

Written Evidence from the South West International Development Network on Racism in Aid

July 2021

South West International Development Network

The South West International Development Network (SWIDN) is a broad network of like-minded people working in International Development and based in the South West. We are made up of organisations, consultants, academics and researchers. SWIDN is just over 5 years old and grew organically from a small team of individuals aspiring to create a space where joined-up thinking and learning happens locally. We value collaboration, shared learning and peer support.

We have a membership of approximately 150 organisations and individuals, and a broader network of 950 organisations and individuals. Our network includes a wide range of small charities and we broadly categorise these as having an income under £500,000.

Following the invitation from the International Development Committee to contribute to this inquiry, we have sought the views and experiences of small organisations in our network and represent these in our spoken and written evidence. In preparation for our submissions,¹ we gathered evidence from our network through one-to-one interviews and an anonymous online survey. We also consulted with our peer organisations² who similarly work with small organisations and we sought qualitative data from across the spectrum of our network. We specifically did not seek personal identifying data in order to encourage candid and truthful findings. As such, we cannot disaggregate our findings any further than we have done so.

¹ It should be noted that we had 2.5 weeks to gather evidence and present the views of our network, and one of these was the school half term week. Many small charities rely on voluntary workers and term times therefore this was a challenging task we took in good faith. If we had sufficient time we would have preferred to do extensive and systematic research including a focus group discussions with small charities in the South West, UK and the public that supports small charities for their international work.

² We are grateful to our friends at Hub Cymru Africa and the Small International Development Charity Network, among others, for their input and support.

As a collective, we are not a homogenised community that always thinks alike. Neither does SWIDN represent the views of all our network members or speak on their behalf. We draw on the data collected from those who took the online survey or responded to the one-to-one invitation to share their relevant experiences and perspectives. Where we make recommendations, these are on behalf of the SWIDN secretariat and our Board of Trustees only and do not reflect the individual views of our network.

We also recognise that we are all on a journey, and that some of the roots of our sector may have racist practices and attitudes. This change requires a process of learning and unlearning. It also demands recognition, time and a commitment to change. While championing change, we also see it is vital that we don't contribute to existing polarisation and isolate those who have yet to recognise the need for this journey in their work. We value building solidarity and see it as critical in tackling racism. We recognise that addressing racism can be divisive and, while the experiences of racism belong only to those who live in black and brown bodies, we are united in the shared pain that racism causes. We respectfully invite those in our network and in our sector more broadly to begin this journey with courage, patience, and good will.

A Note on Terminology

For the purposes of this inquiry we have mirrored the language used in the framing and questions from the International Development Committee. However, we include in our evidence the view that language itself plays a significant role in reinforcing racist concepts and we encourage the committee to engage with the recent thinking about language e.g. the document *Taking British politics and colonialism out of our language* produced by Bond (May 2021).

1. What does it mean for an International Development Organisation to be actively anti-racist?

- 1.1. We are encouraged to see that many of our network are beginning to take steps on the journey to becoming anti-racist. However, our research showed that this is not the majority. For many small organisations, they lack the resources and support to operate beyond essential activities unless required to do so. For an organisation to recognise the need to engage in the process of becoming actively anti-racist, donors

and thought-leaders in the sector must ensure this is a requirement of funding and create the space, including resources, required.

1.2. We have found that, amongst our network, small international development organisations who have started on the journey towards becoming anti-racist are those who openly recognise the roots of development as being in colonialism, and who are taking actions to tackle the same imbalance of power that remains in our development practices today. Examples of actions organisations are taking to become actively anti-racist include:

- 1.2.1. Actively creating time and space for conversations around racism, recognising that racism is structural and widespread and can be discrete; that while we may think of ourselves as antiracist, people can still have racist experiences in our organisations and we need to be actively looking out for this and addressing it;
- 1.2.2. Seeking out our colleagues, partners, and community members who may experience racism; having the courage to understand the truth of individual experiences and recognising where and how this happens;
- 1.2.3. Actively learning and unlearning our unconscious bias; understanding how our own work can play a role in shifting power, addressing this in teams and working cultures who are based in the UK through staff training and follow-up steps to implement and measure change;
- 1.2.4. Establishing working groups/ reading groups internally within organisations to address racism and inequality, both in organisational governance but also in programme delivery, in partnerships and collaborative relationships;
- 1.2.5. Auditing policies and processes for historical and unconscious bias, including the absence of policies related to diversity or biased recruitment processes - such as a reliance on volunteers and unpaid interns – that indirectly excludes people from underrepresented communities joining the sector;
- 1.2.6. Auditing programmes, including how these are designed, community participation and decision-making in relation to their delivery;
- 1.2.7. Establishing working standards, such as committing to host diverse panels at events; recognising the intellectual or contextual knowledge contributions of diaspora or professionals from underrepresented communities with appropriate remuneration;

- 1.2.8. Challenging assumptions, double-standards and discriminatory processes that results in experiences of racism by communities in lower income countries;
 - 1.2.9. Facilitating a dignified, trust-based practice alongside communities in which work happens.
 - 1.2.10. Furthermore, some trust funds are actively engaging in anti-racist activities, including auditing governance structures, improving their all-white boards to improve representation; amplifying the benefit of diverse board.
- 1.3. For small charities, that essential space for self-reflection and innovation is best created and maintained by supportive funding structures that allow time and resources for this process. Small charities often do not have the flexibility of staff time or the financial resources to engage in capacity development. The process of change within small charities can be slower because of the lack of resources, but can also be more impactful where self-scrutiny may feel safer in smaller groups and small organisations can arguably be more agile, decisive and relational due to their flat structure.

2. What actions have organisations taken to shift the power to communities, organisations and authorities in the countries where programmes are delivered?

- 2.1. We recognise the imbalance of power where our sector is divided between 'givers' and 'receivers', 'donors' and perceived 'beneficiaries'. This upholds a top-down approach to development interventions and this conceptualisation reinforces existing power imbalances. Certain measures such as community participation and beneficiary feedback may appear tokenistic and perhaps further exploitative, when the power to fund or not, how to do so and the data required in return, remains firmly with donors, funding organisations and fund managers. If we want true transformation, we need to recognise our limitations and the need for mutuality and a reversal of power.
- 2.2. There are examples of how UK NGOs are addressing this head on. For example ActionAid have adopted "Feminist Principles" which all staff are expected to commit to working towards in all aspects of their work. These "Feminist Behaviours" provide strong leadership on how individuals can work towards addressing power imbalances in day to day work. This is acknowledged as work in progress.

- 2.3. In relation to funding of NGOs and CSOs, there is a trend towards more progressive donors being prepared to “de-restrict” their grant making, shifting the donor-grantee relationship power dynamics, and introducing an element of genuine partnership and trust.
- 2.4. Amongst those small organisations who recognise this systemic power imbalance, many are willing to listen and learn. These are beginning to take steps to shift the power to communities, local organisations, national experts and authorities in the countries in which programmes are delivered. Examples from amongst our network include:
 - 2.4.1. deliberately investing in national partner organisations, at the expense of capacity in the UK;
 - 2.4.2. moving the balance of power so that country partners identify and design programmes that their UK counterparts then seek to fund, rather than the reverse which has historically been the case. (In theory this redistribution of power should work, but the availability and often the requirements of UK donors don’t support a location of power within communities in which programmes are delivered);
 - 2.4.3. actively encouraging the recruitment of qualified local staff into roles in countries in which programmes are implemented;
 - 2.4.4. creating more equitable collaboration by partnering with and being led by national development experts, having greater engagement with local communities and increased participation in evaluations and their results;
 - 2.4.5. creating clear procedures for complaints and feedback and engaging communities on these processes;
 - 2.4.6. establishing community-led safeguarding policies that support and empower local referral systems;
 - 2.4.7. seeking the feedback of in-country colleagues about their experiences of power within organisations and the sector, and their recommendations for addressing this;
 - 2.4.8. reimbursing communities for their time in providing data to satisfy donors’ monitoring and evaluation requirements;
 - 2.4.9. designing programmes and their delivery with intersectionality at their core, and adjusting both against the advice and expertise of community members who are underrepresented;

- 2.4.10. seeking to build mutually trust-based partnerships within the communities they work with;
- 2.4.11. inviting colleagues from their partner organisations to high level meetings with donors to encourage equal partnerships.

3. Why have the changes needed to shift the power in the aid sector in the UK been so slow to be implemented?

- 3.1. The concept of aid is problematic in itself; arguably, the philosophy of aid is premised on hierarchy. At the macro level, aid is inherently paternalistic and the power dynamic of donor and recipient upholds this imbalance. Innovations are happening but systemic changes are slower, and the paternalistic way of thinking and practices hinders progress.
- 3.2. Reframing the concept of 'aid' as 'reparations' could help shift power quickly. As a sector, we haven't yet engaged in this debate and we see minimal shifts amongst individuals and organisations towards doing so. Aid is still considered as a 'gift' rather than a question of justice and the fundamental right of communities in lower income countries. The term 'aid' itself reinforces this view. This shift is critical to the way we view development activities but the shift has been slow - or is yet to start at all - because the issues are so entrenched and the political will is lacking. Reparative justice on a macro scale would be far more effective in achieving global equality if we are serious about a system that achieves this.
- 3.3. A reparative justice approach holds an even broader promise of global solidarity for the fair sharing of challenges from the climate crisis and its implication for communities who are affected the most despite being least contributors. We must openly engage in conversations that rethink aid as reparations and have the courage and motivation to do so.
- 3.4. We see the need for a public acknowledgement of systemic racism by high level actors in our sector. We envisage an opportunity for the FCDO to foreground the journey for UK based charities through such an acknowledgement and follow up actions. We view this acknowledgement as being critical to the implementation of good change in our sector. The issue of racism in aid will not be challenged if we are unable to acknowledge and discuss it at all levels. Fear around terminology, shame or judgement from others can prevent these learning discussions. Acknowledging systemic inequalities can create a sense of shared experience amongst individuals and

organisations that unites us in tackling racism together and encourages our shared learning journey. Otherwise the burden is on the bravery of individuals to address racism on a micro level and this will always be slower and more costly.

- 3.5. The low-risk appetite of funders and larger organisations does not facilitate change or movement towards change. Rather, it translates into bureaucratic, time-consuming and detail-intensive reporting requirements that exclude smaller organisations or those with fewer resources. Such inflexible and complex requirements continue to enable those with power to maintain their power, and those without privilege are excluded from accessing opportunities that could redress the existing imbalance.
- 3.6. Many smaller NGOs have innovative ways of doing things and are pursuing change in their partnerships, but their contribution to a shift towards change remains small-scale and generally invisible to the broader development community. Innovative, considered and accessible funding systems including for small charities could accentuate the change needed to shift power.

4. How do the working practices of the FCDO and other donors influence the work undertaken by development organisations to combat racism either positively or negatively?

- 4.1. Donors are the single biggest driver of change in our sector. Without a shift in donor focus to addressing racism, any change will be slow and fragmented. It is funders who determine how money is spent, but also how time is spent and the priorities of organisations. Unless the FCDO actively and publicly engage in a process of becoming anti-racist and require organisations who receive Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) to do the same, meaningful change will not happen in our sector.
- 4.2. The FCDO in particular uphold the philosophy of aid as a gift of tax-payers money in the language they use and in the processes and systems they operate. Managing risk and demonstrating value for money are current strategic priorities. If tackling inequality or shifting power to lower income communities were alternative priority areas, this would undoubtedly enable positive change in the sector.
- 4.3. The recent cuts in ODA funding by the FCDO, the manner in which they occurred - without collaboration or sufficient consultation - reflect a recent example of a top-down, donor-centered approach to development in which the donor has excessive power and there are limited processes of accountability. It denies communities

whose lives are directly impacted the basic respect and opportunity to have a say in how such decision-making affects them and ways to address this. Those in our network highlighted their experiences and sense of helplessness themselves as an organisation due to the FCDO decision to cancel on signed contracts. They are shocked by the sudden withdrawal of funding that had been previously awarded, in the manner in which budget cuts were communicated through last-minute, bit by bit, incomplete directives and through the absence of any space to query the details, the consequences or possible contingencies.

- 4.4. One of the ways to tackle racism in the aid sector is to recognise the role small charities and the diaspora play in building equal partnerships and to fund this. Small organisations often have agility, drive and extensive contextual insight. They also enjoy trusted, community-based, longstanding relationships that enable them to achieve effective change at a faster pace, albeit smaller in scale. Since the recent cuts in ODA to the Small Charities Challenge Fund (SCCF) and Community Partnership grants, small charities and diaspora-led small organisations in the UK now have no access to any new FCDO funding.
- 4.5. For small charities as well as large, the preparation involved before an FCDO grant is awarded can amount to hundreds of hours of staff time, including from community partners, which the charity themselves must fund. The cuts therefore are not simply an absence of future progress, they have resulted in significant cost and undermined long established trust-based relationships between UK based NGOs and local partners.
- 4.6. The cuts to ODA by the FCDO contribute to racism in the aid sector through the disproportionately negative impact on the lives of black and brown people. The failure of any contingency planning for the devastating impact of the cuts on the lives and livelihoods of communities affected - who are overwhelmingly people of colour in lower income countries - is a further evidence of the power imbalance and its consequences.
- 4.7. Furthermore, many small charities within our network have told us of the devastating loss of trust these cuts have resulted in between small charities and the communities in which they work. These are partnerships that have taken years to build and grow and were done so on previous DFID principles of sustainability, value for money and partnerships. One of our members told us that the: *"Aid cuts send a shocking message that we do not care about the poorest - we are dealing with*

the realisation that we have the impacts of colonialism, the injustice that there is, and to take the funding away shows a gigantic lack of understanding and racism.”

- 4.8. As one of our members has said, we would like to see the FCDO ‘*make funding conditional on a demonstrable and sufficient effort to localise power and control over programmes, and to look at ways to provide increased support for national southern partners to fund work directly.*’

5. What role does the FCDO fee rate structures play in determining pay scales in locally hired and internal staff?

- 5.1. The FCDO sets standards for the sector in the UK, and these are reflected in their funding arrangements. These standards, combined with the drive for value for money and the squeeze on full cost recovery, reinforces inequalities and exaggerates hierarchy. This is the experience of our members.
- 5.2. The drive for value for money in grants and tenders, the squeeze on full cost recovery, and the lack of mechanisms for unrestricted funding of all NGOs, including smaller ones, means that salaries in budgets are pushed to market rates (e.g. one of the organisations we spoke to said that in following FCDO guidance the salary of the UK staff member was 10 times that of their national counterpart). This usually has the effect of reinforcing inequities in pay between the staff of local partners, those of locally hired NGO staff, and those of international staff. It can also put an inordinate amount of pressure on the time of all staff. We observe that the FCDO pay structures are widely replicated across our sector and upheld as perceived good practice. The role the FCDO fee rate structures play, therefore, is also to act as a guide across organisations of all sizes in our sector. We urge the FCDO to recognise their important role in this regard and commit to undertaking a full audit of their pay structures to assess the impact of these using a race and gender lens.

6. Are there challenges in tendering and bidding processes in FCDO contracts that might prevent equitable working practices?

- 6.1. The bidding processes used by FCDO for the small charities challenge fund, and the community partnership grants (both aimed at smaller NGOs) are disproportional, stringent and demanding. Without insight into the board make-up and how it accounts for bias in decision-making or transparent communications on criteria and

the success rate for funding, it is difficult for us to comment. However, even once organisations have had their project proposals accepted, they and their partners face some very in-depth due diligence requirements. These can be a major barrier to smaller organisations applying for FCDO funding, and those that do, find that the time required can take them away from the day-to-day programmatic focus of their work.

- 6.2. We are seeing an increase in large tenders for commercial contracts as a funding modality for the FCDO. Smaller NGOs would like to see the FCDO continue to recognise the challenges and disadvantages this modality has on local partners, on smaller NGOs, and we believe this would be part of addressing the question of the extent to which processes and systems used in ODA funding challenge, or reinforce, existing power relationships.
- 6.3. Once funding is finally secured, the reporting and accountability requirements are also very involved and time consuming. The processes do not reflect the principles of trust and partnership with partners in lower income countries. They are onerous in terms of time and are not appropriate for smaller organisations and their partners that are working closely with communities.
- 6.4. DFID (now FCDO) had taken steps to even the playing field between NGOs and private consultancy firms in tendering for contracts. However it continues to be the larger private consultancy firms, with many years of experience and heavily resourced, that continue to be successful. Larger, well-resourced NGOs have made some inroads. However, while smaller-medium sized NGOs may be invited by consortium leads to sub-contract, they are often financially disadvantaged in such arrangements because of their lack of commercial experience, and the required systems and approaches to bid for tenders.

7. What challenges do organisations face to make the necessary changes in their working culture?

- 7.1. We hear from our network that one of the main challenges to making changes to working culture is having the time, capacity and resources to make these necessary changes, particularly with the donor pressures of project-based work for small organisations. Donors have the ability to change this by including EDI frameworks within grants.

- 7.2. To make real, meaningful change what is often needed is for people in senior positions of power to recognise their own complicity. It is hard to change these existing power dynamics.
- 7.3. Organisations that make efforts to establish equality, inclusion and diversity (EDI) committees often do so in structures that operate outside formal governance. Any efforts to become anti-racist must be embedded in organisational structures and represented at governance levels where the power lies. Change will be slow if roles with the responsibility of EDI are not included in high-level decision-making in their organisations.
- 7.4. Just as SWIDN is not representative of a homogenous sector of organisations and individuals, we see that one of the many challenges in addressing the working culture of our sector is the narrative around a homogenous 'Global South'. Each country has its own identity, traditions, value system and culture, as well as its own shared experiences of marginalisation and exclusion. We see the homogenisation of lower income countries into the overarching concept of the 'Global South' unhelpful and instead suggest a context-sensitive approach.

8. What actions have organisations taken to modify their communication strategies, storytelling, and images used in order to challenge the 'white saviour' narrative?

- 8.1. Much of the language we use around development issues reinforces colonial power imbalances and contributes to the implicit racism in international development today. For example, language that portrays communities in lower income countries as 'beneficiaries' rather than actors with their own agency, reinforces the role of communities as recipients and undermines the expectation of an equal partnership. We hear from our network that the move away from such language is challenged by donor attitudes and public understanding.
- 8.2. Many organisations, both large and small, feel under pressure to maximise the opportunity of their storytelling to generate funds. This reliance on an emotional response from the supporting public is made far worse by an unreliable and highly demanding donor landscape that suits larger charities over smaller ones.
- 8.3. Many in our network have found that the greatest response by supporters is to emotive language that tells a human story, rooted in the narrative of deficit and vulnerability. Challenging this model is a huge risk, especially for small charities who

may lack financial reserves and rely on public support. We recognise the complicity in our sector in the deficit framing and the failure to move forward in constructing a true and reflective narrative that invites donors to a more nuanced understanding, and thereby a journey towards anti-racism. We recognise the value of this important inquiry and its potential in creating space and motivation to challenge this narrative.

- 8.4. We hear from some in our network that they do not raise funds using deficit-based, one dimensional stories; that they seek to be fair and considerate, for example advocating for standards in communication using photography and promoting principles for how they would like their own children to be portrayed when doing so in relation to children in lower income communities. We see this is a slow shift in conceptualising the stories of communities but we are seeking to encourage and equip this where we can.

9. To what extent do the FCDO and other donors demonstrate a commitment to equity and justice in the way that they operate?

- 9.1. DFID enjoyed a good reputation within the sector as being committed to, and driving culture change in relation to equity and justice. An example given is the commitment to addressing sexual exploitation and abuse. However, there is early evidence that the direction of travel of the FCDO might be countering equity and justice, for example, FCDO do not practice the same principles of transparency and openness as espoused by the former DFID department, and have not met the standards required by the UK Governments' aid partners.
- 9.2. Within our network of small charities, we have seen funds being awarded by FCDO to larger, more corporate charities rather than smaller, diaspora-lead organisations whose links with and knowledge of the community are far greater. The sense from amongst our network is that funds are awarded against the design of log frames, strict organisational scrutiny, and the existence of complex risk registers; they are not awarded against the risks themselves, where programmes that are community-designed and led are far more likely to achieve real and effective change.
- 9.3. We'd like to see appropriate funding reinstated for smaller charities, including measures to level the field of funding competition and promotes an equitable partnership approach that enables community-lead programmes to drive change.

10. Do you think the cuts to the UK aid budget will have a detrimental impact on the efforts of UK aid organisations to increase diversity and inclusion in their organisations?

- 10.1. We feel strongly that the cuts to the UK aid budget will have a detrimental impact on the efforts of UK aid organisations of all sizes to address racism in international development. We see this in two ways: the material absence of finances that could fund capacity building and organisational resourcing including for anti-racist activities; and the shrinking space for aid within the UK that these cuts have facilitated. The withdrawal of promised funds from life-saving projects, the decision to do so in the middle of a global pandemic, and the disregard towards tackling global inequality not only shrinks the space for operating, but for operating well.
- 10.2. Anti-racist capacity building initiatives such as training, organisational audits, resourcing good practice and other processes of learning require funding for them to happen. By reducing ODA, the FCDO have removed the resources of many organisations to meaningfully address racism. We consider the ODA cuts to have disrupted the journey towards anti-racism.
- 10.3. The nature of the cuts (lacking transparency, made in the complete absence of dialogue with the sector) have also sent a message to the global community that is "a manifestation of racism", and which undermines trust. Voices from our network told us, *"The eroded trust has been interpreted by many of our partners to be indicative of a racist approach to government spending and reveals the government's conviction that aid is an 'extra' rather than a central responsibility of the UK as a world leader and given its own colonial history. It will take years, and immediate renewed funding, to rebuild this trust."*
- 10.4. To have withdrawn the funding from NGOs, with such short notice, and to have not proceeded with grants that were awaiting sign off to start this year, reflects a disregard for the principles of value for money, partnership, equity, that FCDO have in the past espoused.
- 10.5. The impact of the cuts also affects NGOs efforts towards diversity and inclusion: without appropriate funding it will be difficult to promote internships and programmes that aim to widen participation in the sector from underrepresented communities, as organisations navigate the financial pressure and make cuts from their existing programmes.

Recommendations

The recommendations presented below represent actions the sector and its donors can collectively take to address racism in international development. However, real change in international development demands genuine commitment to rethink global development and the power within in its entirety. Global aid architecture is evidently entwined with the politics and power relations that shape the trajectory of countries with less economic power. This needs rethinking. A shift in an approach towards a just structure and system, and mechanisms such as debt cancellation, lifting trade barriers and making trade work for the poorest are far more beneficial than the amount of often conditional financial aid offered.

a) We ask the FCDO and the UK Government to open meaningful dialogue within the civil society sector around tackling racism and the philosophy of aid that upholds a racist approach.

We recommend the FCDO promote research and dialogue around the philosophy of aid, and the legacy of colonialism. We encourage the UK Government to meaningfully engage with the ideas of reparative justice and to create space for others to do the same through funding for research, innovative solutions and meaningful debate.

We recommend the UK Government consider the appointment of a spokesperson to champion an equitable philosophy of aid and to hold the FCDO to account on meaningful actions towards becoming anti-racist.

b) We ask the FCDO to lead by example, undertaking a full audit of their processes and systems through a race and gender lens.

We highlight the leadership role the FCDO play in setting an example of perceived best practice within our sector. We ask the FCDO to lead by example and commit to equality, diversity and inclusion standards and policies that are informed by a full audit

of their system, and that can act as best practice standards across our sector, including for the donor community. Similarly, we urge the FCDO to fund the creation of best practice guidelines appropriate to small and large organisations on becoming anti-racist.

We recommend that the FCDO consider within their audit their use of language around the conceptualisation of aid. Further, we urge the UK Government to explore a shift in their approach towards aid as reparative justice by engaging with UK and global experts in reparative justice for considered, formalised and accountable guidance.

c) We ask the FCDO and other donors to fund capacity building for UK based organisations to tackle racism in their organisations policies and practices.

Engaging in a process of becoming anti-racist requires time and resources. Organisations in our sector - both large and small - require incentivisation, accountability and resources (including funding) to ensure this journey begins. Flexible contingency budget lines can allow for small charities to address capacity building issues such as internal audits on racism and accessibility. Donors and thought-leaders in the sector could shift the focus of our sector by adding these as core requirement of funding and by creating the space and resources required for dialogue and action.

d) We ask the FCDO to recognise the role small charities play in building equal partnerships, to facilitate and fund this.

Small NGOs and diaspora-led organisations have agility, drive, and extensive contextual insight, often with trusted community-based, longstanding relationships. Creating a mechanism and processes for knowledge transfer from these to inform large scale practices will be beneficial. We ask the Government to recognise the significant contribution made by small charities in the UK to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and to reinstate accessible, appropriate funding to small charities within the year.

e) We ask the FCDO to evaluate the current funding models and to consider new, anti-racist and innovative models that redress the balance of power.

We ask the FCDO to pioneer new and innovative funding models that redress the imbalance of power, including making funding conditional on a demonstrable and sufficient effort to shift power to lower income communities, models of unrestricted funding that can be truly community-led, and models that fund national southern partners directly and appropriately. Innovative funding models must be accessible to small organisations, including diaspora-led organisations within the UK.

The analysis of data and this document was prepared by Dr Tigist Grieve, Ms Hannah Doornbos, Ms Rachel Haynes, and Ms Jessie Greenwood with input from SWIDN Board of Trustees.