LOCAL VOICES, GLOBAL BAN

HOW SMALL GRANTS TO CAMPAIGNERS CAN CONTRIBUTE TO GLOBAL CHANGE

CHRIS STALKER, NOVEMBER 2008
The Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund continues the Princess’ humanitarian work in the UK and overseas. By giving grants to organisations, championing charitable causes, advocacy, campaigning and awareness raising, the Fund works to secure sustainable improvements in the lives of the most vulnerable people in the UK and around the world.
FOREWORD BY UMARBEK PULODOV

Umurbek Pulodov is one of the Ban Advocates and received a grant under the Local Voices, Global Ban scheme. The Ban Advocates are a group of individuals who have been personally affected by cluster munitions. Umurbek spoke at a Reception held by the Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund during the Dublin Diplomatic Conference on Cluster Munitions (May 2008). The involvement of cluster munitions survivors has been a particular strength of the campaign to ban cluster munitions. Umurbek describes what he did with the grant in his own words:

“In the Ban Advocates project, we received training to learn how to effectively lobby [government] delegates, by simulating negotiations. This was a funny game for us to play amongst ourselves, each of us taking on the role of the delegates; there was simply nothing we could say when faced with a victim asking how weapons that have such unacceptable impacts on human lives can still be used. At that moment, we all realised we have the right to ask this question of the delegates.

Recently, we organised a roundtable in Rasht Valley in Tajikistan, where I was injured myself. Rasht Valley is a mountainous area in the North of Tajikistan where about 90,000 people live. That is where most of the cluster munitions were dropped. The roundtable included participants from local government, deminers, the United Nations, the media and the Tajikistan Campaign to Ban Landmines. All of them agreed on the need for a strong treaty and hundreds of people from the valley signed petitions calling for a ban on cluster munitions. We in Tajikistan need this treaty. People from Rasht Valley, like many people from affected communities around the world, said to us that this treaty was very important for them. During the roundtable, an old man came to me. He had lost his leg because of a cluster bomb and his daughter had many injuries also. He told me that he wanted cluster munitions to be banned. He also said that he hoped the victims from Rasht Valley would receive assistance thanks to the Convention on Cluster Munitions.

After the Dublin Conference, I was supported by Local Voices, Global Ban to continue my work in Tajikistan. My project, in cooperation with Tajikistan Mine Action Centre and NGO Harmony of the World is aimed to raise public awareness about cluster munitions in Tajikistan, encourage government to sign the Oslo Treaty in December this year, and be more actively involved in clearance of cluster munitions affected regions. During our field work in affected areas of Tajikistan we also promote People’s Treaty signing. We believe that raising the number of people who will sign the People’s Treaty will push our government to sign and ratify the Convention on Cluster Munitions. Make it happen!”

A press conference to raise awareness about cluster munitions held in a deminers’ camp near Dushanbe, Tajikistan
Credit: Ms. Aziza Hakimova, NGO Harmony of the World

Campaigners for a ban on cluster munitions march in Dublin
Credit: Mette Eliseussen
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“Even if the world decided tomorrow to ban these weapons, this terrible legacy already in the earth would continue to plague the poor nations of the globe. ‘The evil that men do, lives after them...’ and so, it seems to me, there rests a certain obligation upon the rest of us.”

Diana, Princess of Wales, 1997

Cluster bombs (or cluster munitions) are containers with lots of smaller ‘bomblets’. They are fired from the ground or dropped by aircraft. Cluster bombs break apart mid-air, scattering hundreds of bomblets the size of a pencil case, over an area the size of several football pitches.

Because cluster bombs are indiscriminate, they kill and injure civilians at the time of use, and because they are unreliable, they lie in wait to kill and injure years after a conflict has ended. They become de facto landmines - they rip apart people and communities and deny land to people struggling to overcome conflict and poverty.

Up to 98% of recorded cluster bomb casualties are civilians - and nearly a third are children (Handicap International, Fatal Footprint Report, Published November 2006). Since an early type of cluster bomb was first dropped on Grimsby during the Second World War, they have been used in over 25 countries worldwide. The UK has been a major stockpiler of cluster bombs (Human Rights Watch) and one of the most recent States to use them (Basra, Iraq, 2003).

The campaign to ban cluster bombs has its roots in the campaign to ban landmines, which emerged in the 1970’s during the Vietnam war. Diana, Princess of Wales saw first hand the effects of landmines in Angola and Bosnia. Some have suggested that the Princess’ subsequent support for the campaign to ban landmines contributed to the success of the Mine Ban, or “Ottawa” Treaty, adopted weeks after her tragic death in 1997.

The Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund, set up in the Princess’ memory, aims to continue her humanitarian work. Since 1997, the Fund has supported work on clearance, risk education, rehabilitation of survivors and campaigning on landmines and other explosive remnants of war. In 2003, the Fund helped to set up the Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC) of 200 civil society organisations seeking to ban cluster bombs.

In 2007, the Fund published new plans for spending out the rest of its capital. The Board of Directors took a brave decision - rather than continue to support many different worthwhile causes, the Fund would aim to increase its impact on a smaller number of issues. Specific social policy and practice changes were identified and ‘change objectives’ were published in a new Strategic Plan.

A new approach to the mechanics of funding this work was also agreed. Rather than making traditional, reactive grants to applicant organisations, proactive strategies for tackling the change objectives were devised. These strategies were based on robust evidence and allowed for creative and agile use of resources in achieving the objectives.

The foreseeable harm to civilians from cluster bombs is well researched and documented (for example, Landmine Action, Human Rights Watch, Norwegian People’s Aid). If left unchecked, cluster bombs would continue to cause human suffering, potentially far greater than that caused by landmines. But this is not inevitable: Lessons from the Ottawa Process to ban landmines show that a weapon can be stigmatised beyond use, even if the major powers do not sign up to a ban.

In February 2007, a small group of countries, frustrated with the lack of progress on banning cluster bombs within the official United Nations system, set up a parallel negotiating process to secure a strong treaty quickly. This process, known as the Oslo Process, provided a window of opportunity which the Fund, with its new arrangements for spending out its capital, was able to act on. It
published a five point plan in July 2007 to:

1. **Give local campaigners a voice with a small grants scheme** (Local Voices, Global Ban)
2. **Core fund the Cluster Munition Coalition**
3. **Be involved in the international negotiation conferences to support our partners and to highlight humanitarian issues using our unique association with the work of Diana, Princess of Wales**
4. **Host meetings with key civil society and government representatives**
5. **Support its long term partner, Landmine Action**

The first strand of this work, Local Voices, Global Ban is the subject of this review. The scheme was set up in a collaboration between the Fund and Landmine Action. The review was commissioned mid-way through the Oslo Process (and with a third round of grants only just open for applications). It was intended to inform decisions on third round grants, and to provide early lessons on this type of grant-making for the Fund itself as well as other interested grant-makers.

This executive summary of the review is not the story of the campaign, or even the whole story of the Fund’s support for the campaign. Many different people and organisations have
a role and a story to tell. The review, from an independent consultant, assesses one strand of one organisation’s strategy. It is nevertheless a relatively quick, easy, low risk strand that other grant-makers might learn from. Other stories and further lessons will be written up in due course.

The executive summary is divided into two sections, the story of the grants scheme and the lessons learned. In broad terms, the lessons show that:

1. **Setting up and running small grants for campaigners is not difficult and is within Charity Commission guidelines**

2. **Small grants schemes deliver results, if they are part of a wider funder strategy**

3. **Funders interested in supporting campaigns are more effective if they understand the relevant policy environment, have good long term relationships with partner organisations, and can act in an agile manner**

On 28th May 2008, the UK Government announced it would withdraw all its remaining cluster munitions from service and sign up to a treaty banning them. On 30th May, 107 States adopted a comprehensive treaty banning the production, transfer, use and stockpiling of all cluster munitions. The international Convention on Cluster Munitions is open for signing on 3rd December 2008 in Oslo.

At the time of writing, cluster bombs have been banned by two thirds of the world’s countries. The danger of future use remains, especially among countries that have not adopted the Convention. However, what we do now know, unequivocally, is that civil society is able to move governments, and that grant-makers can help them do it.

Campaigners from around the world lie down during rush hour traffic to symbolise what a cluster strike would look like in Dublin during negotiations in May 2008

Credit: Sasko Lazarov/Photocall Ireland
LOCAL VOICES, GLOBAL BAN GRANTS SCHEME

CHRIS STALKER
“Local Voices, Global Ban should be proud of making grants for campaigners in developing countries to help them... in their advocacy role. Our advocacy work in the project included meetings with officials and key persons at different institutions to get a position and proceed discussions on the issue.”

An activist from civil society in a cluster bomb affected country

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT
This summary of lessons learned is drawn from an independent external evaluation of the Local Voices, Global Ban (LVGB) scheme conducted in May and June 2008. LVGB is a key part of a multi-strand programme of work established by the Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund (the Fund) to contribute to an international treaty banning the use, production and stockpiling of cluster munitions.

This report is aimed at staff and trustees within charitable trusts and foundations. It is intended to be an inspiring account of how strategic interventions made by progressive philanthropy can contribute significantly to social and political change. It will be of particular relevance to funders interested in campaigning and advocacy, running small grants schemes, and/or international grant-making.

THE STORY: CONTEXT
The international civil society campaign to ban cluster bombs gained momentum in reaction to slow progress within the official United Nations process. The campaign was formally established as the Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC) in 2003 with support from the Fund. The campaign began to have traction, supported by a small number of ‘core states’. These included Norway, which went on to launch the Oslo Process in early 2007. The goal of the Oslo Process was to gain maximum support by States to a new treaty banning cluster munitions by 2008. This process echoes the Ottawa Process, which resulted in the Ottawa Treaty banning landmines in 1997.

The Fund has a significant history (£11m since 1997) of investment in landmines, both for clearance and campaigning. The Local Voices, Global Ban scheme purpose was conceived, in partnership with Landmine Action and the CMC, as an innovative way of quickly building civil society campaigning capacity to influence states to participate in the Oslo Process.

THE STORY I: OBJECTIVES, PARTNERSHIPS & INFLUENCE
An early example of the important and innovative role that the Fund and partner Landmine Action were to play, was to host a meeting in early 2006 to discuss the need for a treaty banning cluster munitions. This was for key government and civil society representatives. Other ‘opinion former’ receptions and dinners of this type followed at appropriate intervals, with the aim of influencing the broader political and diplomatic policy context.

The detailed planning and delivery of Local Voices, Global Ban took place over the summer of 2007, with a public launch on September 3rd 2007. It was planned to last a year, and the first round of funding opened immediately for applications.

LVGB provided small grants ($500 to $6,000) to grass roots campaigning organisations overseas, to ensure governmental support for an international ban on cluster munitions. In addition to this overarching aim, assessment criteria included the following objectives:

- To secure a strong cluster munitions treaty by building campaign capacity in affected and strategically important countries

- To grow new campaigners in the global south
Almost all the Local Voices, Global Ban grantees commented very positively about the way in which the scheme has been established and managed. For example, most commented favourably on the high quality of support available and the clarity of communications in relation to the application forms, guidance notes and terms and conditions. All the evidence suggested that the perceived 'light-touch' approach for administering a grants programme of this size was wholly appropriate. Other learning included clarity and simplicity of application processes, the importance of communicating deadlines and that monitoring and evaluation methodologies are considered during the grants planning phase.
THE STORY III: OVERVIEW OF PROJECTS FUNDED UNDER THE LVGB SCHEME

In the first two rounds, Local Voices, Global Ban funded 31 different projects in 29 countries to a total of $177,059. The types of projects varied but were consistent in their overarching objectives of contributing to securing a comprehensive treaty. Most activities delivered by LVGB funding were targeted directly at national governments. This included development of national coalitions and alliances to increase public support for the Oslo Process. The design, distribution and translation of campaigning materials was also common.

CASE STUDY: Ghana

Local Voices, Global Ban funded the Foundation for Security and Development In Africa, based in Ghana, to plan and implement a national advocacy strategy. The strategy focused on engaging parliamentarians and the (relatively sympathetic) government to develop and promote a common humanitarian agenda. A key objective of this agenda, once shared and established, was to prompt significant regional government political and diplomatic action towards banning cluster munitions.

The LVGB grantee said:

“The more we engaged, the more they understood…and if they could also demonstrate regional influence then their political leadership and reputation could be enhanced.”

Campaigning and advocacy activities culminated in the Global Day of Action on 15th April 2008, with a joint press conference with Ghanaian government representatives, the United Nations Development Programme, other NGOs and the national and regional media. The Minister of Interior reiterated Ghana’s complete support for a cluster munitions ban. In considering this process, one interviewee said: “...nothing significant can be achieved without civil society, they are needed in order to make progress”. More than one interviewee felt that Ghana’s role in the international and regional meetings: “…led to other African states taking a stronger position in favour of a Treaty, for example, I believe Sierra Leone and Zambia.”
42 participants attend the conference, “Zambia and the Convention on Cluster Munitions: Reporting Back and Moving Forward”
Credit: Dr. Bob Mtonga/ Louis Century
THE STORY IV: OUTCOMES OF LOCAL VOICES, GLOBAL BAN

The small, timely, focused grants made through LVGB supported campaigning activities that contributed to change at national levels. This was primarily influencing government policy change. In some cases, raising public awareness and shifting target audience opinion were achieved. One positive indicator of the scheme’s success has been both campaigners’ and the Fund’s flexibility and agility to respond to changes in their national and international policy environments.

Despite the small size of the average grant, the timeliness and appropriateness of the LVGB funding generated influential campaign activity and advocacy.

Many grantees pointed to their small grants being particularly useful in being available to invest in national campaigns at the time of influencing parliamentarians, decision makers and political processes, around the build up to the international Oslo Process conferences.

“(the) Local Voices, Global Ban funding is additional resources to help us do more of the strategic influencing we need to do to change the government’s position. It is helping us apply more pressure at this important time…”

An interviewee commenting on LVGB

Campaigning in Stockholm City Centre: 98 people dressed in red, 2 in yellow to demonstrate that 98% of cluster munitions victims are civilians
Credit: Anna Östberg/Svenska Freds/Swedish Peace and Arbitration Society
MAIN LESSONS LEARNED
This Local Voices, Global Ban scheme is an excellent example of a progressive and effective funder, operating close to public policy, international diplomatic and political processes. It should be acknowledged that the scheme was designed, developed, established and implemented with remarkable speed (primarily because of the external policy agenda) during the summer and early autumn of 2007. The scheme is built on a history of sustained involvement and interventions by the funder in the issues of landmines and explosive remnants of war.

One component of LVGB’s effectiveness, and indeed credibility, has been the clarity of partnership roles, responsibilities and accountability within the three key stakeholder organisations: the Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund, Landmine Action and the Cluster Munition Coalition. The grant application and management procedures were set up and run collaboratively with Landmine Action, which administered the grants. This has been a key ingredient in the scheme’s success. This approach was transparent and led to rigorous and appropriate collective decision making in the grants assessment process.

In order to develop and implement a project of this type, there are a number of interesting and useful learning points. The overarching one being that the Fund planned and then operated LVGB, primarily as part of a campaign to bring about change, rather than, secondarily, considering it a
discrete grants programme. This is not to say that the duties of a diligent funder were neglected. This approach has implications for trusts and foundations who wish to consider grant making in this way and there are a number of observations for possible learning.

LESSON 1: Understanding the policy and politics

It is apparent that the Fund have strong embedded knowledge and understanding of the specific public policy context and political environment within which it was operating. It has a history of sustained engagement with campaigning to ban landmines, cluster munitions and explosive remnants of war both directly and through partner organisations. This enabled it to do two things; firstly, to speak with confidence and authority to opinion formers and decision makers. Secondly, it demonstrated an understanding of the strategic and tactical relationship between a) the grants and b) the subsequent effectiveness of grantee activities and outputs.

LESSON 2: The synergy between grants and campaign strategy

While Local Voices, Global Ban was delivered as a discrete activity, it was influenced by broader and shifting campaign goals. In addition to LVGB grants directly contributing to influencing within the political context, the Fund worked with a public relations company to play a role in raising public awareness and attitudinal change, in the build up to and during the Dublin Diplomatic Conference in May 2008. There are also some good practice principles to be drawn out from the grants application information and its close relationship to the international campaign strategy.

“The application form was very specific! It gave us a specific plan for the project with a set of commitments, it was easier to stick to it… I think this was quite good.”

LVGB grantee

Ban Buses have travelled all around the world raising awareness about the cluster munitions ban (www.banbus.org)
Credit: Mette Eliseussen
The risk here of course is that poorly informed funders prescribe ineffective campaigning activities and a balance would need to be found. An additional risk is that it is generally considered good practice that funders identify and monitor agreed effects and not activities or outputs, so this approach needs to be carefully thought through. LVGB was designed so that grantees shaped their national campaigns as well as contributing to the effectiveness of the international campaign.

One grantee remarked on the model:

“It is important that LVGB promotes a bottom-up approach by raising awareness and supporting campaigns in local communities aimed at promoting a global ban of cluster munitions.”

This comment relates to the contribution at the local and national level to a global campaign. The role of LVGB in facilitating this link may have useful lessons for other funders.

LESSON 3: Agility and flexibility

There is a strong case for acknowledging the Fund’s agility and flexibility in identifying the opportunity, and of designing, developing and establishing the LVGB scheme so swiftly. A healthy congruence of opportunities came about. The external policy environment, a change of direction under the Fund’s new Strategic Plan 2007 - 2012
and good inter-organisational and personal relationships with partners, meant that project planning, communication and coordination moved quickly. Nevertheless, the Fund and partners appear to have maximised those opportunities and ensured credibility and integrity was built into the grants management process.

**LESSON 4: Mitigating risk**

In the Fund's Strategic Plan 2007-2012 it states that; “...the Fund is not afraid to respond to emerging issues of the day and speak out on behalf of causes that are not recognised or popular. The Fund is proud to support groups and causes that would otherwise find it difficult to gain funding.”

This principle was reflected in the LVGB project and the Fund was confident to carry a reasonable degree of reputational and fiduciary risk. For example, there was at least one grantee who indicated that they were not a legal entity and in one case said:

> “We were pleased to have received a grant as we are not formally recognised by the government…”

**LVGB grantee**

In addition to this, there were a small number of grants made to individuals, some of whom were cluster munitions survivors and who went on to make a significant contribution to the effectiveness of the global campaign. The risk of this approach was mitigated by ensuring such grants were made through organisations, with resources supporting the activities of individual advocates. There was also a requirement that grant applications were referenced against the Home Office list of proscribed organisations.

The project operated well within the legal and regulatory framework set out by the Charity Commission in its guidance on campaigning and political activities (CC9). This guidance has been reviewed and subsequently amended twice in the last three years and now seeks to be much more encouraging to charities seeking social and policy change through campaigning and advocacy.
LESSON 5: Funder credibility

Overall, the Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund and partners have struck the right balance in relation to the extent of risk carried, and the level of public profile sought, in a project of this type. In one case, the association with Diana, Princess of Wales was cited as having added weight to the grantee’s work.

An interviewee said:

“The best thing about Local Voices, Global Ban is that it is allowing small initiatives to flourish. Without it and the funder’s name behind it, it’s possible that some of the really good campaigns would wither on the vine.”

Evidence suggests that a significant factor in the success of LVGB was the relationship of confidence and mutual respect, built up over time between the Fund and its partner organisations, particularly Landmine Action and the Cluster Munition Coalition.

“(The partners)...have made a profound analysis of the problems in relation to cluster munitions and robust positions in relation to the solutions. It is important that this analysis resulted in the campaign strategy and advocacy materials that further served as a basis for campaigning at the international, regional and national level.”

LVGB grantee
APPENDICES
APPENDIX ONE

The full list of organisations awarded grants under Local Voices, Global Ban are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghan Landmine Survivors Organisation</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Public Policies</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austcare</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Aid for Mine Victims</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Centre for Association and Foundations</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap International South East Europe</td>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit Refugee Service</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campana Colombiana Contra Minas</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmine Survivors Network</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Concerns Resource Centre</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Group Landmine.de</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation for Security and Development in Africa</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Eugenia</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Arms Foundation of India</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap International Kenya</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Focus</td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Association for Development, Rehabilitation and Care</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmine Resource Centre</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Action Network on Small Arms – Women’s Network</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Peace &amp; Development Organisation</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippine Campaign Against Cluster Munitions</td>
<td>Phillipines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Red Cross</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegalese Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branislav Kapetanovic (via Norwegian Peoples Aid)</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone Action Network on Small Arms (SLANSA)</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia Coalition to Ban Landmines</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceasefire Campaign</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Violence International Southeast Asia</td>
<td>South East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese Association for Combating Landmines</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Forum on Small Arms and Light Weapons</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish Peace &amp; Arbitration Society</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Network for Research on Landmines &amp; ERW</td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urmarbek Pulodov (via Handicap International)</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative for a Mine Free Turkey</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Landmine Survivors Association</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for the Fight for Civil Disarmament</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soroptimist International Wales South</td>
<td>Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TWO

LOCAL VOICES, GLOBAL BAN - REVIEW METHODOLOGY

Research for this review was conducted from May to July 2008. The methodology was in three distinct phases:

1. **Desk Research** - A review and analysis of documentation including plans and strategies for LVGB, grant application guidance, applications, terms and conditions, websites, minutes of meetings, action points and key correspondence.

2. **Research with partners** - A series of seventeen confidential and anonymised interviews with stakeholders, north and south, which aimed to provide an objective perspective of the attribution of LVGB in campaign and advocacy capacity building and influence at national, regional and international levels. In addition, five detailed questionnaires were completed by funded organisations (LVGB grantees).

3. **Observations and insight** - Attendance for three days at the Dublin Diplomatic Conference in May 2008. An opportunity for further discussions with key stakeholders to observe and understand coalition dynamics, the campaign objectives, strategy and tactics and the role of LVGB funded organisations within this.

Summary of evaluation inputs: In total, during the period March to May 2008: ten LVGB funded organisations were interviewed, five detailed questionnaires were completed by LVGB grantees and submitted. There were two interviews with political targets at the national level, two interviews with other international stakeholders and the three coordinating project partners (the Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund, Landmine Action and the Cluster Munition Coalition) were all interviewed twice. This is an executive summary of the full Local Voices, Global Ban review report which was provided to the Fund in August 2008.
Chris Stalker is a freelance consultant specialising in campaigns and advocacy, strategy and evaluation. His clients have included ActionAid, Amnesty International, Charities Evaluation Services, Guide Dogs for the Blind Association, National Union of Students, Saferworld, Save the Children, Transparency International, the World Development Movement, the World Health Organisation and World Vision.

He was the founder, in 2005, of the Campaigning Effectiveness programme based at NCVO (National Council for Voluntary Organisations) and led its work to support and strengthen the capacity of the sector to campaign effectively for social and political change.

He joined NCVO as Head of Campaigns & Communications in 2003 from Amnesty International UK where he was Head of Campaigns and has worked for Oxfam on campaigns at UK and European levels. Chris lectures in International Human Rights at Kingston University, is an Associate Consultant for INTRAC and provides campaigning advice to charity clients of Bates, Wells and Braithwaite.

Landmine Action is a not-for-profit organisation committed to good governance and the development of civil society through the promotion of international humanitarian law, the relief of poverty and the empowerment of communities marginalised by conflict.

The Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC) is an international coalition working to protect civilians from the effects of cluster munitions. The CMC has a membership of around 300 civil society organisations from more than 80 countries, and includes organisations working on disarmament, peace and security, human rights, victim/survivor assistance, clearance, women’s rights, faith issues and other areas of work. The CMC facilitates the efforts of NGOs worldwide to educate governments, the public and the media about the problems of cluster munitions and the solution.