, HIV, Hunger	11.75m	SO4 (of 4): to contribute to broader support for and understanding of international	Significant policy progress achieved within care's global advocacy on climate change.

				development and humanitarian issues through strengthened policy influencing and public awareness raising in priority areas: conflict, governance and private sector engagement, climate change, HIV & Aids, Hunger and chronic vulnerability and humanitarian response	X% to Y% increase in public awareness of development actors and their role in priority areas, public understanding of development issues, number of supporters who are actively engaged in poverty-fighting campaign activities - evidenced by impact reports, public opinion and attitudinal surveys, NFP synergy awareness monitors
7	Christian Aid	Faith Social justice	17.42m	SO 6 (of 6): thousands of new supporters participating in the movement for global justice.	Number of active Christian aid supporters (16-25) increased FROM 10000 to 50000 by 2011. Six formers from at least 60 schools become peer educators as a result of attendance at the global student forum, number of registered Christian aid volunteers teachers doubled from 100 to 200 between 2008 -11. XX number of multi-faith campaigning events initiated by Christian aid annually
8	Ethical Trading Initiative	Ethical Consumerism CSR	1.6m	SO5(of 5): ETI enables the private sector to participate effectively with the trade union movement and NGOs in support of DFID objectives.	Annual feedback from 50% of corporate members shows that ETI has enhanced their ability to engage with trade unions and NGOs in order to improve conditions for workers
9	HelpAge International (HAI)	Older People Social Protection Basic Services Health HIV/AIDS	5.39m	No evidence	No evidence
10	International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)	Research Institute Sustainable development	3.18m	SO4 (of 4) A change in the attitudes and actions of policy makers and opinion leaders in the UK and OECD countries reflecting a real understanding of how the impact of our current policies, current business models and consumption choices in the north affect the livelihoods of the worlds poorest	Building countervailing pressure from opinion formers and interested public through media campaigns in print, radio, and TV media in UL and other OECD countries. Increase in web campaigns and improved accessibility to information for targeted groups, Work with PPA partners in at least four other areas
11	International Planned	SRHR Gender	42.99m	No direct evidence – new framework makes it difficult to	Production on one (global) landmark publication on sexual and reproductive health and rights each year

	Parenthood Federation (IPPF)			discern any UK specific development education or awareness objective – global SRHR advocacy at different levels	
12	International Service	Volunteering	4.68m	SO4/5 (of 5): 4) strengthen support for international development in educational establishments in the UK. 5) strengthen support for international development in the UK:	70 new schools engaging with global art project, development of global dimension in the school curriculum with QCA resulting in 50 new schools using teaching resources and materials. 10 new partner organisations benefit from support from UK tertiary education and private sector: students and professionals from tertiary education and private sector contributes to international development via corporate social responsibility. 30 new venues within UK library and gallery network engage with art project – approx 240,000 members of public are exposed to development via art project, 20 articles and presentations to share and document lessons learnt with DFID policy, civil society and PPA partners, contributing to networks and policy making forums such as Palestine Platform, BOND and inter-agency campaigns. Organisation of IS human rights awards from 150-200 human rights contacts in UK.
13	Islamic Relief	Faith communities	2.39m	SO2(of 3), increased awareness and commitment to international development. The focus will be on young people and the muslim-based communities in the UK.	Develop and train a cadre of international speakers with at least 30 core speakers by 2011. Establish an active working relationship with at least 30 educational institutions nationally, and with at least 10 Muslim based organisations by 2011. Stage at least one major development education awareness event per year, in partnership with other agencies, eg One world week. Incorporate and promote MDGs and the wider Dev Ed message across all aspects of IRUK's fundraising and campaigning work. Increase the number of written development articles in the Muslim media from X to Y by March 2011
14	One World Action	INGO network Voice and accountability	3.18m	SO4 (of 4). Documented and communicated evidence on how marginalised people can	No evidence of assessment related to enhanced development education or awareness

				effectively hold their governments to account in all key regions include UK and Europe	
15	Overseas Development Institute (ODI)	Policy Research Institute Risk analysis	2.4m est	No evidence	No evidence
16	Oxfam	Gender Climate Change Water governance	27.83m	SO4 (of 4), more young people in England, Scotland, and Wales, aged 10-18 are able and willing to take action for pro-poor change	Increase from X to Y in the number of young people taking pro-poor action via Oxfam and its partners. X% of young people engaging in Oxfam and its partners state they have a responsibility to help overcome poverty and their individual action can make a difference. Specific cases are documented where young people involved with Oxfam and its partners demonstrate increased skills for effective pro-poor change.
17	Panos Institute	Media Rights	5.71m	SO1 (of 3), to produce media coverage that stimulates debate on development issues and includes voices of poor and marginalised	Case studies illustrate at least 10 debates stimulated among media, civil society and policy makers, 50% of media outputs include voices and perspectives of poor and marginalised people, including women
18	Plan International UK	Children Community Education	7.13m	SO3(of 3), increased public awareness and action among young citizens in the UK, their families and communities and other actors in support of child-centred development	Increased in documented evidence of how young citizens, their groups, organisations and networks can build support for development evidenced by published case studies and good practice notes
19	Practical Action	Sustainable Development	3.18m	SO 4(of 4), civil society and political leaders in the north and the south will be more aware of, and support, the appropriate use of technology in achieving poverty reduction and sustainable development targets in development countries	At least 3,000 secondary school teachers and 1M pupils in the UK have increased awareness of the importance of sustainability in technology design and the related impacts of science and technology on global poverty
20	Progressio	Faith	10.31m	SO 4 (of 4), That key sectors of the British public (including	By 2011 there will be a 100% increase in visits to Progression main website from baseline of 21,000 in 2005, a 100% increase

				existing, potential progression supporters, social justice activists, catholic constituencies are more aware of sustainable development and are engaged more fully in the issues through advocacy and are informing and mobilising others for change	in media coverage of progression issues from baseline of 12 articles per year in 2005. 50% increase in outreach to social justice and church based audiences, 33% increase in supporter bases, 20% increase in newsletter circulations, 100% increase in size of progression audiences 2000 campaigners sign up to data base All demonstrating greater success in raising awareness of development issues of concern to progression
21	Save the Children UK	Child rights, Child mortality, health, education in conflict affected countries, hunger, abuse and exploitation Humanitarian aid	23.27m	SO2 (of 4), To build a critical body of support in the UK for development and the interests of children in developing countries	Communications with UK families on child survival seen by more than 20M people and generated financial and non-financial support from 200,000 each year. 380,000 will have participated in events as part of child survival campaign: baseline of 0 for all. Increase from 2,500 to 10,000 children and young people per year will have taken action about international issues and the MDGs in response to SCUK communications and 12000 primary school will have used information packs for school work on child survival, education in conflict countries and emergency.
22	Skillshare International	Volunteering, HIV/AIDs, Gender, Peace-building, governance	74.84m	SO2 (of 3), skillshare international's constituency of support for international development and social change increased, in order to promote an enhanced common awareness of development issues among diverse audiences.	An X to Y% increase in: international volunteers activity as catalysts for change in public attitudes towards, and perceptions of international development, number of people registered on supporter database, involved in public engagement activities, participating in skillshare public engagement events visiting website.
23	Transparency International	Corruption	3.18m	No specific but SO1 (of 3) TI's global and national research and advocacy drives the agenda	Increase in website visits and citing of TI policy and working papers
24	Voluntary Services Overseas (VSO)	Volunteering Education HIV/AIDs	89.01m	SO4 (of 4), increased support from the UK public for development agenda – to	15, 000 learners learn more about development awareness of take action to raise development awareness, 20,000 members of public and supporters learn more about development

		Disability CSO capacity building Diaspora Refugee communities		clearly demonstrate increased development awareness that contributes towards greater active citizenship in the following groups – educators and key staff from all levels of the UK education sector;; people in the UK from diaspora and refugee communities, adult and youth community learning groups, public sector and other voluntary organisations	awareness and take action. Increase in number of returned volunteers' engaged in active global citizenship (taking action). Evidenced by market research and volunteer surveys using institute of volunteer research.
25	WaterAid	Right to Safe Water	3.99m	SO4(of4) Building awareness of and support for development with UK public	Maintain number of unique website hits, increase mail distribution list for WaterAid magazine, distribution to schools of youth activity and awareness pack, number of water bills including WaterAid information, attending WaterAid talks, new relations with corporate organisations, regular givers, supporters of end water poverty campaign
26	World Vision	Faith Child focused development social inclusion	7.7m	SO4(of 4), Young people in the UK and the rest of the world are able to participate and influence others in global poverty reduction, both with and on behalf of children in the world's poorest communities	1000 Young people in formal education and 150 Faith and non-faith-based groups in the UK including working with children prone to social exclusion, are leading or participating in at least one new initiative annually that raises development awareness and influences decision-makers and the wider community around global social justice issues Increase in number of young people mobilising to hold governments to account as part of child-focused global justice campaigns in at least 10 counties in both north and south.
27	WWF UK	Environmental Governance	12.74m	SO4(of 4) Integrated systems for monitoring and evaluation communications and lesson learning developed and implemented across the PPA portfolio and shared with DFID and other partners	At least three campaigns/communication /education initiatives undertaken to inform UK and/or European audiences (public, media, private sector, government) on the links between consumption, environment and poverty – WWF one planet future campaign relates to development agenda

UK Government Policy in Relation to the Building Support for Development Programme (1997-2009)

Date	Policy Document	Policy Focus	Policy Relevance & Influence
1997	DFID White Paper	<p>Eliminating World Poverty: A challenge for the 21st Century</p> <p>Foundational policy paper: recognised need to increase public understanding of mutual dependence & for international development.</p> <p>Commitment to reverse decline in UK development assistance, to achieve 0.7% UN target.</p> <p>Desire to raise awareness through information provision to children & partnership with civil society. Strong focus on formal education system.</p>	<p>DFID publishes BSD strategy paper in April 1999.</p> <p>Civil society groups & educationalists in development awareness working group (DAWG) participate in drafting process.</p> <p>Strategy recognises importance of existing development education work undertaken by network of development education centres & others in the voluntary sector. Seeks to change public perceptions: to go beyond compassion & charity & to break out of the groups traditionally regarded as sympathetic to development & reach new audiences right across society.</p> <p>Strategy contains four objectives, with specific objectives against each of four target groups: formal education, the media, business & trade unions, & churches & faiths. Aims to raise awareness, change behaviour & attitudes.</p> <p>No specific strategic objectives for BME/Diaspora.</p>
2000	DFID White Paper	<p>Making Globalisation Work for The Poor:</p> <p>Reaffirms commitment to UN targets, to development education, particularly to awareness-raising on globalisation & sustainability through global dimension in schools. New priority to strengthen the voices of civil society in developing countries & state accountability.</p>	<p>Majority of DAF/MG funding proposals seek to 'embed the global dimension' in the school curriculum.</p>
2001	ICSD Report	<p>Getting It Right Together: Black & Minority Groups & DFID's Development Agenda</p> <p>DFID seeks to be more inclusive & extend reach but recognises difficulty in developing contact with individual BME groups & networks.</p>	<p>DFID facilitates dialogue with BME actors with a view to creating umbrella organisation as sector focal point.</p>
2002	International Development Act	<p>New act empowers DFID to promote domestic awareness of global poverty & methods for reducing it.</p>	<p>Paves the way for the introduction of strategic grant agreements (SGAs) with organisations whose primary purpose was not development but who have a contribution to make to development.</p>

Date	Policy Document	Policy Focus	Policy Relevance & Influence
2002	Office for Standards in Education	<p>Citizenship: Survey Report.</p> <p>4 years after influential Crick Report (DEE, 1998: education for citizenship & teaching democracy in schools), citizenship education becomes statutory part of national curriculum in secondary schools & non-statutory in primary schools.</p>	<p>EES, DAF & MG fund mechanism used to develop capacities & resources to embed global dimensions in citizenship curriculum. Debate about whether global dimensions should only be taught through citizenship or through whole school.</p>
2003	Home Office Strategy	<p>Prevent Strategy</p> <p>First post 9/11 strategy to prevent international terrorist groups from destabilising UK society & economy (recently updated).</p>	<p>No explicit evidence of operational links between home office & DFID around 2003 strategy.</p>
2004	Gerschon Review	<p>Independent Review of Public Sector Efficiency</p> <p>Sets headcount targets for the civil service. DFID is required to make efficiency savings reflecting its Public Service Agreements.</p>	<p>BSD faces reduction in its administration budget for the first time. Impacts on engagement with SGA recipients limiting capacity for dialogue with these 'non development' partners as well as other policy level interaction around the BSD agenda.</p>
2004	House of Common ODPM Report: Social Cohesion	<p>Sixth Report of Session 2003-04</p> <p>Following disturbances in the summer of 2001 research is undertaken by an independent review team on community cohesion. Parliamentary committee report published in May 2004 notes that arrival of asylum seekers is placing pressure on local communities.</p> <p>Community & voluntary organisations have a role to play working across different cultural groups. Local Authorities encouraged to make such engagement a condition of grant support.</p>	<p>Recognition within ICPD that BME partnerships can contribute to social cohesion & prevent agendas.</p>
2005	DFID CSD Approach Paper	<p>Civil Society & Development:</p> <p>Hilary Benn endorses approach to working in partnership with civil society to deliver the millennium development goals & hold international organisations to account.</p>	<p>Proposals for Mini Grant fund requests shift towards MDG awareness raising work. Reinforced by focus on MDGs in some DEC guidelines for MG applicants.</p> <p>Evidence of shift in understanding of civil society away from service provider to means of holding state accountable. Civil society in UK as means to reduce poverty in developing world. Development NGOs focus on MDGs.</p>

Date	Policy Document	Policy Focus	Policy Relevance & Influence
2005	British Government tenure as EU presidency.	Make Poverty History Campaign Government takes leadership role around MPH, Commission for Africa at Gleneagles & Africa Progress panel on MDGs.	MPH leads to greater trust between PPA & SGA recipients, for instance TUC & BOND. Emerging DVI initiatives framed around Africa partnerships. BME network through CfD has strong bias towards UK based organisations with Africa linkages. Trade Union SGA focused on developing linking programmes in Africa. Larger number of DAF/MG proposals focus on building links with African communities
2006	Change in UK Communications Technology	Introduction of 3G technology in UK 3G roll-out enables internet access via mobiles, sending images through mobiles. Increased penetration of web technology across UK society.	PPA, SGA, DAF & MG grant applications all begin to have online & integrated media components reflecting changing approaches to advocacy & communications in civil society. Use of web-based information & learning resources for development education networks renders centre-based business model less relevant. Large NGO move into online campaigning & fund-raising using viral campaigns & message driven strategies that reflect shift away from development education & awareness-raising approaches.
2006	Government creates Office of Third Sector	New cabinet level office aims to enable the third sector to campaign for change, deliver public services, promote social enterprise & strengthen communities.	Introduces standardisation & accountability in sector. Also emphasises distinction between UK civil society engaged on UK poverty & those engaged on international development..
2006	DFID White Paper	Making Governance Work for the Poor: Commitment to double investment in development education & give every UK child the chance to learn about the issues that shape the world. Also commitment to promote more active citizenship, particularly in terms of links between civil society in the UK & those in developing countries with a view to achieving MDGs.	ICPD focuses on Diaspora linking programme Management of DAF grant mechanism contracted out.
2007	Civil service drive to improve effectiveness,	Further requirement for efficiency savings building on the Gerschon Report (see above 2004).	Plan to renegotiate PPAs with a view to improving accountability, impact & BSD integration at objective level. BSD documentation

Date	Policy Document	Policy Focus	Policy Relevance & Influence
	efficiency & accountability	CSD experience budget cuts & asked to seek improvements in efficiency.	posted on DFID web site.
2007	DFID Practice Paper	<p>Gender Equality Action Plan 2007-9</p> <p>DFID states that 'gender equality' is a goal in its own right, has a vital role to play in the achievement of MDGs & will require a widespread change in attitudes & perceptions.</p> <p>Under the Gender Equality Duty of the 2006 Equality Act, public bodies in the UK are required to build gender equality into their work & set out their plans in a Gender Duty Scheme.</p> <p>DFID funding for civil society should encourage a greater focus on gender equality & women's empowerment. Plan to review the guidelines for the governance & transparency fund, civil society PPA & civil society challenge funds.</p>	<p>DFID publish Gender Duty Scheme by April 2007, no visible link made to BSD programme as GEAP focused on programmes in developing countries.</p> <p>BSD without specific objective to promote gender in development, only through MDGs (goal 3). Few DAF/MG recipients focused on gender.</p> <p>Little debate between DFID & civil society partners on the importance of gender equality in development.</p> <p>Little evidence of strategic focus on gender in PPA partnerships although recent campaigns on violence against women by VSO, Action Aid & Oxfam.</p>
2008	DFID Annual Report	<p>Building Support to Deliver Progress on Poverty Reduction</p> <p>Emphasis on achieving MDGs as collective endeavour: among governments, private sector, NGOs & faith groups.</p> <p>Civil society recognised for its diverse role, communicating with British public about global poverty & what is being done by government & civil society & organising campaigns.</p>	<p>Global schools partnership programme, new youth volunteering programme & Diaspora volunteering programme all mentioned as important initiatives for active citizenship & collective MDG endeavours.</p> <p>Evidence that DFID accords greater value to public engagement, particularly at events, conferences & festivals. Recognition that DAF/MG funded UK projects provide an important entry point for Ministers to undertake regional visits & talk to communities about global issues & build confidence in DFID.</p>
2008	DFID Internal communications strategy	<p>Communication matters: our communication strategy</p> <p>The strategy aims to do a better job of explaining to people what UK aid is spent on & why it matters. It aims demonstrate that UK aid delivers real impact, is good value & of benefit to UK people.</p> <p>Effective communications is a means to improve policy, influence partners & to demonstrate success</p>	<p>BSD strategy needs to draw lessons from the mainstream development agencies, health sector, advertising industry & the central office of information (COI).</p> <p>Psychographics & attitudinal studies need to improve targeting & message creation, leading to more effective public engagement, public influencing & public behavioural change around</p>

Date	Policy Document	Policy Focus	Policy Relevance & Influence
		<p>to the UK public. Most importantly, 'all good communications starts with an understanding of our audience'.</p>	<p>international development issues. BSD strategy needs to recognise the inter-dependence between domestic & international aid policy.</p>
2009	Home Office Strategy Paper	<p>New UK Counter Terrorism Strategy The strategy is divided into 4 strands: Prevent, Pursue, Protect & Prepare, is to be delivered working with a wide range of stakeholders including a range of government departments & voluntary agencies.</p>	<p>Likely that development ministers need to be seen to be doing something to engage with the Prevent Agenda & to ensure DFID helps tackle the root causes of radicalisation of individuals. DFID may request VSO & other DVI programme managers to make operational links with other government departments (Department of Communities) to become more joined up. Faith groups & Diaspora may be seen as entry point to tackle disadvantage & to engage in the battle of ideas. Faith groups encouraged to access DAF/MG funds for development awareness raising initiatives.</p>
2009	DFID White Paper	<p>Eliminating World Poverty: Assuring our common future Fighting global poverty & achieving the MDGs to be at the heart of continued mission but recognised need to recalibrate elements of the agenda to deal with the changed circumstances which now prevail. Because of globalisation, the world is more interdependent, with a shared environmental & natural resource dependency & now with increasing realisation, a shared future.</p>	<p>Any new or revised BSD strategy is likely to be strongly influenced by the new white paper. Likely that 2009 policy influence will continue to be underpinned by interdependence but with greater focus on addressing prevailing issues of global financial crisis, declining global trade, effect of climate change, conflict & weak government.</p>

Financial Analysis

Table 6.1: Building Support for Development Expenditures and Budgets (in £ millions)

Head	1999/00	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	20010/11
Development Education								1.79	2.47	2.68	9.73	10.04
Volunteering and Linking								1.53	2.50	4.80	6.13	7.13
Media									0.35	0.58	0.72	0.72
DAF + admin	1.80	2.00	2.20	2.40	2.60	2.80	3.00	3.12	3.40	4.82	6.50	6.50
Mini Grants + admin							0.37	0.42	0.44	0.55	0.69	0.70
SGA			0.12	0.01	0.47	0.85	1.24	0.73	0.50	0.06		
Other									0.38	0.28	0.26	0.03
Total Expenditure*	3.73	5.58	5.53	5.44	3.15	7.31	9.12	7.59	10.04	13.77		
Budget	3.50	5.75	7.25	6.35	5.00	7.50	10.00	11.80	14.40	19.00	24.00	29.00

Notes:

1. Figures in **red bold** are estimated by projecting back for the DAF
2. Figures in **red** are exact amounts from DFID expenditure data including management fees
3. * Totals up until 2003/04 are taken from the Departmental Reports
4. 2009/10 and 210/11 are approved budget figures
5. Until 2006 SGA and DAF were the only budget lines so a breakdown of expenditure is difficult to find
6. In 2006/07 and 2007/08 limited data on breakdown of the whole budget was available

Table 6.2: Building Support for Development and Related Expenditures (in £Thousands)

Division/Department Structure	Civil Society Dept and Information Dept separately					Information and Civil Society Dept.		Knowledge and Comms	Knowledge Sharing and Comms	Communications			
	1996/97	1997/98	1998/99	199/2000	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03			2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07
Joint Funding Scheme (moved to PPA from 2000)	40,122	35,858	35,506	shown as PPA	31,335	7,254	4,671	197					
PPA (began in 1999 and from 00/01 includes volunteers)				34,959	28,245	53,650	57,227	56,567	66,054	82,149	89,141	90,491	95 000
Volunteers	26,090	23,933	25,883	26,706									
Other Non Govt Organisations Grants	2,219	2,129	2,084	2,876	535								
Civil Society Challenge Fund (began in 1999)	0	0	0	0	3399	5744	9683	7000	11959	7113	14594	14,280	15 000
Global Transparency Fund												5,000	20 000
Development Awareness	1,303	1,105	1,770	3,763	5,580	5,411	5,431	2,681	6,626	7,113	10 025	14400	19 000
Strategic Grants						116	14	470	847	1244	732		
Information and Communications for Development						1872	3206	3693	7027	5037	5677	3,524	
Media and Marketing									1552	1101	1348	2105	7 600
Other Information Programmes							165	320					
Total	69,734	63,025	65,243	68,304	69,094	74047	80,857	75,401	94,065	103,757	121,517	129,800	156 600

Source: Based on departmental Reports 2000 – 2008. Changes in Department and Division Structure moved some activities this table links those within the civil society and information groupings during the period. i.e. Information and Civil Society were separate departments with the budget heads shown from 1996/97 to 2001/02; then they merged for two years; 2003/04 saw an enlarged Knowledge and Communications Department with evaluation and research included (budgets not shown here) with some adjustments the following year. From 2005/06 the structure returned to the earlier civil society and information base enlarged with the increased wider communications activities. In 2008 civil society department moved to the Policy and Research Division and the whole of Communications was consolidated in London (thus the DAF, Media and Education aspects of BSD went to Communications with PPAs, the residual SGA links and some other civil society relationships going with CSD to PRD).

Recommendations from Four Independent Reviews

1. The **Formal Education Review** gives recommendations at three levels:

Vision/strategy

- 1.1 Develop clear, outcome focused vision for BSD education support. The original 1999 BSDP objectives were all output rather than outcome focused, which has made evaluation of progress difficult. Equally, the education system in the UK is structured around outcome statements primarily through the *Every Child Matters*¹ '5 outcomes' (be healthy, stay safe, enjoy and achieve, make a positive contribution, achieve economic well-being). As such, if DFID wants to secure support from the education sector, it should consider renewing its vision to address learner outcomes. From a clear vision can then flow the structures to support its implementation.
- 1.2 Build strategic relationships with key education departments and agencies. Interviews suggest that DFID could be more visible at the policy level in order to promote the Global Learning agenda. Stakeholders welcomed DFID engagement but felt it should be structured around a clear set of goals and a willingness to establish joint working practices.
- 1.3 Establish areas of mutually re-enforcing work to support maximisation of resources and coherent messages to schools. There are a number of existing and complementary statutory and non-statutory agenda (e.g. community cohesion, Sustainable Schools) that DFID could help support either with its network of delivery organisations or through relationship building with the DCSF and others. Indeed, such an approach has been most effective in Wales, where the EES co-ordinator has worked with the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) both to advance the Global Learning agenda (which is now statutory) and deliver support to local areas as well.

Management

- 1.4 Improve monitoring and reporting arrangements for all programmes in order to justify expenditure. In particular, there should be a shared reporting template that allows DFID to review progress against outcome targets, data about reach and evaluation of risks. Templates should also be timely with the high investment projects like DGSP and Platform 2, reporting perhaps quarterly, compared with the EES reporting half-yearly and DEA annually. There should also be a process in place to withhold funds or cancel contracts if performance is unacceptable. Such monitoring and reporting is critical to benefits realisation; if this is not therefore possible going forward as a result of OSR resource constraints (which it should be noted are unlikely to change in the near future), DFID should consider either cancelling and retendering contracts and employing a managing agent to establish clear lines of accountability or scaling back grants to a manageable level.
- 1.5 Management processes around the EES in particular need to be addressed. Current arrangements are unsatisfactory and impose a particularly heavy burden on DFID. The 12 contracts (which are advanced quarterly and involve 48 transactions per annum) are out of sync in terms of contract start and end dates. This makes comparison of progress difficult. DFID also does not have the capacity to properly monitor impact. Indeed, even though there is an annual reporting cycle, information about reach and effectiveness is limited. As noted above, DFID should consider cancelling and retendering contracts and employing a managing agent to resolve the situation. Indeed a 'Consortium model' could be considered which would involve cancelling all contracts and inviting regional (or wider) consortia to bid based on desired outcomes. DAF funding could also be placed in the fund so that consortia would be responsible for innovation as well as strategic support.
- 1.6 Further end-user evaluation focused both at a programme level and more broadly on the links between Global Learning and improved outcomes for children and young

people. Programmes such as the DGSP and Platform 2 should have on-going independent evaluation. Further, DFID funding to the DERC should be leveraged to commission wider, longer term research into the impact of pupil engagement in Global Learning.

Delivery

- 1.7 Consider the advantages and disadvantages of a regional delivery model as opposed to more local or national investment. It may be that a renewed vision for BSD education work will mean that more resources could be invested at a national level through joint working with other Departments or at a pupil or school level through programmes such as the DGSP. DFID should consider other models of delivery that have been used in different education initiatives. Whilst the Sustainable Schools model appears to use regional structures through government offices with strong central support, the recent 'Confucius Classroom' project which aims to spread an understanding of China, employs teachers directly in regions to spread good practice.
- 1.8 However, it is not clear how these arrangements would work in the short-term and there may be value in maintaining current regional and local networks, some of which deliver good support to LAs and schools.
- 1.9 Consider developing more programmes in the youth sector (as capacity allows). Indeed, this is an area where DFID activity has been growing in recent years, through the Platform 2 programme and where other government departments such as the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Department for Children, Schools and Families have invested resources. However, as above, DFID should make efforts to join-up any future programmes in the youth sector with other departments and agencies.

2. The **Media Review** gives **project** and **overarching** recommendations:

Overarching Recommendations cover three broad areas

Strategic It is recommended that DFID should have better control over the realisation of the BSD media strategy.

- 2.1 DFID should have a more co-ordinated strategy for harmonising the external BSD media activity with in-house activities such as DFID media relations and the DFID website. (Recent team restructuring is a positive move in this direction.)
- 2.2 Key development messages should be generated and disseminated through both DFID in-house and outsourced BSD media operations.
- 2.3 DFID should determine what media policy and regulatory outcomes would support the achievement of its BSD objectives and put in place an action plan that includes
 - funding for outsourced research and lobbying initiatives
 - collaboration with INGOs and others with an interest in the same outcomes
 - a planned programme of related in-house activity

There are various options to achieve these ends:

- i. DFID could recruit an in-house expert with the appropriate media professional background to help Communications staff develop a more pro-active and co-ordinated strategy on all DFID-funded media activity promoting development awareness.
- ii. DFID could set up a specialist Development Awareness Media Strategy Panel comprised of two or three designated DFID Communications staff and two or three outside media experts. The panel could meet perhaps twice a year to review the media strategy, commission and consider evaluations and research findings.
- iii. DFID could outsource some of the tasks involved to established media partners such as CBA and IBT.

These options are not exclusive.

Operational

Partnership

It is recommended that in future DFID should be more pro-active in managing its relationships with the media projects it supports and in determining what direction it wants its funded projects to take.

- 2.4 A named person in DFID should be assigned responsibility for steering the organisation's outsourced media projects. Every year there should be at least one strategy meeting with each project, where DFID and the project director should discuss and agree the direction the project will take in the medium and long term.

Measuring impact

It is recommended that in future DFID should do more to evaluate the outcomes and effectiveness of its strategy. It is suggested that:

- 2.5 DFID should continue to monitor the ratio of commissions to funding awards achieved by the BMS as well as the number of hours of programming on UK television about the developing world.
- 2.6 DFID should be clear about what media policy and regulatory outcomes it wants to see. It should identify the milestones that need to be reached and the research that needs to be commissioned for these outcomes to be achieved. The research and lobbying work should be evaluated against the passing of milestones and the achievement of clearly defined objectives.

Sourcing content

In order to fuel the BSD strategy, DFID needs to source compelling content about the development process. Some positive initiatives have already been put in place, but there is scope for this to be done to a greater extent. It is recommended that DFID considers piloting the following two initiatives:

- 2.7 DFID to open up a Development Communications Hub at one of its field offices. The role of this hub should be to
 - source good quality content (in the form of short-form video, feature articles, photo stories, podcasts, blogs) by commissioning local video producers, journalists or participants in the development process to produce material for DFID to publish on the Internet or elsewhere
 - facilitate media access to DFID-supported development projects in the region
 - facilitate training and support for project workers, volunteers or other participants to produce 'user-generated content' such as films or blogs about their personal struggles in relation to the development agenda
 - share expertise with other DFID business units outside the UKThe hub should be led by a person with proven skills and experience to commission good quality content and manage media relations.
- 2.8 DFID to support the CBA's new initiative to commission BMS producers to make short-form films for DFID when they visit developing countries. This would require working closely with field offices and producers to develop a clear idea of what kind of content is needed. The resulting films could be posted up a DFID FaceBook channel, with links from the DFID website. In this way DFID could aim to stream fresh video material on a regular basis.

Project Recommendations cover CBA-BMS, IBT, One World Media Awards and the Development Awareness Fund Media Grants

CBA-BMS

- 2.9 Funding for the Broadcast Media Scheme should continue. The BMS project manager should be asked to review the scheme's staffing establishment and submit costed proposals to ensure that the project has sufficient human resources to cover its workload and sustain its capacity in the medium to long term.
- 2.10 The BMS project manager should also be asked to put forward costed proposals to DFID, by the end of 2009, for initiatives that could increase the amount of content about development activity (as opposed to content about the developing world). BMS could test these during the 2010/11 financial year. If the testing meets with success, then the initiative(s) should be continued for as long as conditions remain favourable. If not, then further initiatives should be conceived and tested.
- 2.11 DFID should commit to a minimum of three years funding every time it renews its grant to BMS.
- 2.12 The project's title is very long-winded, so consideration should be given to a change of name for the organisation.
- 2.13 Each year BMS management should select a sample of the television programmes that have been commissioned as a result of BMS funding and use focus groups to market test the impact they make on viewers' levels of concern about international poverty. This will give some reliable indication of how much impact television programmes have on public opinion.

IBT

- 2.14 Further research funding applications from IBT and its partners are likely to be of significant value in influencing upcoming policy decisions in relation to international content on UK television and should be given favourable consideration

- 2.15 DFID should consider entering into an ongoing funding partnership with IBT in order to develop a stronger partnership between the two organisations and a longer-term vision for IBT's role in achieving DFID's objectives.
- 2.16 DFID should look to commissioning IBT to undertake further research on media issues of importance to the BSD strategy. These include (but are not restricted to):
- The scope for increasing news of development within mainstream television news bulletins
 - The role of the Internet in informing the UK public about the developing world. (It is understood that DFID is already looking into commissioning an Internet study.)
 - Trends in local media with particular reference to its capacity to cover UK-linked development stories

One World Media Awards

- 2.17. DFID co-funding of the One World Media Awards should continue and indeed if agreement can be reached on (iii), (iv) and (v) below there would be a case for an increase from its current very modest level – a level which was fixed five years ago and has not been subsequently altered. (It is particularly important for DFID funding to be maintained during a recession which is bound to affect the level of funding of the Awards from hard-hit commercial media organisations like ITV and possibly also from charities reliant on public donations.)
- 2.18. DFID should commit to a minimum of three years funding every time it decides to renew its grant to OWBT.
- 2.19. The OWBT should be asked to review the future viability of the Local Media Award; if the category is to be retained, OWBT should come back to DFID with a credible promotional strategy to ensure an increasing level of entries. The focus on a Local Media Award needs to be rethought in the light of the current severe financial crisis affecting regional and local media. It is probable that only the BBC will be in a position to afford such coverage in future (it is noteworthy that three of the five Local Media winners have been BBC regional broadcasters).
- 2.20. The OWBT should be invited to propose, either through a reinvigorated Local Media category or in some other way, how the Awards might better recognise creative communication of development work itself and not just aspects of life in the developing world.
- 2.21. DFID should agree specific measures with OWBT to evaluate the impact of the Awards, for example on the numbers of good quality entrants, the extent of media coverage of the event and the award-winners and on key messages.
- 2.22. There should be greater convergence between new One World thinking and DFID's (relatively) new Communications Strategy. In particular there should be a dialogue over the need to reward media used by "interested mainstream" and "family first sympathisers" groups over that used by "active enthusiasts".

Development Awareness Fund Media Grants

- 2.24 A clear distinction should be made between projects which are primarily educational but which have a media dimension and those which come from media organisations and concern media activity.
- 2.25 The former projects should continue to be assessed under the Development Awareness Fund but the latter should receive separate treatment by DFID Communications. Applications would have to be assessed by either external media consultants or by the proposed DFID Media Strategy Panel of communications staff and outside experts.

3. The **Trade Unions, Faith Communities, BME and Diaspora Groups Review** made recommendations at strategic and operational level:

Strategic Level

- 3.1 DFID should build and sustain relationships with all core constituencies in civil society with a focus on wider public engagement and the development of deeper stakeholder relationships with key networks notably faith communities, trades unions, the private sector and BME communities.
- 3.2 DFID should give higher priority within the BSD Strategy to civil society audiences and institutions resourcing this work financially and with appropriate staff engagement.

Operational Level

- 3.3 The Outreach and Stakeholder Relations Team (OSRT) should identify revised BSD outcomes for developing engagement with key civil society stakeholder networks with specific, time bound, indicators.
- 3.4 Civil Society Department should integrate the Diaspora and Youth Volunteering work within the respective PPAs with VSO and Christian Aid and agree monitoring indicators and processes with OSRT.
- 3.5 Civil Society Department should integrate all support to trade unions through the TUC PPA, again linking with OSRT, to develop the stakeholder relationship.
- 3.6 DFID's engagement with the private sector should be coordinated more effectively, including a focus on building support for development through business linkages.
- 3.7 DFID should identify new BSD outcomes for work with faith communities, working collaboratively with the network through a mutually agreed institutional framework.
- 3.8 DFID should strengthen the level of expertise within the responsible staff team/s (across the Policy and Research Division and the Communications Division) with a particular focus on UK civil society, social inclusion, and institutional analysis.
- 3.9 A mechanism for the management of stakeholder relationships with civil society institutions beyond traditional NGOs/CSOs should be developed jointly by CSD and Communications Division to ensure that DFID's civil society expertise and strategic communications skills are combined.
- 3.10 Funding instruments and financial support should follow the establishment of institutional relationships and not vice versa.
- 3.11 Civil Society Department should review the links between the UK and international programmes of NGOs and CSOs and ensure that the synergies are reinforced through the support provided by all the various funding arrangements with specific targets related to building support for development in all cases.
- 3.12 DFID's Management Board should ensure Communications Division and Civil Society Department work together effectively to reframe the BSD Strategy and the related stakeholder relationships.

4. Recommendations from the **DAF and MGS Review** are also given at the strategic and the operational level:

At the **strategic level**

- 4.1 funding instruments like the DAF should follow the establishment of strategic outcomes and institutional relationships

At the **operational level**, to improve the provision of financial support for development awareness

- 4.2 The DAF should be gradually phased out over the next 3 years and replaced with larger longer term grant support for key target groups who are central to the BSD strategy and who are currently supported under the DAF

For Education

- 4.3 The proportion of funds currently being spent on formal education in the DAF should be used to contribute to support for more strategic interventions within education. This should include further and higher education and the youth service.
- 4.4 Funds for education should be for agreements at national level for the four countries, with consideration given to how regional delivery is managed particularly within England. For example, groups of DECs may be identified to play a role in implementation in the different regions.
- 4.5 Given the integrated nature of the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG), consideration may be given in Wales to funds being allocated to WAG to support delivery of the ESDGC strategy.

For Media Groups

- 4.6 Media groups have not effectively accessed the DAF and MGS. Consideration should be given to enabling media organisations focusing on development awareness to access grant funds through other DFID media funding channels

For Trade Unions

- 4.7 Small Grant Support for development awareness work with Trade Unions is more effectively placed within the PPA with the TUC. The PPA may be expanded to encourage the TUC to provide more funds for small grants focused on development awareness.

The phasing out of the DAF and the move to more strategic interventions in education, media and the Trade Unions will result in more limited opportunities for other key target groups that DAF has focused on, e.g. BME, Diaspora, Faith and the Churches and more local level community groups. These groups have an important role to play in delivering development awareness at the local level and engagement with them provides an entry point for DFID to engage with the wider BME and community agendas. To enable them to continue to access funds and contribute to building support for development it is recommended that the Mini Grants Scheme should be developed as a larger competitive fund.

- 4.8 To facilitate this, a more detailed review of the Mini Grants Scheme should be undertaken which looks at options for expansion and for improved management of the fund. Expansion and development of the MGS may include:
 - a. Increasing the level of funding for individual projects to a maximum of £25,000 per annum for a maximum of 3 years.
 - b. A focus on specific locally based target groups outside the formal sector, e.g. voluntary and community groups, BME groups and Diaspora and Faith Based Organisations
 - c. Increased capacity building support to organisations applying for and receiving grants for preparation and implementation of projects
- 4.9 Options for improving the management of the MGS should include:

- a. The appointment of organisations who have the capacity to manage the fund effectively and who can add value through offering capacity building support to applicants and grantees. Consideration may be given to organisations presently managing the fund after careful evaluation of their performance to date
- 4.10 Steps should be taken to understand the needs and agendas of the specific groups which the expanded Mini Grants Scheme is targeted at.
 - 4.11 Close attention should be paid to monitoring and evaluation of the programme as well as to assessing impact and lesson learning.
- To enable effective management of the changes:
- 4.12 TLC should continue to manage the DAF through the phasing out process in order to maintain continuity for existing grant holders
 - 4.13 The transition should be managed by DFID, if possible drawing on expertise in social inclusion, to ensure effective understanding and engagement with the groups targeted under the expanded Mini Grants Scheme.
 - 4.14 DFID should take a strategic approach to fund management. A clear strategy for the management of the expanded Mini Grants Scheme should be agreed with clear delineation of tasks between DFID and the organisations managing the fund on their behalf. As much responsibility as possible should be given to the organisations with DFID's role restricted to key decisions and monitoring at an output to purpose level.
 - 4.15 Education expertise should be made available to support the work in the formal sector with a brief to improve communications, collaboration and learning across the sector.