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Executive Summary

Background to the report

Independent foundations in the UK have a long and evolving history of making grants internationally. But in a context of growing awareness of the global dimensions to wealth inequalities, environmental sustainability, security and economic volatility, they increasingly need to review their international commitment. What is their role within the bigger picture of governmental and private aid to developing countries? How can foundations’ resources be used to best effect?

This report provides an up-to-date picture of the scale of UK foundation resources devoted to international development. It also identifies how these resources are distributed across region and need, and how foundations approach international funding activities. It has been commissioned jointly by the Nuffield Foundation, The Baring Foundation and Paul Hamlyn Foundation, and updates previous research in this area.¹

Approach to the research

There were three parts to the research.

1. A quantitative survey of annual giving for international development and related activities by foundations spending more than £50,000 in this area in 2009/10.

2. A wide search of foundations’ annual reports and other published project documentation.

3. Detailed interviews with a balanced and representative sample of foundations.

Results

The results show that international development and related activities are an increasingly important funding theme for UK charitable grant-making foundations, both large and small. A number of the newer UK foundations have included an international strand in their programmes, or give it their highest priority. These include the Children’s Investment Fund Foundation, the Waterloo Foundation, the Ashmore Foundation and the Wood Family Trust.

Key quantitative results

- The annual value of current spending by charitable foundations on international development and related causes is estimated at around £292 million.

- This is equal to just under half of the amount which DFID spends through NGOs.

- Ninety foundations have been identified as making grants above a total value of £50k per annum for international development and related causes in 2009/10 (listed in report).

- Spending on international development represents 13% of the total charitable spending of foundations which fund this area, and 9% of the spending of all UK grant-making foundations.

- The region attracting the highest number of foundation funders is Africa (37%), in particular East Africa. This is followed by Asia (23%).

- Foundation interests are diverse. Direct health care and formal education attract the highest number of foundation funders (12% each). Sustainable economic/agricultural development and investment attracts 10%, followed by utilities (including water) and infrastructure (9%).

Findings on motivation and approach

The qualitative research illustrated a number of emerging trends in foundations’ motivation and approach in international development and related areas.

- A growing involvement which reflects foundations’ different motivations and interests.

- A spending focus on similar areas to government and other official international development funding such as investing in health, education, and sustainable development, particularly in Africa.

- Responsiveness to emerging needs in international development by establishing new programmes and strategically reviewing and re-focussing existing programmes.

- Maintaining a highly independent and diverse pattern of international funding, tackling areas which become neglected or marginalised.
Increasingly tackling international development at both strategic and grassroots levels, and working with multiple stakeholders and partners where this is the best way of achieving impact.

Targeting their relatively limited resources at the level of civil society where they can have most impact.

Providing sustained support for existing strengths in developing countries, as well as sustainable forms of support for new ones.

**Key messages and issues from the research**

Growing internationalism in foundation funding means that foundations face more responsibility to assess legitimacy and effectiveness within the challenges of the global context.

The place of independent foundations in the total ‘ecology’ of overseas development aid continues to be diverse and to evolve.

Much greater knowledge-sharing and debate, however, is needed in the key issues which arise from their global contribution, including:

- Does foundation funding have a specific role in relation to other private and public overseas aid funders? How can foundations’ contribution be made in the most effective way, whether financial, strategic or operational?
- How far should foundation funds be used within governmental or multi-lateral programmes, and how far should they maintain a completely independent and diverse role?
- How can good practice and effective innovations within the many diverse and individual initiatives be brought to scale, and where can sustainable routes out of grant dependence be developed?
- How can foundations best empower local civil society, and build local capacity?

Relatively low-level funding can have a transformational power in a developing country context, and there is a need to explore how more foundations could become engaged in international funding.
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Foreword

Independent foundations in the UK have a long history of making grants internationally. In recent years, new foundations have been established, often focussing on international development. This study maps the role of UK foundations in funding work in developing countries. The impetus behind it comes from the foundations themselves, particularly those involved in the Association of Charitable Foundations (ACF) interest group on international development.

Five years ago we commissioned a review of international development funding by UK trusts and foundations. The resulting report, Going Global, examined the funding mechanisms used by foundations spending between £50,000 and £1 million a year on activities carried out by the non-government sector in developing countries.

This follow-up report updates the information in Going Global, but has a broader scope. It includes all private funding (above £50k per annum) from UK foundations for international development. The range of work supported by foundations has also been expanded to include research, development education and climate change/sustainability where it relates to development issues.

We are grateful to the report’s authors, Professor Cathy Pharoah and Linda Bryant, for their painstaking efforts to provide both the quantitative data and qualitative descriptions in the report, and for posing some pertinent questions about UK foundations’ role and modus operandi in funding work in developing countries.

The potential benefits of funding work in developing countries are great. There is a clear need, and grants that are modest by UK standards can have a significant impact. But the scale of need compared to foundations’ resources, and the array of other funders, both institutional and private, means foundations need to be strategic in their decisions as to where, what and how to fund. This report provides the background information necessary for both current and future funders to ensure their contributions are effective.

Much of the publicity and discussion about foundations’ support for international development focuses on the large US foundations such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. However, a number of organisations in Europe and the US, including government agencies, are interested in the wider foundation funding picture beyond these well-known names, and this study will be useful in providing them with an up-to-date overview of UK foundations.

Last but not least, we hope this study will contribute to discussions and possible partnerships between foundations, and between foundations and other international development funders.

Sarah Lock, Nuffield Foundation; Robert Dufton, Paul Hamlyn Foundation; and David Cutler, The Baring Foundation.
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Definitions

Bilateral aid

Bilateral aid is provided to developing countries on the DAC (Development Assistance Committee) List and some other countries on a country to country basis, and to institutions, normally in Britain, working in fields related to these countries.

Aid channelled through multilateral agencies (see below) is regarded as bilateral where DFID controls the use and destination of the funds. This relates mainly to humanitarian assistance delivered through UN agencies, including the World Food Programme.

Civil society/civil society organisation (CSO)

Use of the term ‘civil society’ is increasing, but its meaning is much debated. A broad definition is ‘the groups and organisations that occupy a position between the household, the state and the private sector’. Civil society organisations therefore include registered charities and NGOs, but also community groups, trade unions, business associations, co-operatives, faith-based organisations, recreational groups, think tanks, indigenous groups and philanthropic organisations.

Community-based organisation (CBO)

A community-based organisation is a type of NGO, sometimes referred to as a grassroots organisation. CBOs normally consist of a group of individuals who have joined together to respond to a common need or situation. Examples include women’s groups, credit circles, youth clubs, co-operatives and farmers’ associations.

DFID

Department for International Development (the UK Government department responsible for promoting development and the reduction of poverty).

Foundation/trust

In this report the terms ‘foundation’ and ‘trust’ are used interchangeably to refer to independent grantmaking charities, whose income derives mainly from private sources. Generally ‘foundation’ is used in this report.

International NGO (INGO)

An international NGO (see below) is an NGO that works internationally. A UK-based INGO is based in the UK and works internationally. The majority of foundation funding for international development goes to NGOs.

International development

The term ‘international development’ does not have a universally accepted definition, and is used for the purposes of this report to refer generically to activities in developing countries and emerging economies encompassing growth, governance, health,

education, gender, disaster relief, humanitarian aid, infrastructure, rights, economic and environmental sustainability, and associated research.

**Multilateral aid**

This is aid channelled through international institutions for use in or on behalf of aid recipient countries. Some international institutions’ activities benefit both developed and developing countries. In these instances, only the part of the UK contribution used for development activities in developing countries is reckoned as aid. The proportion reckoned as aid for each agency is agreed by the DAC.

**Non-governmental organisation (NGO)**

Non-governmental organisations are part of civil society. In this study, NGOs are defined as ‘private organisations that pursue activities to promote the interests of the poor; protect the environment, provide basic social services, relieve suffering or undertake community development. NGOs often differ from other organisations in the sense that they tend to operate independent from government, are value-based and are generally guided by principles of community and cooperation’. Development NGOs range from Northern-based charities operating internationally, such as Oxfam, Save the Children and ActionAid to CBOs in developing countries.

**Official Development Assistance (ODA)**

Official funding administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as the main objective.

---
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1 Introduction to the report

1.1 Background

International grant-making by independent foundations has continued to evolve throughout recent decades of increasing globalisation. As awareness of the global dimensions to issues such as wealth distribution, environmental sustainability, security and economic volatility continues to grow, foundations have to consider the nature and extent of their international contribution. How much of their relatively limited resources should be devoted to international need? What is their role within the bigger picture of governmental and private aid to developing countries? How can their resources be used to best effect?

This report provides an up-to-date picture of the scale of UK foundation resources devoted to international development. It also identifies how these resources are distributed across region and need, and how foundations approach international funding activities.

It has been commissioned jointly by the Nuffield Foundation, The Baring Foundation and Paul Hamlyn Foundation. The study updates previous research commissioned by the Nuffield, Baring and Paul Hamlyn Foundations, and published in June 2007 under the title Going Global. Since this earlier study, several new UK foundations which fund internationally have emerged, including the Children’s Investment Fund Foundation, the Waterloo Foundation, the Ashmore Foundation and the Wood Family Trust.

This report updates estimates for UK foundations’ international funding. It also extends the analysis of distribution routes for international grants. The specific focus of this report is on identifying emerging patterns in how foundations have continued to articulate and respond to funding challenges in an increasingly global and fast-moving political and economic context.

1.2 Context for UK foundation international funding

Governments and multilateral institutions have increasingly recognised the role which philanthropy can play in providing resources for international development, an interest which has grown as a result of recession and faltering economic growth. Recent estimates suggest, for example, that total global philanthropic funding flows from OECD to developing countries reached $53 billion in 2008, out of total spending from private, public and philanthropic sources of $476 billion.£


£
The part played by foundation funding within the landscape of total aid to developing countries was mapped out in previous research\(^8\) and is reproduced in Figure 1. It reveals the complexity of funding flows within which foundation funding carves out its path. A major distinction between the funding from public, private and philanthropic sectors is that the majority of foundation funding flows to civil society organisations, though this is not exclusively the case. This is discussed further in Section 2.

Figure 1: High-level view of funding flows contributing to international development

---

8  Casas and Fiennes, ibid
1.3 Approach of the report

The approach and methodology used for the research broadly follows that of the earlier Going Global study, but differs in a number of ways.

• We adopted a more inclusive definition of international development to encompass new areas such as climate change, and related international funding activities such as health, medical and other scientific research, and environmental activities where specifically relevant to international development and developing countries.

• We have included foundations giving over £1 million per annum.

• We were able to build on the earlier work and identify a much larger list of foundations who met the criterion of making total international grants worth £50k or more.

• We have classified foundations’ funding activities by region, topic area and beneficiary, within the limits of the published information available, to create a fuller picture of the contribution of foundations.

Further details on the methods and sources used are set out in the next two sections.

Structure of the report

The report presents the results of two broad strands of work:

• Findings from a quantitative study of the total amount and patterns of distribution of UK foundation funding for international development and related activities.

• Findings from a qualitative exploration of motivations and approaches to international funding amongst a small selected sample of foundations, illustrated with several practical examples of their approach, programmes and projects.
2 Findings from the study – scale

This section of the report presents the findings of research on the scale of funding for international development and related activities.

A table of the foundations identified as spending a total of more than £50,000 per annum on their international grant-making, with details of amounts and areas of interest, is inserted at the end of the report.

2.1 Method of research

Data for the research has been drawn from figures published in the audited annual reports and accounts which foundations submit to the Charity Commission. International funders were identified using relevant directories (see references). Published information was supplemented with interviews with a balanced selection of funders of different sizes and with different programmes.

Many foundations which make international grants do not regard their work as ‘international development’. For the purposes of this report, the term ‘international development’ is used to refer generically to activities in developing countries and emerging economies encompassing growth, governance, health, education, gender, disaster relief, humanitarian aid, infrastructure, rights, economic and environmental sustainability, and associated research.

The study was generally restricted to foundations spending more than £50,000 per annum on activities in developing countries. This criterion was introduced to keep the study manageable, as there are hundreds of smaller foundations and trusts providing funding below this level. Because of the very heavy skew in charitable spending towards the larger trusts and foundations,9 the vast majority of funding for international development by value is represented in the report.

Foundations publish their annual accounts at different times of the year. Most of the data used in this study relate to grants made in the fiscal year 2009/10, or the calendar years 2009 or 2010.

All reasonable efforts have been taken to compile reliable figures for the amount of funding which foundations devote to international grant-making, but as foundations vary in the amount of detail they publish on spending by programme area, in some cases we have used best estimates.

2.2 Scale of UK foundation funding for international development

2.2.1 Total foundation funding for international development

Ninety foundations were identified as making international grants worth around £50,000 per annum or more. These are listed in Section 6.

International development and related funding by these foundations was estimated to be worth around £243 million in 2009/10.

It can be estimated that at least another 20% of this amount, around £49 million, is given by smaller trusts not included in the study, and those on which there is little published information. This means that total foundation funding for international development is estimated at about £292 million per annum.

2.2.2 Place of international development in all UK foundation funding

Foundations which fund internationally contain both the UK’s very largest and smallest charitable funders. International foundation funders as a group, however, are weighted towards the larger foundations, and represent around three-quarters of all UK foundation grant-making by value (74%), as can be seen from Table 1. This is based on published figures on the top 500 grantmakers, which represent the majority of UK funding.

Funding for international development and related causes represents an average 13% of the total annual charitable expenditure of £2.3 billion by foundations involved in international funding. It is equal to 9% of all foundation funding.

There is, however, a wide range in the proportion of funding dedicated to international development. For several, it represented all (100%) of their charitable spending, while for others it was just one per cent. Figure 2 illustrates the range. There is a large cluster of funders at the top end of the range for whom international funding represents all, or almost all, of their funding. While 13% of international funders’ funding overall went to international development, the average proportion of funding dedicated to it was 45%. This shows that international development tends to have a fairly high priority amongst those who support it.

10 The proportion is based on a previous attempt to compile figures for the total scale of charitable trust grant-making in the UK, and which is still the only data available. See Pharoah, C., and Siederer, N. (1997) ‘Numbers, income, grants and assets – new estimates’ in Dimensions of the Voluntary Sector 1997 (Ed Pharoah, C). CAF West Malling.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY DATA ON UK FOUNDATION GRANT-MAKING 2009/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Foundations which fund internationally</th>
<th>All foundations *</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total grant-making</strong></td>
<td>£2.3 billion</td>
<td>£3.1 billion</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International development grant-making</strong></td>
<td>£292 million</td>
<td>£292 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International dev’t grants as % of total grant-making</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range of international grants as % of grant-making</strong></td>
<td>1% –100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures for top 500. (Pharoah, C, 2011 ibid)

Figure 2: Distribution of proportion (%) of funding dedicated to international development across 90 foundations

2.2.3 Trend for smaller foundations to specialise

The results also show that smaller foundations tend to devote a higher proportion of their funding to their international development work. This is illustrated in Figure 3, which ranks foundations by income size. The trend-line shows clearly that the
proportion (though not the amount) of funding declines as foundation income increases.

**Figure 3: Relationship of size of foundation and % of funding for International Development**

![Figure 3: Relationship of size of foundation and % of funding for International Development](image)

### 2.2.4 Distribution of total international funding by foundation size

Although smaller organisations tend to dedicate a higher proportion of their funding to international development, there is a strong positive relationship between amount given and scale of foundation income. The distribution of the total amount given by foundation income-band is shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income band</th>
<th>% of total international funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; £1 million</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1-5 million</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5-10 million</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10-50 million</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;£50 million</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.5 Foundation funding for international development in context of ODA

Foundation funding for international aid forms just one part of the bigger picture of the total flow of international development support, which includes government aid, foreign direct investment, remittances from migrant labour and contributions from international non-government organisations.

Table 3 places the contribution of foundations within the bigger picture of total aid funding, excluding the private sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3: GOVERNMENT AND VOLUNTARY FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL AID 2009/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total DAC country ODA(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UK ODA(^2) of which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Total DFID Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Voluntary grants(^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public, corporate and legacy donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK foundations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: DFID SID 2010; OECD, IDS, 2011.
* Estimate including NGOs which fundraise from the public.
** Based on grossing up figures for donations to the major international fundraising charities, Pharoah, 2011, ibid

2.2.6 Funding relationships between DFID, foundations and international aid charities

Both foundations and DFID provide funding to civil society in several different ways, but mainly:

- **indirectly** to developing countries through UK international aid charities and other civil society organisations as intermediaries; and

- **directly** to non-government organisations based in developing countries.

Table 4 shows figures for DFID support through civil society organisations. This represents around 9% of its spending.

   oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=TABLE1

   ONS October 2010
In contrast, it is clear from looking at the details of grants in foundations’ annual reports that foundations give a very high proportion of their funding to civil society organisations, although full figures for this are not available. Other important recipients are universities and hospitals.

Table 4 shows that UK foundation funding is highly important to civil society, and is equal to just under half of DFID funding through civil society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4: DFID SPENDING THROUGH NGO 2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFID funding to UK NGOs only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£362 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID Bilateral Aid through all NGOs globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£599 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK foundation international funding to civil society in UK and globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£292 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DFID SID 2005/06 - 2009/10, National Statistics, October 2010

The next section of the report turns from the input side, namely the levels of foundation funding for international development and related issues, to the output side; the impact of foundation spending on region, activities and beneficiaries.
3 Findings from the study - regions, activities, and beneficiaries

3.1 Classifying foundation funding

This section of the report presents the findings of the quantitative research on the distribution of foundation by regions, activities and beneficiaries.

Detailed analysis of individual grants made was outside the scope of this study. In order to get an indication of international funding priorities, we classified the priority areas referenced in annual reports using a system adapted from a previous study.\textsuperscript{14} The amount of detail available varied, so the results should be regarded as indicative.

3.2 Foundation funding by region

3.2.1 Funding by major region

Foundation funding priorities by region is similar to that of UK expenditure on bilateral international support. Bilateral help represents about 60% of DFID expenditure, with the bulk of the rest allocated to multilateral expenditure.

As Table 5 shows, the broad distribution of the number of foundations who fund particular regions is similar to the spread of gross public expenditure. Africa appears to receive most support, followed by Asia, and then the Americas.

### Table 5: Foundation Funding by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total UK Bilateral Gross Public Expenditure %&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>UK Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>44.21</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing countries (general)/global</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong>&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Number of foundations mentioning that they will fund this region

#### 3.2.2 Estimated value of foundation funding by region

As noted, there is not enough information in foundations’ annual reports to allocate expenditure by region. However we have used foundations’ statements of intent to fund a particular region as a way of deriving the indicative allocation of funds shown in Table 6.

---


<sup>16</sup> These figures do not total 100% as some DFID data was not allocable by region – see Footnote 12
### TABLE 6: ESTIMATED ALLOCATION OF FUNDING BY REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number*</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>£ (m) Equivalent**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing countries (general)/global</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>243.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of foundations mentioning that they will fund this region
**Total funding divided by % of foundations mentioning they will fund this region

#### 3.2.3 Foundation funding at sub-regional levels

Priorities within regions are set out in Figure 4, which gives the proportion of foundations willing to fund particular sub-regions. East Africa emerges as the area of greatest funding interest (22%), followed by South Asia (17%). The extent to which funding interest in Eastern Europe has grown is also illustrated by the 8% of foundations mentioning that they fund in this area.

![Figure 4: Distribution of number of foundations by sub-region funded (%)](image-url)
3.2.4 Foundation funding by subject area

Figure 5 shows the range of international development areas funded by foundations. Areas attracting highest numbers of funders were direct health, education and welfare services. Sustainable economic and agricultural development attracted 10% of funders, with utilities and infrastructure close to this at 9% of funders.

![Figure 5: Proportion (%) of UK trusts (by number) funding each subject area](image-url)
3.2.5 Foundation international funding by beneficiary group

Sometimes foundations indicate the groups they fund, either in particular regions or as a main funding focus. Figure 6 shows the proportion of foundations funding particular groups. The single largest category of beneficiary is children and youth, with children representing almost three-quarters of cases. The priority given to children reflects the findings of a previous study which analysed a large sample of all grants made by UK charitable foundations. (Vincent & Pharoah, ibid) Within the women and families group, 70% were instances mentioning women.

A striking difference between the findings of the previous study of all grants, and the study of international funders, is that the proportion of grant-makers mentioning disadvantaged people in the international study was twice the proportion found in the study of all grants. (18% compared with 9%) This is likely to reflect funders’ concern about the scale of disadvantage in developing countries.

3.2.6 Summary of quantitative findings

Findings from this second report indicate that the number of foundations with a charitable expenditure of more than £50k per annum on international development and related activities is considerably higher than previous estimates. Around 90 foundations have now been identified, compared with 65 identified previously.17 Reasons for the increase are:

- the widening of the criteria for inclusion;
- the establishment of new trusts and programmes; and

---

17 Las Casas et al, ibid
• the fact we were able to build on earlier research.

The inclusion of a larger number of foundations has meant that the estimate of international giving is also larger. The research indicates that the annual value of current international funding by foundations can be estimated at around £292 million.

This is equal to almost 30% of donations from the general public in this area, and shows the significant contribution being made by foundations. It is also equal to around half of DFID total spending through NGOs.

The importance of spending on international activities can be seen in the wide range of foundations committed to it. Many of the largest foundations have an international programme, and in addition to this, there are hundreds of small trusts which fund in this area. Not all of these are included in this report.

Although the research did not study the size of grants specifically, the data in foundations’ annual reports suggests that while there are several sizeable grants, many foundations are also making a considerable number of small grants, of less than £5000, to the many small in-country NGOs in the developing regions.

Overall, spending on international development causes represents 13% of the total charitable spending amongst the foundations which fund this area, and 9% amongst all UK grant-making foundations.

Africa appears to attract the highest number of foundation funders (37%), in particular East Africa. Reasons behind this are partly historical, but as the next section of the report will show, growing global concern about the challenges facing Africa has prompted more foundations to develop funding programmes targeted at this region.

The area attracting the second highest proportion of funders is Asia (23%). Again, strong historical factors underlie this, but it is also clear that several foundations believe it is highly important to address issues of poverty and inequality in India.

Foundation interests are diverse. Direct health care and formal education attract the highest number of foundation funders (12% each). Sustainable economic/agricultural development and investment attracts 10%, followed by utilities and infrastructure at (9%). There is little data to show whether priorities for funding have changed, but these are the areas increasingly targeted by foundations who want to intervene in people’s lives at an early stage. There is an increasing emphasis on health and education problems that are preventable, on more general public health, and on locally-based, and locally-controlled income generation schemes to empower people to address poverty through their own resources.
4 Motivations and approaches

International development funding is inherently complex because its context spans challenges in the world’s political, economic, religious, cultural, ethnic and environmental dimensions. The canvas for international intervention is large, and the picture fast-moving. In providing an update on foundations’ international funding, we felt it important to establish perspectives on how foundations articulate and address such challenges, how their approaches might be changing, and how the future looks.

With this in mind, we complemented the study of quantitative patterns and trends in foundations’ international funding with an exploration of emerging patterns in motivation, approach, decision-making and programme development. Our aim was not to try to establish the extent of any particular features, but to identify existing and emerging patterns in some key areas.

Research method

To gain more insight into the way foundations engage with international needs and activities, we explored a small balanced sample of foundations in more detail. We used published material from annual reports, accounts and other documentation. We also carried out in-depth interviews both face-to-face and over the telephone. Twelve per cent of the ninety foundations listed in the report were interviewed, and the sample was selected to represent a range of size, age, geographical area of interest and source of funding.

Through consultation with funders and intermediaries we established a number of issues for further exploration.

• Why do UK foundations fund international work? What motivates and influences them?
• How do foundations develop strategy and priorities?
• What has been foundations’ response to the recession?
• How do foundations work in partnership and collaboration?
• How far do foundations identify new funding needs e.g. environmental and economic sustainability?
• Have foundations developed new approaches to funding, finance and development?
• Does foundation funding have a special place?
Each of these is addressed in turn in the rest of this section. Issues are presented largely through brief case studies illustrating particular features of foundations’ approaches, programmes or projects.

4.1 Why UK foundations fund international work

Independent foundations in the UK have a long history of working internationally which has continued to evolve over recent decades of globalisation. There is no single source of motivation or influence behind foundations’ interest in funding internationally. Reasons are diverse, partly reflecting the UK’s changing international role and relationships. Some lie in the particular background and international links of foundations and founders. A commitment to funding certain regions is locked into the charitable missions of some organisations.

Foundations are also responding to many new factors in today’s global environment, and an international dimension has become integral to the mission and vision of many foundations today. It was also clear that several foundations have recently re-focussed existing international funding strategies or developed a new international programme. This could be either as a response to shifts in the global environment, or to changing perceptions of how best to tackle international development issues.

Case study: The Indigo Trust and the contribution of information technology in tackling social change in Africa

With a focus on the power of information technology, The Indigo Trust, one of the eighteen Sainsbury Family Charitable Trusts (SFCT), has developed a new programme around the use of computer and mobile phone applications at a grassroots level, to improve governance, empower citizens and contribute towards development outcomes in Africa.

There were 3.84 billion mobile handsets in the developing world (67.6 per 100 population) in 2010. While the Trust recognises that technology isn’t a panacea, mobile phone applications do have the potential to aid development in all sectors, by increasing access to information, aiding communication and enhancing choice. Just 10% of Africa’s population is currently connected to the internet, but this proportion is rapidly expanding. In urban areas, the internet already has the potential to strengthen individuals and communities by increasing their access to information, and encouraging democratic transparency.

ICT can have a powerful role in stimulating social change and economic growth. The Indigo Trust aims to support interventions which use hand-held information and computer technology (ICT) to enhance transparency and accountability, and increase access to health and education, as well as agricultural and welfare services. The Trust believes that if people have the ability to access, share and create information, then they are empowered to make positive changes in their own lives and communities.
4.1.1 Historical roots

There are many important historic and individual roots in founders’ and trustees’ interests or experiences, such as Paul Hamlyn’s seminal contact with the work of Jaipur Foot organisations (BMVSS) in India, which led to the Foundation’s continuing interest in this region. Former Commonwealth links through business and other activities also influence the targeting of particular regions for support, with examples including the work of the Beit Trust in South Africa, and the Dulverton Trust in East Africa, both originally set up by families who made their fortunes in these regions, and are dedicated to helping develop them.

4.1.2 Globalism today

Growing globalism, however, has seen the emergence of new or renewed interest in supporting international activities. Through today’s multi-national trade and corporate activity, modern business links continue to be highly important in helping define areas of foundation interest.

• The Ashmore Foundation, which is funded through donations from Ashmore Group employees, supports projects in Emerging Market countries.

• The Innocent Foundation supports activities in the countries from which the products they use are sourced.

Successful international entrepreneurs want to give back to their countries of origin, including to Central and Eastern Europe.

• The Khodorkovsky Foundation supports higher education amongst young Russians.

• The Kusuma Trust UK, founded by Anurag Dikshit, aims to strengthen secondary and tertiary educational achievement in India.

4.1.3 Social justice and inequality

Several foundations regard international development as an essential part of a strategic and global approach to social justice.

• The Children’s Investment Fund Foundation (UK) aims to make a material difference to the well-being of children in poverty in developing countries.

• The Waterloo Foundation, like many other donors, particularly values the impact which relatively modest amounts of money can have in poorer countries.
The Baring Foundation places a particular focus on marginalised groups such as refugees and forcibly displaced peoples in Africa.

Employees in the Zurich Community Trust elected to dedicate 15% of the Trust’s funding to international needs, and they have developed an India Programme (see below).

Neglected health needs are reflected in Help the Hospices’ and the True Colours Trust’s involvement in palliative care at an international level.

Some foundations, like the Waterloo Foundation and the William A Cadbury Charitable Trust, work locally and globally, combining a dedicated community focus in the UK with an international programme.

4.1.4 Professional and academic activity

There are also many areas of foundation activity where drawing national boundaries makes little sense in today’s world. This is particularly the case in relation to academic, scientific and professional research and development work, as supported, for example by Nuffield, Gatsby and Wellcome foundations.

Case study: Wellcome Trust – Mahidol University – Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Programme

This initiative is part of the Wellcome Trust’s south-east Asia Major Overseas Programme in Thailand, and was established in 1979 by Mahidol University in Bangkok, and the University of Oxford. Its field research extends across Thailand, and provides healthcare to refugee and displaced communities along the Thai-Myanmar border, and to other communities. It has clinical research collaborations with groups in Bangladesh, Cambodia and India, as well as a number of African countries.

The Programme employs around 370 people, over 90% of whom are local staff. It has achieved international recognition for its excellence in tropical disease research and research training and its career development track from MSc to postdoctoral training, which aims to develop research leaders both locally and internationally.
4.1.5 Global issues

Finally, it is important to acknowledge that some areas of foundation work are inherently global, and demand attention at this level.

- The Bromley Trust and Esmee Fairbairn Foundation focus on international human rights, addressing areas such as refugees, slavery and trafficking, torture and other abuses.

- Humanitarian and disaster aid attracts contributions from many foundations when international crises arise, often given through the Disasters Emergency Committee.

4.2 How foundations develop their strategy and priorities

These examples indicate how an international dimension is an increasingly integral and seamless aspect of the vision and funding of UK foundations operating in a global context. It is also clear that over the last two or three years many foundations have carried out radical reviews of their international funding strategy and priorities, mirroring a process which DFID has also gone through. Some examples of how foundations have developed or re-visited international priorities are set out in the case studies below. They illustrate how foundations have responded to various factors, including changes in the global environment, recession, perceptions of the role of Independent funders, and the changing balance of need between different developing countries and regions.

4.2.1 Changing regional need

As the results in Section 2 showed, around 23% of foundations say they provide funding in India. Its recent rapid economic growth has prompted funders of all kinds to re-think their activities in this region. DFID has reduced its India funding, and will increasingly target the poorest states and people, with a focus on healthcare, nutrition and education. The Paul Hamlyn Foundation has carried out a major strategic evaluation of its funding in India.
Case study: Paul Hamlyn Foundation India Programme strategy

Since its inception in 1987, PHF has supported NGOs in India, but its recent review asked whether it should continue to work there, and how it could make a difference.

The review concluded that despite recent high economic growth and a history of aid, India remains a poor country with significant regional imbalances. Women, scheduled castes and tribes face persistent barriers to development, and commercialisation has driven the rural poor from their land.

With a vibrant NGO sector, and recent legislation to devolve power to villages (the Panchayati Raj Act), there are huge opportunities to support the poor in India. PHF proposes to provide support at three levels: building development sector capacity, funding projects which increase the access of vulnerable communities to basic services, and policy development. As a project working at all three levels, PHF funds the National Institute of Women, Child and Youth Development (NWCYD) to run short-stay facilities for runaway girls at train stations in Bhopal, Itarsi and Katni. NWCYD works through the ‘panchayat’, elected local representative councils, to support the development of women and children.

4.2.2 Major Africa programmes targeted at root causes of disadvantage

With persisting and growing evidence of global inequalities, several large funders have begun to align resources away from addressing the effects of poverty and disadvantage towards tackling root causes. The needs of Africa have moved high up funders’ agendas. Intractable problems of malnutrition, and poor access to health and education, particularly amongst women and children, have become key priorities for some of the largest funders. As a result, huge resources are being devoted to enabling access to simple and effective methods of prevention where there is potential for long-term benefit on a wide scale. Immunisation and access to education are examples of this approach, which echoes DFID’s new strategic focus on targeted interventions which have measurable outcomes.
Case study: Children’s Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF)

Few independent funders, apart from the giant US Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, have the resources to undertake large-scale public health and education programmes in partnership with governments and international agencies. In the UK CIFF has placed a strong emphasis on taking this route, investing more than £18 million in child survival in 2009/2010, with a particular focus on risks due to malaria and AIDS, and £3 million on educational development.

It has set itself ambitious targets, based on an analytical approach to assessing need and the potential for impact. It aims to help eliminate paediatric HIV/AIDS in Zimbabwe, supporting the government’s work through a major grant to the Elizabeth Glaser Paediatric Aids Foundation. Through a ‘Teacher-Community Assistant Initiative (TCAI)’, in Ghana, the Foundation is working with the government to improve education outcomes for primary school children, aiming to roll out TCAI across 13,000 schools.

As a result of concern about negative public images about Africa, Charity Projects worked with the Gates Foundation on a ‘See Africa Differently’ initiative aimed at the G20 summit in 2009, and has evaluated all of its work to date. Its new strategic long-term priorities are focussed on tackling malaria and the achievement of the Millenium Development Goal ‘Education for all’.

The Nuffield Foundation has developed a specific Africa strand within its mission to increase the availability and quality of research and professional skills through capacity-building. A new *Africa Programme*, jointly funded by the Nuffield Foundation and the Commonwealth Relations Trust (a subsidiary Trust of the Nuffield Foundation, with an endowment of £8 million) replaced the Commonwealth Programme and was launched in 2010.

Case study: Nuffield Foundation Africa Programme

This programme aims to build research and professional capacity in Southern and Eastern Africa. It funds projects delivered in partnership by UK and African universities. Most of these are training initiatives in science, technology and public service provision, and many have involvement from government departments or quasi-government bodies from the relevant African country.

For example, the Foundation recently funded a collaboration between the Centre for the Analysis of South African Social Policy (CASAP) at Oxford University and the Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER) at Rhodes University to provide professional development training for civil servants on social policy and its analysis.
With a related emphasis on the importance of strengthening top-level research and training capacity, the Leverhulme-Royal Society Africa Award supports scientists wanting to develop collaborative research projects between the UK and Ghana or Tanzania.

The Big Lottery Fund’s (BLF) new 'International Communities' fund aims to build public understanding that achieving material change in developing countries is a long-term process, and it is distributing £25 million between now and 2012 to the poorest and most marginalised populations. Having funded programmes in Africa for the past 25 years, the Gatsby Charitable Foundation is now focusing on sector development in East Africa, targeting its support at high potential economic sectors, such as cotton and tea, where sector growth has potential to benefit large numbers of the poor.

The vision of the recently-established Waterloo Foundation, which is based in Wales, is to work as a foundation of our times, with both a global and local focus in its own community in Wales. Its World Development programme has been framed to work principally through UK international NGOs and to prioritise areas which will help reduce aid-dependency, including education, access to water, sanitation and hygiene, and enterprise development.

**Case study: Waterloo Foundation – keeping girls in education**

In 2009, the Foundation provided Camfed (the campaign for Female Education) with a grant of £100,000 to support the costs of educating 800 girls in south east Tanzania. The grant will provide targeted support to enable girls to continue in secondary school, when large numbers drop out of formal education altogether. The support provided by Camfed pays for school fees and accommodation, as well as providing mentorship and general support to improve the quality of learning outcomes at partner schools. They also maintain a close relationship with district education authorities to monitor the impact of programmes on drop-out rates and secondary pass rates for all girls in the districts in which Camfed operates.

Other strategic changes recently introduced by various funders into their international funding approach and aimed mainly at more effective use of funds include:

- shifting to longer-term funding agreements, with more power to build sustainable change;
- supporting subsistence agriculture where farmers have no access to international markets;
- managing demand and focusing resources in a more targeted way;
clarifying criteria for the use of loan or grant funding; and

developing partnership approaches (see below).

4.3 Response to recession

One of the issues of concern when this report was commissioned was the possible impact of recession and ongoing economic volatility on international aid funding. Amongst the sample of foundations studied in more detail, there appear to have been mixed effects.

Foundations dependent on investment income were most affected by recession, and were forced to reduce their spending. This was managed in different ways. Small foundations which specialise in international funding have been unable to avoid reducing their spending, and one, for example, reported a 14% annual cut. Some of the larger foundations, and those with multiple income strands, were able to protect their international funding, and absorb cuts into other areas of work. Other effects of recession which were reported included an unprecedented number of applications in particular years which forced careful prioritisation. Several foundations mentioned that one important response to economic uncertainty was to reduce funding exposure through developing partnership approaches.

4.4 Working through partnership and collaboration

Several foundations see increasing value in developing effective partnerships to achieve their international objectives, including with the organisations they fund, with co-funders and with other relevant stakeholders. Partnerships can bring additional funding, influence, expertise and access to networks. They can often provide a stronger basis for sustainable long-term change, because risks and learning are shared, and resources can be increasingly tailored to changing needs. Partnership working has not always had a good press, but there are an increasing number of UK examples of highly successful national and transnational foundation partnerships.
Case study: European Foundations’ Initiative for African Research into Neglected Tropical Diseases (EFINNTD)

The EFINNTD is a unique trans-European five-foundation partnership, aimed at medical and health gains in Africa on several levels. Cariplo, Gulbenkian, Merieux, Nuffield and Volkswagen foundations have invested a total of €2.9 million in tackling the ill health and impoverishment caused by infectious diseases. Major international funders have prioritised malaria, AIDS and TB as contributory causes to disadvantage, but ‘neglected tropical diseases’ (NTDs) such as bilharzia, elephantiasis and sleeping sickness affect over one billion people, half of whom live in Africa’s remote rural areas, urban slums or conflict zones. NTDs contribute to an ongoing cycle of poverty and stigma, that leaves its victims unable to work, go to school or participate in family and community life.

EFINNTD supports junior and senior research fellowships to work on NTD, to develop networks to raise awareness of the issue, and to support the development of locally-led schemes to distribute treatment. Funding is flexible and can be arranged to suit participant need. It is aimed at developing people, not projects, and combines investment in young talent with building expertise in NTDs and in public health, and with research institution-building. The transnational partnership gives the scheme wider reach and enables the value of limited budgets to be maximised. A challenge for the scheme is to place funding on a long-term basis.

4.5 Funding directly, or indirectly, or operating programmes

As described in the early part of the report, aid to developing countries flows through multiple channels. Foundations and DFID both provide international development funds through UK international aid charities, and also directly to non-government organisations and CBOs based in developing countries. The chain between donors and recipients is increasingly under scrutiny. The majority of DFID’s bilateral assistance in 2010/11 was delivered by its Country Programmes (£2,845m or 67%). But while DFID devotes around one-tenth of its spending to civil society organisations, foundations channel the majority of their international funding through them.

Building capacity of civil society itself as a way of strengthening and empowering local or marginalised groups is a central concern of the Baring Foundation. In its joint international funding partnership with the John Ellerman Foundation, it aims to build the capacity of African NGOs to support refugees and internally displaced people in sub-Saharan Africa, in the belief that the multiple needs of forced migrants are best met through an effective local civil society, aided by UK international NGOs. A recent workshop report illustrates well the realities of the key role of CSOs in fragile communities, and its main points are reproduced below.
Case study: Baring Foundation – John Ellerman Foundation Uganda Workshop

A recent workshop in Uganda brought funded organisations together to review their support for those suffering forced migration. Its report highlighted the fragility of refugee and displaced people, amongst the most disadvantaged and marginalised in the developing world, and the particular contribution of civil society.18

Ongoing threats to population stability:

• commercial development of land by foreign investors, which forces migration;
• weakness and corruption at governmental levels;
• climate change;
• rise of religious fundamentalism;
• deepening poverty and threats to international aid funding from recession; and
• restrictive NGO legislation.

Contribution of civil society

• strengthening women’s leadership ability;
• holistic approaches to support including shelter, food, education, rights and land;
• development of the education system and access to it;
• building organisational capacity in civil society;
• developing communities and their relationships;
• tackling violence against women; and
• identifying issues, local political lobbying and policy change.

Direct in-country funding often takes place where foundations have strong pre-existing relationships and knowledge, or where their work is highly specific or niche. Where programmes cover a fairly wide and varied geographical area, foundations may

18 For full report see http://www.baringfoundation.org.uk/
lack sufficient expertise of their own and find it most effective to work through UK international NGOs. It means they can draw on the expertise and established track record of UK NGOs, and concentrate the foundation’s resources directly on need. They also often work with international NGOs where they have large budgets to distribute and want to minimise overhead costs and duplication of effort.

Foundations seem principally interested, however, in developing the most appropriate and best route for achieving their particular objectives, whether through direct or indirect funding. Grants may be directed at research institutes, universities and hospitals, and are increasingly made available to public or private partnerships. Some of the newer foundations, such as the A M Qattan Trust which works largely in Palestine, are developing in-country institution and programme-building initiatives where there is a lack of civil society infrastructure.

**Case studies: Zurich Community Trust – capacity-building in India**

The aim of the Zurich Community Trust’s India Programme is to work through South Indian NGO partners, with an impressive commitment to building capacity over the long-term. Since 1994 the scheme has focussed on 12 NGO partners.

The Trust wanted to increase impact through combining core funding with staff engagement. Zurich staff ‘assignees’ each undertake a four week project in India using their professional skills to help develop organisation capacity. Benefits to both partners and participant staff have been recently evaluated. NGO gains include the development of management, governance, human resources, communications, finance, service delivery and advocacy skills. Benefits to participants include personal leadership, resilience, planning and organisation.

The scheme has worked with The Association of People with Disability (APD) in Bangalore for 15 years. Its reach grew almost threefold between 2003 and 2007, from 3045 to 9041 beneficiaries.

**Case study: The Innocent Foundation – sustainability through economic and agricultural development**

All of the projects supported by the Foundation aim primarily to build infrastructure for sustainable economic and agricultural development. The Foundation works through intermediaries to fund sustainable economic and agricultural facilities within local areas. In 2009 it provided funding through the Microloan Foundation of Malawi to help set up 12 new self-sustaining business co-operatives in irrigation, fruit and vegetable production, and juice-making. A three-year partnership with Plan International in Guatemala provided access to microfinance and additional social services. Through War on Want in Brazil, funding was provided to set up the processing units for Babucu nut-breaking communities. Each unit will support one community with 80 families.
4.5.1 Funding for sustainable economic, agricultural and environmental growth

While better access to personal health and education is becoming an increasingly important route to addressing the root causes of poverty, the other is the opportunity for sustainable economic, agricultural and environmental growth. A number of foundations are getting more involved in enterprise development.

**Case Study: Gatsby Charitable Foundation and Wood Family Trust**

The Gatsby Charitable Foundation and the Wood Family Trust (WFT) are two foundations with a shared focus on markets as a means of improving the incomes of poor people across East Africa. Since 2010 they have partnered on programmes in Tanzania and Rwanda to transform their tea sectors.

The Chai Project in Tanzania aims to double smallholder production, increase productivity and incomes and enhance the overall competitiveness of the sector. While the target beneficiary is the smallholder tea farmer, the Project is also comprehensively reviewing the whole production process - input supply to end market - to address barriers and inefficiencies at all stages.

The Project began with an audit of all existing and potential tea growing areas and an industry benchmarking of costs. This research set out the opportunities for increasing output, productivity and quality and confirmed how returns to smallholders could be increased through higher yields, higher prices and, potentially, increased smallholder stakes in factory ownership.

To realise this potential, the Project has launched a challenge fund to incentivise the private sector to tackle specific local constraints. It is also working to strengthen farmer associations and with government bodies to create and implement a road-map for the sector.

WFT and Gatsby have also expanded their partnership to the Rwandan tea sector. Building on the experience in Tanzania, the Imbarutso Project expects to operate a similar challenge fund to incentivise tea factories to adopt business models that invest in smallholder farmers. Imbarutso is also working with government bodies to support regulation and policy that will ensure smallholder interests are recognised, with the overall objective of promoting a sustainable, functioning market that works for the benefit of all.
Case study: Tudor Trust – sustainable agriculture network

The Trust works in a proactive way in sub-Saharan Africa, developing a programme of support for projects which promote sustainable agriculture. The focus of the Trust’s Africa Group is on building a stronger sustainable agriculture network by resourcing centres of good practice and farmer-to-farmer learning through grants towards core running costs, capacity-building grants (including grants towards exchange visits within Africa, and capital grants to build infrastructure). The Group made 16 grants totalling over £0.5 million in 2009/10 to organisations primarily in Kenya, Zimbabwe and Uganda. In 2010 it held its third week-long conference on farmer-to-farmer learning, supported and hosted by Manor House in Kenya.

Case Study: Excellent Development

Excellent Development is one of the charities supported by the Andrews Charitable Trust. It supports farmers in Africa to gain access to clean water and grow enough food to eat and sell. The projects themselves are carried out by community groups who come together to improve food and water supplies by building sand dams, terracing land and planting trees. The Andrews Charitable Trust has given around £145,000 over the last two years to Excellent Development for their projects and for identifying partners in other African countries where their model might be replicated, and which the Trust could support.

4.6 Identifying new needs and approaches

With relatively inelastic budgets foundations have a difficult balancing act between on the one hand maintaining long-term commitments, and on the other responding to new needs or ways of tackling problems. Some new needs are being met from within existing budgets, but newly-created foundations also have a significant role in addressing them. Some examples are set out below.

4.6.1 Climate change

Climate change is a global problem of a scale and complexity which makes effective foundation intervention particularly challenging. Although climate change is a global environmental issue, it was not the focus of this report. There are, however, several examples of how foundations are targeting its specific effects on disadvantage in developing countries.

19 For further information on this area see the research of the Environmental Funders Network http://www.greenfunders.org/home/wtgpw4-final/
Case Study: Building national action plans in developing countries

In recognising the contentious nature of the issues involved in tackling climate change, CIFF has chosen to fund the Mitigation Action Plans and Scenarios (MAPS) programme, a guidance framework for developing a national approach for greenhouse gas reduction. CIFF is providing a grant for developing countries to pioneer new approaches and models to tackle climate change in ways that are transformational and have widespread political support.

The process will start initially in Brazil, Colombia, Peru and Chile. The aim is to build lasting national capacity that leads to political commitments to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases in ways that support, rather than compromise development. The Foundation plans to roll out the MAPS Programme to other countries in Latin America and then more widely to Asia and Africa.

Case Study: Supporting self-help schemes

African agriculture is highly vulnerable to the change in growing conditions caused by the atmospheric build-up of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases linked to global warming. The work of Self-Help Africa in building the capacity of smallholder African farmers to address the threats posed by climate change is supported by HCD Memorial Fund.

There are around 80 million small farms in Africa, and around 75% of all Africans rely on agriculture for their livelihoods. Farmers lack the resources to adapt to climate change as it occurs, but the way in which they work – from the amount and type of crops they plant to the way in which they till the land and protect natural resources – can help to cut carbon levels. Self-Help Africa listens to farmers as they share their discoveries, by linking in with research institute programs, and by sharing lessons with other organisations.

---

Case Study: The Ashden Trust – sustainable technology

Sustainable technology projects are a major focus in the Sustainable Development International programme of the Ashden Trust, one of the SFCTs, which devotes around 20% of its charitable expenditure to this area. Projects equip people with the knowledge and tools to work in an environmentally sustainable way, and also help alleviate poverty by promoting the adoption of sustainable technologies in income generation, agriculture, education and health.

4.6.2 Palliative care

The important role which better health can play in international development has increasingly been recognised over the last two decades, and health has become the focus of many major programmes, as noted above. With such a dominant focus on healthy outcomes, palliative care has been neglected and foundations have recently played an important role in helping to highlight this area and provide services.
Case Study: Combining resources to promote pain relief and palliative care

New alliances of foundations have been formed to make a major impact on raising awareness of the need for palliative care, and to fund the development of new services and initiatives. With so many competing and urgent health needs in developing countries, palliative care has been a neglected area, and low on the health policy agenda of many governments, although there is an acute need for it in sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, the Middle East, North Africa and Central America. It is estimated that 60% of those who die each year in low and middle-income countries, 33 million people, need palliative care. The scale of the problem is enormous, although simple treatments can prevent acute, degrading and needless pain.

The Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund and The True Colours Trust are part of the Waterloo Coalition which aims to improve significantly access to palliative care and pain relief in Kenya and Malawi between April 2011 and December 2012. The Coalition will do this by identifying and supporting in-country partners who are able to implement replicable programmes, which expand or enhance existing initiatives and strengthen government health systems to deliver sustainable palliative care.

The other Waterloo Coalition members are the African Palliative Care Association, the Global Access to Pain Relief Initiative, the International Children’s Palliative Care Network (ICPCN) and the Worldwide Palliative Care Alliance (WPCA). Another funder, The Open Society Institute’s International Palliative Care Initiative, has observer status. The Coalition members have a range of experience, skills, expertise and resources. They have decided to work together in two countries for a specified period to increase their impact in each country. The Coalition has a budget of £600,000 and its members are also able to offer technical support. Grants have been awarded to the Palliative Care Support Trust in Malawi to establish services in six district hospitals and communities, the Kenya Hospice and Palliative Care Association for services in 11 provincial hospitals, The ICPCN, Partners in Health and EMMS International in Malawi.

Momentum behind a campaign to promote palliative care has been building since the early 2000s. The ICPCN was established in 2005, and the WPCA in 2009, with the support of Help the Hospices which devoted 17% of its charitable expenditure in 2009/10 to its international programme.

4.7 New approaches to funding, finance and development

While grant-making remains the principal mode of foundation funding, financial support is provided in many different ways, including investing in property for rent-free use, providing loans, supporting lenders such as the Microloan Foundation, which
receives 58% of its voluntary support through foundation grants, and co-investment partnerships. There is no information on whether styles of financing vary significantly between foundations’ domestic and international programmes, and this would be worth further research. Internationally foundations are, like many other funders, increasingly concerned with applying resources to address poverty specifically through investing in the development of sustainable livelihoods: many support the growth of social enterprise projects, and sustainable agricultural development.

The Chai and Imbarutso projects (section 4.5) attempt to catalyse and facilitate growth using a combination of expert analysis, facilitation, capacity building and through grant and loan finance. The Baring Foundation has made a mission-connected investment in Equity for Africa, a fund which provides ‘transition investing’ for small and medium-sized micro-entrepreneurs in Sub-Saharan Africa aiming to build their business to the next level.

**Case study: The Ashmore Foundation – building primary health care enterprise in Ghana**

The Foundation has a strong interest in supporting social enterprise as a sustainable approach to building skills and income in marginalised communities. The AfriKids Medical Centre is one of several of the Foundation’s sustainability initiatives that improves services for the local community while also building an independent revenue stream to reduce reliance on donations.

The Medical Centre provides basic health services to the community of Bolgatanga, with an inpatient capacity of 60 beds and a new maternal health unit. By 2015, the Centre plans to have 80 beds, 8,000 inpatients and 100,000 outpatients each year. The Ashmore Foundation has supported AfriKids with a grant of £70,000 to develop a permanent x-ray suite which will improve local access to healthcare while also providing a sustainable source of revenue to enable the self-sustainability of AfriKids social programmes in Ghana. AfriKids is committed to achieving local self-sufficiency, and is aiming for the Ghanaian arm to be completely self-sufficient by 2018, when they will close down the UK fundraising office.

**Case study: Affordable healthcare products**

The Wellcome Trust has launched a £45 million partnership with the Indian government’s Department of Biotechnology, to support the development of innovative healthcare products. In the context of India’s flourishing biotechnology sector, it is hoped that this scheme will catalyse the development of new healthcare products at an affordable cost.
ACT Foundation - investing in people through property

The ACT Foundation, which is funded through income from property investment, places a high priority on providing the appropriate buildings and physical assets for achieving social change. It supports Meninos do Morumbi, an educational project for children of shanty town dwellers in Sao Paulo, Brazil, by providing accommodation to allow the project’s future expansion to take place from a position of stability.

A wholly-owned subsidiary company was set up to purchase the project’s current building, and the rental charge was waived. Meninos do Morumbi helps build confidence, self-esteem and skills amongst the poorest and most disadvantaged children through developing musical and other talents. Its famous Percussion Group, which uses traditional Brazilian instruments, performs internationally. The Foundation has also given an interest-free loan to Homeless International, which supports funding for housing projects in India and Malawi.
5 Overview – the place of foundations in international development funding

This research has provided new and unique information on the scale and nature of UK foundations’ contribution to international development and related activities, and provides an opportunity to reflect on a number of issues, particularly at a time when low levels of public awareness of how aid is spent is damaging public support for aid spending.22 This last section of the report discusses some of the implications and key messages of the findings.

5.1 Increasing focus on global dimensions

International funding by independent UK foundations is substantial, representing 9% of their spending, and it is growing. The report shows that various factors underlie the increasing prominence of international work within foundations’ programmes. Some have historical international links, and many have recently strengthened and revised their international programmes. Some see international working as an inherent aspect of global citizenship today, and some are working on global issues of social justice and rights. Several of the newer foundations created over the last few years either give high priority to international funding, or are almost totally dedicated to working on international issues. To some extent this reflects multinational corporate activity, and the motivation of successful entrepreneurs to support countries in which they work, or from which they originate. The growing internationalism in foundation funding, however, also means that foundations face a greater responsibility to assess issues of their legitimacy and effectiveness within the scale and challenge of the global context.

5.2 Foundations and global aid policy

A study which mapped the rapid growth of independent foundations across Europe led us to raise some critical questions about foundations’ emerging role in relation to government. For example, whose responsibility is it to decide on the use of independent foundations’ resources or to deliver public and quasi-public goods, and to what extent should foundations influence public policy?23 A new climate of government spending reduction in the UK has seen strong support being given to the potential contribution of philanthropy in public welfare provision, but though additional philanthropic resources are welcome, uncertainties about their role and responsibilities are important to consider in the context of existing provision.


legitimacy remain. While the scale of the giant US Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is unique in foundation terms, its ‘sheer size and influence’, as a recent commentator has highlighted, ‘brings the debate (about the role of foundations as policy actors) into sharp relief’. Parliament’s International Development Committee has launched a new consultation on the role of private foundations in international funding.

Although the funding contributed by independent UK foundations is relatively small, equal to about 4% of total UK ODA, for example, the research shows that some foundations are increasingly working with the grain of current mainstream trends in international development. This is seen in their prioritisation of health, education and sustainable development, renewed emphasis on Africa and contribution to large-scale preventive programmes aimed at the root causes of disadvantage and poverty. Several foundations are working within government and multilateral agency partnerships.

As the contribution of private philanthropy within international aid grows, the need to clarify its role in relation to other major funders, and explore how its contribution can be made in the most effective way, whether in financial, strategic or operational terms, is also growing. Should foundation funding be used as a part of large-scale government or multinational aid agency funding, as vital leverage to influence the way in which large national and global aid institutions work? Or as a resource for independent experimentation, risk-taking and innovation to develop new approaches which can be mainstreamed? Who should lead such discussions, and what is the right forum?

5.3 Independence of direction

A further question is how far the relatively limited funds available to private foundations should be used for global-level welfare programmes. The scale of the challenge is enormous and DFID, for example, has turned its attention to how the huge potential of private sector investment can be harnessed for international development, referring to it as ‘the engine of development’. Can independent foundations have more impact if they devote their resources to new, neglected or marginalised areas left out of mainstream international aid? The research revealed many examples of how foundations’ independence of resources has enabled them to work in the widely diverse, often innovative or marginalised and contentious issues summarised below.

26 http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/international-development-committee/inquiries/private-foundations/
• **Evolving new approaches**

There are several different kinds of examples of how foundations are trying to work in new ways. Many are increasingly exploring their scope to work with a wide and flexible range of private, public and civil society partners. While grants remain the main form of support, finance is also being provided through equity investment, loans, capital and other assets such as equipment, and property subsidies. Innovation in finance is frequently linked to more holistic approaches to supporting locally-based enterprise, which involve different packages of combined funding, networking, professional and business support. Further examples of different approaches include the development of affordable health care in India, and the exploration of opportunities to address inequality through the use of modern hand-held computer and mobile phone technologies in Africa.

• **New needs and neglected areas**

Through their international funding, foundations are responding to new and emerging areas of need such as the impact of climate change and sustainable land use. They are also tackling several major needs neglected within broader mainstream health and education programmes, such as neglected tropical diseases, palliative care, trafficking and slavery, forced migration and grassroots participation and democracy.

• **Building internal professional and technical capacity and infrastructure**

Several foundations aim to address a lack of competitive capacity in developing countries by trying to strengthen skills and expertise in particular areas of professional and technical competence, such as health, bio-medical research and agriculture. This sometimes also involves investing in building a professional training and development infrastructure which will not only foster but also maintain the growth of internal ability and excellence.

The challenges which arise from the many individual and diverse foundation initiatives lie in the extent to which learning and experience is shared, good practice and effective innovation brought to scale, and sustainable routes out of grant dependence developed where possible, or even essential. How can foundations best share their knowledge and influence policy and practice in more systemic ways? Are sufficient resources devoted to this? How far do foundations as a whole explore the most effective ways of adding value, and are they sufficiently ‘creative’?  

5.4 **Focus on civil society and its institutions**

A major difference between the way in which foundations and other government and aid agencies work is that UK foundations focus a large part of their international...
support on civil society organisations, while just 9% of DFID spending, for example, is channelled through UK and overseas NGOs. The focus on civil society funding is particularly important to foundations for a number of reasons. One is that there are many geographical areas and issues where help can only be delivered through CSOs, whether support is provided directly or indirectly. Up to 40% of healthcare, for example, is provided by CSOs in some African countries. Another is that in addition to a crucial service delivery role, CSOs can have a vital role in building up local political, educational and economic capacity. They can play a role in monitoring local governmental accountability and empowering people to find ways of addressing their problems. This means that a priority for many foundations working internationally is to strengthen civil society infrastructure with the aim of enabling people to address problems from within their own resources. While foundations are also increasingly using their power to act as catalysts for mobilising additional private or public resources, their focus generally remains directed towards driving progress from change at individual and local community levels.

In working predominantly with civil society organisations, foundations have particular strengths as funders. Their independence, for example, gives them the scope to empower local causes and groups in ways that are not politically driven. Their funding can be flexible, tailored to suit the difficult and challenging circumstances in which many organisations are working. They can reduce bureaucracy, developing more sensitive approaches to accountability than governments and international agencies can. For some foundations this means developing close and engaged relationships with their funded projects. For others it means relying on trusted international NGOs to deliver local initiatives.

Foundations also have the freedom to set their own balance between existing and new commitments. Many foundations working in the international context aim to nurture existing strengths and capacity, as well as investing in new developments, providing sustained as well as sustainable forms of support.

Many questions arise for foundations grappling with effective local civil society interventions. They have developed several different approaches to accessing necessary local expertise, working through intermediaries in the UK such as international NGOs, for example, or through trusted and known partners in developing countries. Issues arising include whether practice and approach is improving and whether sources of knowledge are sufficiently wide and representative. This report provides many illustrations of foundations investing their resources at the points at which they believe they will be most effective, but how is this assessed? How are decisions between funding people, projects, or organisations made, and is the current balance between direct / indirect funding appropriate? What is the role of foundations in policy, advocacy and local conflicts? Most importantly, how do beneficiaries perceive them?
5.5 An evolving place in international development funding

International funding is a substantial part of independent foundation spending. Foundations’ commitment to it is growing as they increasingly acknowledge a role in global citizenship, and the transformational power which relatively low-level funding can have in a developing country context. The research has shown that the place of foundations in the total ‘ecology’ of overseas development aid continues to be diverse, and to evolve in dynamic and interesting ways. This parallels their role in public welfare in the UK domestic context. Yet we know little about where the international aid funding ecology is working effectively or ineffectively. Foundations are addressing issues which are particularly challenging in the context of intervention at a global level, and this makes it vital that hard-won knowledge and learning is shared. The many questions and issues which are raised when funding within an international context, and which have been illustrated here, need much more debate, discussion and research. This would both contribute to developing international funding practice, and encourage other foundations to get more engaged in global grant-making.
Table of foundations supporting international development and related activities, ranked by international spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS (£)</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FOCUS – GEOGRAPHY</th>
<th>FOCUS – THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Wellcome Trust</td>
<td>59,000,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>The support of clinical and basic scientific research into human and veterinary medicine; the social and ethical implications of medical advances; and the history of medicine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comic Relief</td>
<td>41,084,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Children and young people, HIV/AIDS, women, conflict, urban slums and trade, environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Children’s Investment Fund Foundation UK</td>
<td>22,004,487</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>India, Kenya; Lesotho; Malawi; Mozambique; Nigeria; Pakistan; Tanzania; Uganda; Zambia</td>
<td>Child survival; Nutrition and hunger alleviation; Early child development; Educational achievement; Care environment; Climate change; Foundation approved programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Lottery Fund*</td>
<td>14,400,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Tackling the causes of poverty and deprivation overseas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Return for Kids</td>
<td>10,049,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>India, Eastern Europe, Africa</td>
<td>Education, HIV/Aids, finding homes for children in institutions, development of preventative and alternative care services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigrid Rausing Trust</td>
<td>9,116,100</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Africa, Asia, South America, Eastern Europe</td>
<td>Human rights, womens’ rights, minority rights and environmental advocacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sainsbury Family Charitable Trusts (SFCT)</td>
<td>7,390,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>(see individual trusts in group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khodorkovsky Foundation</td>
<td>6,709,220</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Advancement of education in Russia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS (£)</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>FOCUS – GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>FOCUS – THEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Foundation</td>
<td>6,208,346</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Global development, and environmental challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elton John Aids Foundation UK</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Eastern Europe, Asia, Russia</td>
<td>Alleviation of physical, emotional and financial hardship of people living with HIV/AIDS, and AIDS prevention programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Foundation for Democracy</td>
<td>4,110,766</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Africa, Eastern Europe, Middle East</td>
<td>Civil society - strengthening, Political party development, Local governance, Civic participation, Women, Youth, Elections, Rule of law, Media, Trade unions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vodafone Group Foundation</td>
<td>3,771,558</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Albania, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, Fiji, Ghana, Hungary, India, Kenya, Romania, Turkey, Tanzania, Chile, Hiati;</td>
<td>Mobile communication technologies, funding people to work with charities, disaster relief, local community funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund</td>
<td>3,238,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Palliative care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro Charity Trust</td>
<td>2,759,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>India, Indonesia, Malawi</td>
<td>Poverty relief for poor, orphans, children, families. Education, health, welfare, access to water, food, accommodation. Promoting self-sufficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rufford Foundation</td>
<td>2,079,863</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Various and HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS (£)</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>FOCUS – GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>FOCUS – THEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Waterloo Foundation</td>
<td>1,762,451</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Africa, South America, India</td>
<td>Poverty relief and relief of stress in all parts of the world. Sustainable development, by promoting environmental conservation and preservation, prudent use of natural resources. To promote physical and mental development of children and mental health of adults.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Beit Trust                                     | 1,683,455                            | 2009    | Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe | Education (secondary & tertiary), health, welfare and the environment.                                                                。
<p>| A M Qattan Foundation                          | 1,500,000                            | 2009-10 | Arab world and Palestine | Education and culture                                                                                                                                            |
| Allan and Nesta Ferguson Charitable Settlement | 1,253,363                            | 2009    | Developing countries   | Education, overseas development and world peace.                                                                                                                                 |
| Paul Hamlyn Foundation                         | 931,996                              | 2009-10 | India                 | Supporting vulnerable groups of people, especially children, education, health and social justice.                                                                |
| Childwick Trust                                | 909,915                              | 2009-10 | South Africa          | Pre-school education                                                                                                                                           |
| The David and Elaine Potter Charitable Foundation | 817,892                             | 2009    | South Africa, India and other developing countries | Education                                                                                                                                                    |
| Esmee Fairbairn Foundation                     | 727,200                              | 2009-10 | International (including UK) | Human rights, women, relief of poverty, environment.                                                                                                           |
| Baring Foundation                              | 689,572                              | 2009    | Sub-Saharan Africa     | Capacity building in Sub-Saharan Africa, funded with partner, the John Ellerman Foundation to address needs arising from long-term forced displacement. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS (£)</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FOCUS – GEOGRAPHY</th>
<th>FOCUS – THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Wood Family Trust **</td>
<td>608,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Making markets work for the poor and VSO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Audrey and Stanley Burton Charitable Trust</td>
<td>593,500</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Developing nations, welfare, Jewish charities, arts, health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice and Hilda Laing Charitable Trust</td>
<td>570,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Grants to organisations working to relieve poverty overseas, with a particular emphasis on helping children who are vulnerable or at risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H C D Memorial Fund</td>
<td>509,500</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Africa, Central America, Pakistan, India, Palestine, Sri Lanka, Timor and Belarus</td>
<td>Health, education and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Response to Eastern Europe</td>
<td>491,454</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Romania and Moldova</td>
<td>Relief of poverty, welfare, health and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ellerman Foundation</td>
<td>473,610</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Health and disability for proactive grants; capacity building in Sub-Saharan Africa funded with partner; the Baring Foundation to address needs arising from long-term forced displacement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scotshill Trust</td>
<td>446,250</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Third world and human rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sir Halley Stewart Trust</td>
<td>416,137</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Africa - Ghana, Tanzania, South Africa, India, China, Bosnia, Middle East, South America, Haiti</td>
<td>Medical grants, social and educational grants and religious grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS (£)</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>FOCUS – GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>FOCUS – THEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Zochonis Charitable Trust</td>
<td>391,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>General charitable purposes with some preference for education and the welfare of children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reed Foundation</td>
<td>390,293</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Emergencies and disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis’s Leprosy Guild</td>
<td>379,886</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Africa, South America</td>
<td>Leprosy treatment and care programmes, social, economic and physical rehabilitation, leprosy training and education, medical elective projects related to leprosy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Joffe Charitable Trust</td>
<td>367,500</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Relief of poverty and human rights work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sylvia Adams Charitable Trust</td>
<td>360,700</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Kenya, Tazania, Uganda</td>
<td>Worldwide, the focus is on primary healthcare and health education, access to education, appropriate technology and community enterprise schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulverton Trust</td>
<td>352,300</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>East and South Africa</td>
<td>Education, conservation, agriculture; Peace and Humanitarian Support: peace intervention, infrastructure for disaster relief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help the Hospices</td>
<td>338,000</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Africa, India</td>
<td>Hospice and palliative care support and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Haramead Trust</td>
<td>335,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Children, social welfare, education, people with disabilities, homeless people, medical assistance, victims and oppressed people and religious activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS (£)</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>FOCUS – GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>FOCUS – THEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rowan Charitable Trust</td>
<td>314,000</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Overseas aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor Trust</td>
<td>306,130</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Sustainable agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverhulme</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Ghana, Tanzania</td>
<td>Research in agriculture (including animal health); water and sanitation; basic human health research (including medicinal chemistry); biodiversity (including medicinal plants and green chemistry) and energy (including renewables).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pears Foundation</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo; Ghana; Honduras; Nepal; Rwanda</td>
<td>International development, supporting Jewish organisations to address global issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zurich Community Trust</td>
<td>261,500</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Capacity-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Marm-Munning Trust</td>
<td>229,065</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Helping natural disaster victims; providing food and shelter to destitute people; supporting self-sustaining projects; providing educational support; and providing healthcare to poor people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ACT Foundation</td>
<td>222,500</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Brazil, India, Malawi</td>
<td>Relief of poverty, development, homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jephcott Charitable Trust</td>
<td>209,053</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Africa, developing countries</td>
<td>Health, population control, education, environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS (£)</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>FOCUS – GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>FOCUS – THEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ashmore Foundation</td>
<td>198,682</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>South America, Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, India</td>
<td>Support for education, health and social enterprise initiatives benefiting children, young people and vulnerable communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury Phoenix Trust</td>
<td>196,091</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Africa, Asia, India</td>
<td>HIV/AIDS awareness and education in the developing world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cadbury Foundation</td>
<td>191,400</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Education and enterprise projects in areas of deprivation. Health, welfare and environmental projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saga Charitable Trust</td>
<td>182,889</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Cambodia; India; Kenya; Namibia; Nepal; Peru; Romania; South Africa; Sri Lanka; St Lucia; Thailand; Zambia</td>
<td>Benefiting underprivileged communities at destinations in developing countries that host Saga holidaymakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Innocent Foundation</td>
<td>177,478</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>India, Bangladesh, East Africa, West Africa, Central and south America</td>
<td>Sustainable agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusthouse Charitable Foundation</td>
<td>171,800</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Health care, health education and community projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coltstaple Trust</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Relief of poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Adlington Cadbury Charitable Trust</td>
<td>165,330</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Africa; Asia; Eastern Europe; India; The Americas</td>
<td>Overseas: sustainable development projects predominantly in Africa. Social welfare, healthcare and environmental projects; Sustainable development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bromley Trust</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Human rights internationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilden Charitable Fund</td>
<td>119,490</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Community development, education and health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kiawah Charitable Trust</td>
<td>116,594</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Eastern Europe, Africa</td>
<td>Relief of poverty and sickness both nationally and overseas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS (£)</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>FOCUS – GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>FOCUS – THEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Gate</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Support for small scale environmental, technological and educational projects in developing countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The David Forrester Trust/ The Donald Forrester Trust</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Estelle Trust</td>
<td>108,467</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Community-based development, education, health and conflict resolution in Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Charles Hayward Foundation</td>
<td>107,800</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>India, Pakistan and Commonwealth countries of Africa</td>
<td>Sanitation, health education, disability, youth at risk, farming skills, income generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisbury Telegraph Trust</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Charities formed for the advancement of the Christian religion or the relief of poverty both in the UK and overseas, and charities working to conserve the natural world and retain its value for the benefit of this and future generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Puri Foundation</td>
<td>101,466</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>To relieve persons in particular citizens of the towns of Mullanpur, near Chandigarth and Ambala who are in conditions of need, hardship or distress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Freemasons’ Grand Charity</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>World development in the poorest countries (although not disaster relief); the environment, especially sustainable projects impacting climate change; child development especially psychological research and mental health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS (£)</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>FOCUS – GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>FOCUS – THEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief Fund for Romania Limited</td>
<td>91,720</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Support for children, the sick, the elderly and other groups in need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothworkers’ Foundation</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Emergency crisis relief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onaway Trust</td>
<td>78,490</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>India, Israel, Kenya, Nepal, Philippines, Uganda, Zimbabwe, South America</td>
<td>Support of indigenous peoples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Charitable Trust</td>
<td>71,858</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>South Africa; Africa: Kenya</td>
<td>Relief of poverty, development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Mercer Charitable Trust</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Advancement of education, promotion of medical and scientific research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Father O’Mahony Memorial Trust</td>
<td>62,207</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Asia, Africa and Eastern Europe.</td>
<td>Projects to support the poor in Asia, Africa and Eastern Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scott Bader Commonwealth Ltd</td>
<td>62,200</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Assistance of distressed and needy people of all nationalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C B and H H Taylor 1984 Trust</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>UK charities working overseas on long-term development projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H B Allen Charitable Trust</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Overseas aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alchemy Foundation</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Thirdworld water projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Trust for Education</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tinsley Foundation</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Developing countries, global</td>
<td>Human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R H Southern Trust</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Poverty relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scurrah Wainright Charity</td>
<td>41,160</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Zimbabwe and Southern Africa</td>
<td>Innovative work in the field of social reform, tackling root causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS (£)</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>FOCUS – GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>FOCUS – THEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Human rights, rural poverty and conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfield’s Edward Johnson Trust</td>
<td>31,370</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The William Leech Charity</td>
<td>30,427</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Medical, educational and environmental needs of children in underdeveloped countries, emergency aid in response to natural disasters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAINSBURY FAMILY CHARITABLE TRUSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS (£)</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FOCUS – GEOGRAPHY</th>
<th>FOCUS – THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Headley Trust</td>
<td>Included in SFCT figure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Anglophone Africa and Ethiopia</td>
<td>Water/sanitation, environment, education, literacy and healthcare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gatsby Charitable Foundation</td>
<td>Included in SFCT figure</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Africa (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi), Cameroon, Mozambique</td>
<td>Economic growth of key sectors, agriculture, financial sector development, innovation and technology transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The JJ Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Included in SFCT figure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Sustainable agriculture and community forestry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Staples Trust</td>
<td>Included in SFCT figure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Overseas development – projects which empower women, support the rights of indigenous people, improve shelter and housing, generate income in disadvantaged communities, and encourage sustainable agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ashden Trust</td>
<td>Included in SFCT figure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Community-based, sustainable technology projects that help people to help themselves in an environmentally sustainable way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS (£)</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>FOCUS – GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>FOCUS – THEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The True Colours Trust</td>
<td>Included in SFCT figure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Promoting and developing the palliative care sector for adults and children in sub-Saharan Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Monument Trust</td>
<td>Included in SFCT figure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>HIV / AIDS treatment and care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Indigo Trust</td>
<td>Included in SFCT figure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Information technologies in Africa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated annual average of current spending programme

**$9 million (£5.7m) committed to Chai project