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Purpose and Agenda

Purpose of workshop:
To review and strengthen the *Principles of Accountability for International Philanthropy* and craft strategies to make the document come alive in the philanthropic practice of our regions.

Agenda:
1. Welcome and introductions
2. Setting the scene
3. Plenary dialogue on the Principles
4. Small group brainstorm on key questions
5. Report-back in plenary
6. The Principles in relation to the ‘enabling’ or ‘disabling’ environment for philanthropy in our regions
7. How can we make the Principles come alive to improve accountability and development effectiveness?
8. Summary and thanks
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Welcome

Atallah Kuttab, Chair of the WINGS Advocacy and Leadership Committee, welcomed the participants on behalf of WINGS and its partners, the Council on Foundations (CoF) and the European Foundation Centre (EFC). He outlined the scope of the Committee which is to advocate for an enabling environment for philanthropy through a range of activities, identifying new trends, challenges and opportunities for philanthropy. The objective of the Cairo workshop is to gather global feedback on the *Principles of Accountability for International Philanthropy* document as well as WINGS’ work in promoting accountability more widely in the philanthropic sector. Atallah welcomed interested WINGS network members to become involved in the work of the WINGS Advocacy and Leadership Committee (those interested in joining should get in touch with him at akuttab@saaned.com).

Barbara Ibrahim, WINGS Board member and Director of the John D. Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Engagement in Cairo, welcomed colleagues from the WINGS network in the Arab and Africa regions, as well as other international partner organizations. She noted that Arab Foundations Forum (AFF) members met shortly after the Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions took place. Back then, the popular uprisings in the Arab world were the centre of discussion. However, some 20 months after the dramatic changes in the region began, we risk losing touch with the intentions of those who have struggled for change in the Arab region. There is a danger of falling back into the ‘old order of things’ and failing to deliver on a more accountable practice of governance and philanthropy. Now is a good moment to reflect on the issue of accountability, seizing the opportunities that have been thrown up by the democratic uprisings. We need to get back to basics and beyond the lofty rhetoric of the ‘Arab Spring’ to talk about real things: How can we deliver meaningful accountability and transparency to the people and societies we aim to serve? Who are we working for, and to whom are we accountable?
Overview of the Principles

Barry Smith, WINGS Facilitator, offered a brief background and overview of the Principles:

- Developed by a joint EFC/CoF working group, 2005 to 2007.
- Wide consultations with EFC/CoF members, networks and NGOs.
- A simple set of standards for international, cross-border philanthropy.
- Embrace a diversity of grantmakers.
- Complement codes of practice at national or regional level.
- A ‘living document’ subject to review and updating.
- In the context of the Global Philanthropy Leadership Initiative (GPLI), WINGS with EFC and CoF leading a global consultation to review and update the Principles.
- Process starts in Africa and the Arab region with mini-workshop in Cairo (Sept 2012).
- Follow-up one-day event scheduled in Johannesburg on 2 Nov 2012 (in conjunction with the African Grantmakers Network Assembly 2012).
- Further regional workshops/consultations planned as well as an online discussion forum and a possible tool kit/resource.
- The Principles are ‘an aspirational tool for international donors.’
- Fundamental principles for cross-border philanthropy.
- Illustrated by concrete ‘practice options’.
- Basic accountability question asked: ‘To whom is my organization responsible as it makes grants or develops projects across borders?’
What is ‘accountability?’

An obligation or willingness to take responsibility and account for one’s actions.
- Subject to giving an account.
- Explaining one’s conduct.
- The quality or state of being accountable.

‘Social accountability’ usually relies on civic and stakeholder engagement, i.e. a process in which partners, civil society organisations and citizens participate directly in securing accountability.
- ‘Social accountability can be distinguished from other forms of accountability because it requires the active participation of citizens.’

According to the Principles, accountability in practice reflects a commitment to:
- Uphold your core mission (integrity).
- Serve the public good as defined by national laws and international conventions (honour public trust).
- Engage and inform your stakeholders with respect to your intentions and decision-making processes (transparency, communication, access to information).
- Provide a mechanism for input and feedback from those affected (facilitating stakeholder and citizen voice, listening).
- Assure positive community impact through your grantmaking and operating activities (effectiveness, demonstrate results).
The Seven Core Principles

1. **Integrity**: Engage in line with and truthful to your mission, values, vision, and core competencies. Show that you are genuine in your intentions in all aspects (programmatic, operational, financial). Be honest and transparent with your stakeholders.

2. **Understanding**: Research and understand the context for your international philanthropy. Tap into existing expertise, including local knowledge, and develop a realistic, appropriate strategy.

3. **Respect**: Avoid cultural arrogance. Respect cultural differences and diversity. Recognize local knowledge, experience and accomplishments. Be modest about what you know, what you can accomplish with the resources you have, and what you have yet to learn. When visiting international grantees and partners, always keep in mind that you are a guest in someone else’s country.

4. **Responsiveness**: Listen carefully in order to understand and respond adequately to partners’ needs and realities. Be open and prepared to adjust your original objectives, timeline, and approach to the local context and capacity—resist the temptation to impose your own models or solutions. Build a relationship of trust with your grantees and partners and with the communities where you work.
The Seven Core Principles

5. **Fairness**: Be reasonable and flexible in requirements from partners, ensuring that your demands are proportionate to the level, purpose, and nature of your support. Be mindful of limited capacity to deal with multiple funders, and do not demand of them what you would not demand of yourself.

6. **Cooperation and Collaboration**: Recognize that international work calls for a high level of cooperation and collaboration among funders and with other actors, including NGOs, businesses, governments, and multilateral organizations. Work collaboratively to maximize resources, build synergies, boost creativity, and increase learning and impact.

7. **Effectiveness**: Assess the effectiveness of your international philanthropy by engaging in mutual learning with peers, grantees and partners. Demonstrate how your philanthropy contributes to the achievement of your mission and the advancement of the public good. Plan for sustainability and commit to staying long enough to be effective.
Good Accountability Practices

The Principles recommend the following good accountability practices (and illustrates them with practical examples):

1. Align your international philanthropy with your vision and mission.
2. Understand the context in which you operate.
3. Engage with others. Do not work in isolation.
4. Inform, listen, and respond.
5. Respect diversity, autonomy, and knowledge.
7. Ensure good governance.
8. Ensure good stewardship of philanthropic resources.
9. Assess, learn and share knowledge.
Good Practice Principles in Africa and the Arab Region

Barry located the *Principles* document in the wider context of existing Arab and Africa regions codes of conduct and good practice:

*Arab Foundation Forum (AFF) Principles of Good Practice*

- Good governance
- Legal compliance
- Anti-corruption
- Prudent management and finance
- Transparency
- Monitor, evaluate and assess impact
- Comply with good labour standards
- Uphold human rights
- Non-discrimination
- Environmental responsibility
- Social responsibility
- Cooperation
Good Practice Principles in Africa and the Arab Region

*East Africa Association of Grantmakers (EAAG) Code of Ethics*

- Use resources for social good
- Define mission, aims and programmes clearly and publically
- Maximum transparency
- Keep administrative costs to a reasonable minimum
- Publish regular reports on activities and finances
- Legal compliance (for both grantmakers and grantees)
- Clear decision-making, oversight and policies for grantmaking
- Avoid conflict of interest
- Ensure confidentiality
- Respect, tolerance and non-discrimination
Good Practice Principles in Africa and the Arab Region

CAFSA (Charities Aid Foundation Southern Africa) Code of Practice for Ethical and Effective Grantmaking

- Contribute to positive social change
- Adopt professional and effective approaches
- Work in partnership
- Cultivate mutual respect
- Be open and accessible
- Champion accountability
- Practice consistency
- Reflect and nurture diversity
The Development Effectiveness Debate

Barry highlighted links to the current global debate and process among actors in international aid and development around ‘development effectiveness’ arising from the *Paris Declaration* and subsequent high level meetings in Accra and Busan:

- A range of targets and commitments to increase ‘aid effectiveness’ and accountability (agreed by aid donors, developing countries, civil society and business leaders).
- Global civil society development coalitions pressing for a move from ‘aid effectiveness’ to ‘development effectiveness’.
- Development stakeholders are calling for a wider range of donors (both public and private) to held accountable – particularly to citizens in developing countries.
- Some official donors are failing to meet their *Paris Declaration* targets.
- Civil society argues that the fight against poverty requires greater transparency and accountability (re: development resources, investments and results).
- Key civil society concerns are:
  - Greater donor transparency
  - More access to information on resource flows
  - Better collaboration and partnerships
  - Enhanced beneficiary ‘voice’ and ownership
  - Ability to demonstrate impact and measure development results.
Plenary Feedback on the Principles

- There was a recommendation to develop detailed indicators for each principle, similar to the process with other global development and corporate social responsibility reporting systems. We should engage with stakeholders to get feedback and assessment on performance against the Principles and relevant indicators.

- The current Principles framework is very broad. It would be ideal if detailed indicators and supportive tools could be developed along with some initiative to start reporting against the Principles (to assess the levels of accountability).

- The Principles need to recognize the responsibility and accountability of grantees. ‘Grantmakers should not try to do what grantees should be doing (i.e. some aspects of the Principles may overlap with or encroach on grantee responsibilities)

- ‘The principles of Southern leadership and ownership of development process should be made more clear.’

- In regard to Principle Number 2 (Understanding), international foundations do not always respect local knowledge and expertise or the experiences of the people on the ground who have real-life experience of social and development issues addressed by philanthropy. Additionally, it would be useful to cite the importance of accessing local research and scholarship.
Plenary Feedback on the Principles

- Regarding the issue of local knowledge, there is a big issue with programme design and needs assessments in international giving. The situation on the ground is often not well understood by those designing international philanthropic interventions. At the same time, accessing and using local or indigenous knowledge can be a challenge – it is often ‘easier’ to just bring in an ‘expert’ (the Arab Social Sciences Research Institute in Lebanon is doing useful work on this issue).

- International funders often prefer to work with and through international organizations, even if local NGOs have capacity to work with funders. This means that local NGOs and civil society organizations (CSOs) are deprived of important opportunities for partnership, knowledge-sharing and experience. This is an issue that merits further discussion.

- On the issues of ownership and control, we need to ask questions like ‘accountability to whom?’ We maybe highly accountable to other formal philanthropy and development bodies or to governments, but we need to ask ourselves how accountability works at lower levels of the hierarchy. How can we become more accountable to communities and citizens?

- The Principles should be more clear about what ‘assessing positive impact’ means.

- We are good at developing ‘amazing documents and principles,’ but how can they be implemented? Tool kits and indicators to accompany such principles would be very helpful.
Plenary Feedback on the Principles

- The discussion of the Principles needs to be put into a context of power dynamics that are often hidden or not acknowledged as well as ‘personalized agendas’ in philanthropy, politics, etc.

- It is important to think about the impact that would be achieved by becoming more accountable. ‘You don’t get to say if you are accountable – others get to say that!’ The most useful thing we can do is to create mechanisms by which our constituents can hold us accountable (and not vice versa). We should try to answer questions about ‘what do we need to accountable for, when and how?’

- ‘To whom are these principles addressed?’: They are aimed primarily at actors in international and cross-border philanthropy.

- ‘Has there been any assessment of the application of these Principles) over the past five years?’: There has not been a formal assessment of the application of the Principles. The current global consultation led by WINGS in intended to get feedback on their relevance and strategies for making them more operational.

- John Harvey of CoF observed that the world has moved on since the Principles were developed. The philanthropy field has changed substantially. There has been significant growth of philanthropy in the emerging economies as well as in the fields of venture philanthropy, social entrepreneurship and other market-oriented approaches. International standards have been established to for community foundations. Perhaps it is time to take a stronger lead in widening and assessing accountability in international philanthropy.
Plenary Feedback on the Principles

- ‘There seems to be an unspoken assumption that all voices and relationships are equally important in accountability, or that an organization can hold itself accountable. This is inaccurate. If we are working for social change, as many philanthropists strive to do, there will be a conflict of interests. Assuming that one can be held accountable to all stakeholders when achieving social justice sounds unrealistic or untruthful. There will always be conflicting interests in the process of achieving social justice.’

- The theme of the recent CIVICUS World Assembly 2012 was ‘Making a New Social Contract.’ Many institutions of power in the world have lost ground and trust with citizens. We need to start rebuilding social trust at all levels – so the conversation about what it means to be accountable is timely and highly relevant to civil society, as well as the private and public sectors.

- ‘The lack of trust in current structures (philanthropic or not) stems from their lack of accountability. Thus accountability should not be a voluntary issue. It is about whether you are committed to become more accountable – if not, you should exit the field.’

- Keywords for building accountability should be ‘transparency, trust and relationships.’

- Given the growth of philanthropy in emerging economies, as well as cross-border giving in Africa and the Arab world (such as through the Southern Africa Trust, TrustAfrica and some Arab foundations), the Principles may become more important and relevant in building the enabling environment for South-South resource flows.
Plenary Feedback on the Principles

- ‘Perhaps we should not try to be equally accountable to all stakeholders. In social development and social change work, priority should be given to accountability to citizens and the most marginalized in society.’

- On the point about creating indicators for accountability, this is important and helpful. However, it would be hard to imagine a set of international principles that everyone can abide by and measure their performance against. There will be some common principles, but the implementation will differ based on each practitioner’s (or their organization’s) local context.

- Such principles of philanthropy are important and should be introduced to a wider audience of emerging philanthropy (such as venture philanthropy, impact investing, etc.).

- When we deal with the principle of ‘respect,’ it is certainly important to respect local culture. But sometimes we may be seeking to change local culture (such as mind sets and attitudes about health, gender, human rights, etc.). ‘So how can we respect something we want to change?’

- We need to recognize the difference between the general principles for philanthropy and codes of ethics. Codes of ethics maybe specified and further clarified based on a context or a regional situation. But these Principles are general and must apply to different contexts and situations. ‘They are just guidelines for how to address theories of change; they do not dictate the theories or models that are to be applied.’
Once we have agreed on the Principles, we need to ask the ‘So what?’ question. What process is required to apply the Principles and make a real difference in practice? We need to put in place mechanisms for feedback from key constituents. The Principles put into action should complement and connect with larger movements to build accountability, public trust in institutions, and active citizenship. ‘All international players and organizations have to re-earn trust.’

In the accountability discussion, there may be an unspoken assumption that we will treat everyone the same, but that is not reality nor how life works (or should work). If we are working to change society in important ways, that brings us into conflict with certain groups and individuals. We should put more value on those who are powerless and voiceless, or at least not the same value as those who have power. We need a ‘social justice framing’ of accountability. Conflict is part of change process and we can’t be equally accountable to everyone – we must be able to speak truth to practice.

‘Who uses these principles? Are the principles purely voluntary and advisory? Or should we move towards stronger reporting and compliance? We have an opportunity to move beyond giving comments and opinions every five years. That should include tools and processed for assessment of performance against the Principles.’

‘Lack of public trust and confidence is a result of weak accountability. If we practice accountability, we will build trust in the field of international philanthropy.’
Small Group Brainstorm

Workshop participants divided into smaller groups to discuss the following questions:

1. What do we want from this process and who are the Principles for?
   - How can the Principles best serve the philanthropy community in Africa and the Arab Region?
   - Who are the main audiences and stakeholders for the Principles (i.e. Northern donors, Southern grantmakers and partners, South-South philanthropy, citizens and communities, etc.)?

2. What is most valuable in the current Principles and what’s missing and needs to be included?
Small Group Feedback: Group 1

- The language of the *Principles* needs work. Some of the principles are too broad.
- Terms and language may need to be more precise to enable implementation.
- A glossary or guide to the meaning of terms would be useful.
- The *Principles* should be reviewed to remove any hint of ‘cultural arrogance.’
- The *Principles* tend to speak to accountability ‘in all places, in all directions.’ How can we make them a useful tool to build capacity in our organizations?
- As much as with philanthropic organizations, we need to make sure that CSOs and NGOs are accountable.
- We should go beyond consultation to action.
- In the process, we should be open to and encourage creativity and innovation in philanthropy and development.
- The *Principles* may be too narrow in their programmatic focus.
- The *Principles* should acknowledge diversity within countries – taking account of both local and international dimensions.
- We need more emphasis on understanding the role of power at all levels.
- Increase the focus on methodology and implementation: how to get to substance, spelling out ‘accountable for what, why, when and how.’
Small Group Feedback: Group 2

What do we want from the process?
- Frameworks for partnership.
- More clarity in complex relationships
- Openness to grantee/constituent feedback.
- Maximizing accountability of both donors and partners/grantees.
- More informed choices and decision-making for both donors and partners.

Who is our main audience?
- Cross-boundary and international donors.
- In-country partners.
- Official gatekeepers in funding relationships.

What is missing?
- Unbundle the meaning and practice of transparency.
- Indicators of accountability.
- More context (‘Who, what, when, how?’).
- How to institutionalize accountability.
- Tools to build strong relationships and trust.
- Good practices for accountability set out in a more dynamic way, allowing for performance measurement.
- We should move beyond principles toward practices of accountability.
Small Group Feedback: Group 3

What do we want from this process?

- The consultation process is an opportunity to ground the Principles more firmly in our operating context and to make a stronger link to assessment and action.
- The process will help to build alignment around values, inspiring grantmakers to act on these values.
- The process is exactly the kind of value-adding work that WINGS should be doing – it leverages and engages both the network and WINGS’ unique positioning.
- It would be useful to develop a glossary of terms as well as learning and implementation tools for grantmakers.
- The process should consider incentives, reporting and compliance mechanisms.
- The process will provide a focus for increase dialogue and collaboration among grantmakers and funders in our regions (including through use of online or social media platforms).

Who is our main audience?

- Foundations, grantmakers, corporate social investors, public and private sector development actors.

What is valuable or missing?

- Valuable: The Principles’ acknowledgment of the need for responsiveness and the value of local knowledge, capacity and culture.
- Missing: What does it mean for us in practice?
Plenary Discussion

- ‘Nobody ever put on their website, “It’s my way or the highway.” It’s not about talking the talk about accountability, it’s about walking the walk.’ If we want to build accountability we need to move from principles to practice. Thus it would be useful to explore questions of methodology and practical steps to be taken. The point is how to measure how well we are doing.

- It should be recognized that the costs of ensuring accountability can be significant. So we must figure in time and budgets to support accountability.

- There are particular problems with building accountability and transparency in societies divided by violent conflicts or suffering under state oppression. In such circumstances, the safety, security and confidentiality of grantees must be respected. Full public disclosure in such conditions may not be feasible or advisable.

- In societies where civil society organizations and philanthropy are not well understood or respected, some good practice certification program could help to attract resources and build more trust in the our sector. Such certification and self-regulation could encourage governments to reduce restrictive regulatory measures. Community foundations have invested in standard-setting and self-regulation as a way to prove to donors they are doing their job.
The Principles and the Enabling Environment for Philanthropy

Barry raised the question of how the Principles link to the ‘enabling’ or ‘disabling’ environment for philanthropy in Africa and the Arab Region. Can the Principles be used to strengthen advocacy work for a more enabling environment for civil society and philanthropy?

- Barbara Ibrahim of the Gerhart Centre in Cairo pointed out some of the contradictions in the enabling environment for philanthropy in the Arab region. While there are increasing cross-border flows of resources within the Arab world (some transparent and others not), some states in the region are erecting barriers for funding from the West. The irony is that some Arab governments continue to receive large amounts of Western funding for military and security spending. These contradictions need to highlighted.

- The Principles and GPLI efforts to set the scene for better cross-border and international giving may help to encourage more South-South funding and collaboration. In the Arab region, there are some internal institutional obstacles worthy of attention. As we try to ensure that we guard against corruption and nepotism, we may be adding extra layers and hurdles to our put grant application requirements. We need to avoid inflexibility, and excessively rules-bound grantmaking that tie our hands or stifle creativity and responsiveness.

- Publicizing and promoting cross-border giving shines a light for donors who are ‘new to the game’ on the opportunities and challenges they of funding in the Arab region and Africa. problems they are face. We can play a role in opening doors for new support and new ways of working across borders.
Halima Mahomed from TrustAfrica added a perspective on the enabling environment in sub-Saharan Africa. There are real issues about the legal and regulatory environment for civil society and philanthropy in African countries. In many countries, the environment is restrictive (and in some cases repressive) with few incentives for giving and philanthropy. Some countries have a regulatory regime which gives some legal space for philanthropic and civil society structures but which is restrictive around programme focus and content, sources of funding, etc. In a few countries (like South Africa, Mauritius and Kenya), the environment is more supportive or is improving.

However, in general there is a worrying trend towards closing down civic space and limiting basic rights of assembly, expression, freedom of information and freedom of association. How do we deal with this threat?

While overall the regulatory environment for philanthropy in Africa is not particularly conducive to international philanthropy (an in some cases actively restricts foreign funding of CSOs), in practice African cross-border grantmakers like the Southern Africa Trust and TrustAfrica have been able to facilitate civil society funding across borders in a transparent, accountable way.

Despite government suspicions, political posturing and interference in relation to foreign funding, it is best to be open, transparent and accountable when engaged in cross-border giving. Only through accountable, transparent funding and reporting can we hope to build trust and engage with governments to improve the enabling environment.
The Principles and the Enabling Environment for Philanthropy

- The *Principles* may be useful in advocacy with governments to improve the national and international enabling environment for philanthropy. For example, when meeting with governments actors in international and local philanthropy could cite the *Principles* as a good practice guide for accountability. The *Principles* could provide talking points or a platform to in dialogue with decision-makers and policy makers about a more open, supportive framework for civil society and philanthropy – in both national and cross-border contexts.

- John Harvey of CoF supported the inclusion of the *Principles* advocacy tools to improve the regulatory environment. He informed the group about follow-up initiatives arising from the Global Philanthropy Leadership Initiative: a paper exploring what ‘ideal’ laws and environments would look like for cross-border giving (for both ‘giving’ and ‘recipient’ countries); and an ‘Index for Cross-Border Giving’ which ranks countries by the ease of their legal and fiscal requirements for giving/receiving cross-border funds. These tools are intended to be useful for further advocacy, networking and collaboration.

- Atallah Kuttab observed that while facilitating cross-border funding flows for non-profit activities is often challenging, there are far fewer obstacles to for-profit funding flows. With the growth of more market-oriented forms of philanthropy and social investment, as well as ‘hybrid’ philanthropic organizations that mix non-profit and for-profit approaches (such as micro-finance), we should keep an eye on emerging space for innovative mechanisms for international resource flows.
Summing Up and Next Steps

How can we make the Principles come alive to improve accountability in our regions?

- If we sign up to principles for international philanthropy, we should consider making our commitments public and encourage others to follow suit.
- Overall, the Principles are sound, but some of the language needs clarification and refinement. The global consultation process may suggest some additional content, and we should explore ways to move from principles to practice.
- In marketing the Principles, it might be helpful to develop and include illustrative narrative examples of grants that go wrong because they don’t follow these kind of principles ('tell more compelling stories').
- Participants were keen to pursue possibilities and strategies to get buy-in for, and application of, the Principles on the ground among our networks and organizations.
- More work is needed to think through use of the Principles for building accountability on the ground. Who looks after the interests of the beneficiary?
- The Principles have relevance as a touchstone for both domestic and international fundraising.
- The workshop explored creative ways to implement and monitor the principles. Grantee feedback mechanisms, such as those developed by Keystone Accountability and SAANED, could be useful tools to learn from and test further in our regions.
- At the follow-up WINGS workshop in Johannesburg on 2 Nov 2012, it may be useful to include a ‘thought experiment’ in which participants draw on their experience to picture what a truly accountable philanthropy organization would look like – i.e. what real-life approaches, tools and implementation strategies contribute to success in accountability? Since there is no single magic tool or ‘silver bullet,’ we should rather share our experiences, be innovative and assemble a range of practical tools and resources.
Summing Up and Next Steps

- We should be practical, focused and realistic about next steps. We should use the WINGS consultation process to raise more issues explore options for putting the *Principles* into action.
- In the process, we should demonstrate true accountability, model creativity and build on the resources already available in the room.
- There was strong support for developing an assessment mechanism to improve practice around the *Principles*.
- Organizations and colleagues will ultimately best understand and embrace the *Principles* through relationships and practice.
- This workshop and the on-going process is a good space for us to add our voice to the *Principles*. We should feature the *Principles* and the WINGS consultation process at the African Grantmakers Network Assembly in Johannesburg (30 Oct -1 Nov 2012).
- We should consider the applicability and use of the *Principles* these not just for cross-border giving but also for domestic grantmaking.
- There were suggestions from the group to take advantage of our regional networks in Africa and the Arab region, building support for the *Principles* and testing them in practice over a two year trial period.
- The boards of our organizations should be engaged in the process – invite some board members the Johannesburg workshop.
- It would be useful to amplify citizen voice and engagement in this process. We could explore surveys and other tools for engaging citizens.
- We need to be careful about ‘name and shame’ approaches to accountability as we are seeking to persuade and not to punish.
- While being practical, we should also be aspirational – ‘Lets push the boundaries wherever possible.’
Close and Thanks

The workshop closed with thanks to all participants, resource people and facilitators. Special thanks to our hosts, the Arab Foundations Forum and the Gerhart Centre for Philanthropy and Civic Engagement, to the WINGS staff and Board, and to our partners, the European Foundation Centre and the Council on Foundations.