



“Making a Difference through Grant Programs”

Seminar Transcript

1 December 2008

Sabancı Center, Istanbul

Speakers:

Kavita Ramdas, President and CEO, Global Fund for Women  
Kumi Naidoo, Honorary President, CIVICUS

Moderator:

Filiz Bikmen, Sabancı Foundation, Manager of Institutional Development and Programs

## WELCOME

Filiz Bikmen: Esteemed Deputy Governor, Mayor, President of the Board of Trustees of the Sabanci Foundation Ms. Güler Sabanci, valued guests, members of the Press, I would like to welcome you all to the seminar “Making a Difference Through Grant Programs” organized by Sabanci Foundation.

Last year, in our previous seminar ‘Global Perspectives on the Changing Roles of Foundations’, our distinguished guest speakers discussed opportunities, developments, new practices and approaches in the foundation sector. Grant programs, one of the most significant ‘roles’ or ‘vehicles’ used by foundations all over the world, were an important part of that discussion. For this reason, we set our topic this year as ‘Making a Difference through Grant Programs’. We believe that this subject is important in general terms for the future of the third sector in Turkey, and in particular for the Sabanci Foundation.

Today we will discuss the difference grant programs can make in pursuit of advancing social development. Why do foundations use this practice and how do they implement them? What are key elements and critical success factors? What kind of outcomes can be obtained? How can we measure impact and maybe most important of all, how can foundations in Turkey, using this approach, make a difference in people’s lives? Our distinguished speakers and prominent leaders in this field will share their views about this subject in our seminar today. On behalf of the Sabanci Foundation I would like to thank my esteemed colleagues Kavita Ramdas, President and CEO of Global Fund for Women and Kumi Naidoo, Honorary President of CIVICUS, for coming from California and Johannesburg respectively to share their profound knowledge and experiences with us.

This morning, following Ms. Güler Sabanci’s opening speech; I will introduce our esteemed guests to you. They will deliver their presentations of about twenty minutes each. After a short break, three of us will have a discussion session and then open the floor for questions from the audience. I would now like to invite Ms. Güler Sabanci, the President of the Board of Trustees of the Sabanci Foundation, to make her opening remarks.

## OPENING REMARKS

Güler Sabanci: Esteemed Foundation and NGO representatives, guests, representatives of the press: Welcome to the Sabanci Center for the Second Sabanci Foundation Seminar.

Last year, we came together to discuss the changing roles of foundations in the world with two international experts: Barry Gaberman, Retired Senior Vice President of the Ford Foundation, and Craig Kennedy, President of the German Marshall Fund.

Today, we get together again by two experts from the international civil society sector: Kumi Naidoo, Honorary President of CIVICUS (World Alliance of Civic Participation) and Kavita Ramdas, President and CEO of the Global Fund for Women. I’d like to thank them once again for joining us today to share their experiences and knowledge.

The theme of our seminar this year is “Making a Difference through Grant Programs”, during which we will discuss the role of grant programs in promoting social development and change.

Dear guests; The Sabanci Foundation, one of Turkey’s largest foundations providing a broad range of philanthropic contributions for the past 34 years, has recently completed its strategic development work. New trends and issues in global and Turkish civil society were a starting point as the Foundation set out to determine a new set of programs earlier this year.

As a result of extensive program design activities, we have decided to focus on women, youth and persons with disabilities. While we will continue our existing programs- for example the scholarship program and our support to the Sabanci University- we will realize our new programs and philanthropic investments within the framework of this new program strategy.

Our new programs will focus on addressing the challenges facing women, youth and persons with disabilities. All of our efforts are aimed at helping to create a 'better tomorrow' by empowering and encouraging these individuals and making a difference in their lives.

One of the most important aspects of our Foundation's new strategy is to incorporate the use of grant programs. As such, we have launched a 'Social Development Grant Program' to allocate a total of 1 million Turkish Liras to projects that demonstrate sustainability and the potential to create a multiplier effect in areas related to women, youth and persons with disabilities. Applications to the Grant Program started on 20 November 2008 and will continue until 20 January 2009. I'd like to encourage NGOs and universities to apply to this program. For more information, please visit the Sabanci Foundation web site.

Dear guests: This year is the second Sabanci Foundation Seminar, through which we aim to bring all of you important actors together to discuss new interventions and developments in the civil society sector. I look forward to making this an annual event, and it will be our pleasure to come together with all of you every year.

So, our seminar on "Making a Difference with Grant Programs" is now starting. I'd like to thank you all again for your contributions. As a citizen, I'd especially like to thank NGOs for their contributions to society.

Filiz Bikmen: I would now like to invite our distinguished speakers to the stage to deliver their speeches.

Kavita Ramdas is the President and CEO of Global Fund for Women, which is the largest grantmaking foundation in the world focused exclusively on supporting international women's human rights. The Global Fund has assets of \$21 million and runs grant programs of \$8 million per year. Ms. Ramdas has been the recipient of many esteemed awards in her field.

Kumi Naidoo is the Honorary President and former president of CIVICUS which is the world's largest international civil society network for 10 years. Kumi is one of the most well-known experts in global civil society and poverty studies, and was appointed to the Board of Civil Society Relations of the UN by Kofi Annan, the former Secretary General of the UN.

Welcome again, Kumi and Kavita.

So, without further, we're going to listen to your remarks but before that I just want to say a few words about what Kumi and Kavita have come to share with us today.

As I explained in my opening remarks, Kumi represents an organization called CIVICUS and they focus on four areas under the mission of acting together for a just world: social justice, economic justice, civic justice and political justice. Under these four themes they organize a network of hundreds of non-profit organizations and civil society organizations every year in a huge assembly. They run a program called "Civil Society Watch" to make sure that civil society in different parts of the world has the space to contribute to their own societies. So, today we'll be listening to his perspective on the global agenda as someone who's been actively involved with UN and World Bank civil society discussions.

Kumi is a leader in the sector and has the opportunity to tell us a little bit about the big picture. Then we'll move on to Kavita who will bring it down to the local level specifically focusing on women's organizations and what it means to be both the fundraiser and the grant maker. She will talk about the unique model of the Global Fund for Women and some of the challenges that they face in connecting the local issues to the global issues.

#### GUEST SPEAKER REMARKS

Kumi Naidoo: Thank you, Good Morning, Ladies and Gentlemen, Colleagues and Friends, Those of you wondering why I came all the way from South Africa to be here: the answer is very simple: the Sabanci Foundation needed to have a gender balance on this panel!

The first time I came to Turkey, in 1999, was for a conference organized by TUSEV, which had the involvement of the president of the country. The aim was to discuss what was happening around the world which at that time in the early 90s, or the late 90s was called "an associational revolution" (a term coined by Lester Salamon) that was, citizens forming organizations and non-profit groups to address the various challenges and it was also time when there were still many questions about whether government, business and what we call civil society which includes non-profit organizations, foundations, religious groups, trade unions and so on.

There was a big question then, about whether in fact we could learn to walk together with each other because today we live in a world where it's become completely complicated. The government cannot address all the problems that the humanity faces. Foundations and non-profit organizations cannot do so on their own and neither can business. And unless we can focus on the competitive advantages of the different sectors in society and unless we can better understand how we can harness the competitive advantages for social progress, we will not get too far.

In those days, there were still many questions about whether we could work and I want to share with you that late in the evening after the conference was over there was a bunch of us - some from outside, some from inside and there was somebody who was saying, NGOs, a term that is used globally to refer to Non-Governmental Organizations, are really important and kept talking NGOs, NGOs and a business person said "What is this thing you're talking about NGO, I haven't quite heard of it before." and the non-profit sector person that I was with said "Really? You haven't heard of NGOs?" "But to understand NGOs is very easy, all you have to do is to understand Christopher Columbus" he said. Because when Christopher Columbus set out, he didn't know exactly where he was going. When he arrived, he didn't know exactly where he was. When he got back, he didn't know exactly where he had been, however he had a huge impact on the world and he did it all with somebody else's money!

So, today we all live in a world where there is a lot of fluidity, a lot of change, a lot of uncertainty. We talk and act at a time when everyone is focusing on the global financial crisis. It's worth taking a lesson from China because the character for crisis is the same character in the alphabet as the character for opportunity. And the challenge for all of us who are concerned about moving this world such that it is more equitable, more just and more fair, is to understand a way that actually we can, out of the desperation and uncertainty that we feel, how can we learn from it to move the whole planet in a different direction.

But Dear Brothers and Sisters, the reality is, today, and every single day, 50.000 men, women and children die from preventable causes. 50.000 men, women and children! Every single day. And in my continent Africa alone, every day we lose 6000 people from HIV Aids alone, 7000 people from malaria alone and 1.500 people from tuberculosis alone. What is happening in some parts of the world is not simply a sad situation, a problem or a tragedy. It is actually a passive genocide or a daily silent tsunami that is underway.

Now, those of us who might not live in countries where we have those kinds of statistics, it's important for us to recognize the slogan that was prevalent in the early 1990s which said "Think globally, act locally". Can I just check, is that a slogan that any of you have heard? Think globally, act locally? And what was behind that slogan was "irrespective of what issue you are trying to tackle, at the local or national level within your own country, you need to better understand our global institutions, global processes and global discourse and ideas have an impact on what you can or cannot achieve at the national or local level. However, one of the ironies of the moment of world history that we are living in is that precisely at a time many countries including my own South Africa, and the successor states of the former Soviet Union for example, we're getting formal democracy for the first time. The real power on many issues we are shifting from national to the global levels.

So today in Turkey you can't wake up one day, government, business and civil society and say "We're going to address climate change." You can't address it as a national issue. These issues can only be addressed with the global community coming together. Similarly, you can't address the issue of environmental or un-environmental catastrophes, even in issues like HIV AIDS today, is because the placing of life saving pharmaceutical drugs is negotiated at a global level, that is, also the solutions also have a global dimension to it so you can't see it solely as a national issue. So today we also have to think locally and act globally if indeed that is where the solutions to our various challenges actually lie. At this point though, I really would like to say that it is the 1st of December, and the 1st of December is World AIDS Day, and I'd like to just ask you all to stand for thirty seconds and maintain a moment of silence for memory of the tens of millions of people who have died already from HIV AIDS and close to 8 million people that will die today from the HIV AIDS epidemic. (...)

Thank you very much. This particular seminar is taking place at a very special moment actually, because today is World AIDS Day. In Doha, at the moment there is a big world conference going on financing food development that is looking at how we can ensure that we find the resources to address poverty and other pressing issues. Today also in Poznan in Poland of the next twelve days starts the climate change negotiations and preparation for the post-Kyoto conference next year. And importantly, this is happening at a particular moment in world history where there's a lot of anxiety. I just want to pick up on a few issues quickly. One is whether a society can form foundations and non-profit organizations, and so on. As we've seen since my first visit to Turkey in 1999 there has been so many positive developments like the associational law in 2004, the foundations law early this year, and you can see that these are real efforts and I want to commend and welcome that and to say that has been a global trend of the last ten to fifteen years. However it is just important to note one negative trend and that is the tragedy of September 11, 2001, which the whole world stood in solidarity with the people in the United States. Sadly the response to September 11, 2001 through the so called war-on-terrorism, we have seen in many countries around the world in the name of the war on terror, there has been a clamping down on space for non-profit organizations.

And I want to tell you this in a story, about 18 months ago, in a country called Zimbabwe, which I am sure many of you have heard of because it's been in the news very sadly over the last couple of years.

CIVICUS had been called in to support the religious community and civil society who were concerned in raising issues about the state of democracy in Zimbabwe and as happened in the past, we were followed by security police agents and after a few minutes I went up to one of them and started a conversation and said yes the card, yes the brochure, you know, this is nothing secret/in the person. Two guys started talking and they said, democracy in Zimbabwe is not perfect but why is CIVICUS and other human rights organizations putting so much pressure on us when we in Zimbabwe didn't do Abu Ghraib (translator's note: prison in Iraq) torture, we're not planning Guantanamo Bay, we're not engaged in racial and religious profiling, we're not like the UK government trying to pass a new detention about trial law and so on. So I'm saying that really we must not take the space for civil society to be able to function in its various manifestations for granted even in countries that claim to be promoters of democracy. That democracy is a central important factor to ensure that the ability of citizens to take private action for public good is actually there, is not something we should ever take for granted because as Kavita will tell you, the Patriot Act for example in the US also puts restrictions on the functioning of foundations. Thankfully, though, from 20th of January next year, when president Obama is inaugurated, there are many of us in civil societies with pedigrees from South Africa and the developing world and I'm sure in this part of the world they have been saying "We hope that from next year onwards we can dream of a world of much more trees and a little less 'bush'".

I want to go to the question then, how does change happen and how do foundations in particular through grant making programs within this kind of global context work to actually affect change. The sad reality is that a lot of foundations around the world are put under pressure for whole range of reasons to show quick returns on investments. So if we look today at where the resources of foundations and the various non-profit organizations that they support, you'll find that still about 90% of the resources approximately, goes into delivering of services that is providing direct support for people in need, and the little less, the remainder, goes to trying to support non-profit organizations that are trying to change a particular policy, and even less goes to trying to reforming government arrangements that exist in society. So I want to take an example of another moment that we're in called "16 Days of Activism". UN globally sort of sponsored the event "16 Days of Activism" against gender based violence which started on the 25th of November and ends on International Human Rights Day on the 10th of December. So I used it as an example to make this point given the focus of Sabanci Foundation on women, youth and people living with disabilities.

I want to take the issue of domestic violence. As a foundation, how do you try to make a difference? For example, there is a lot of important work that women's organizations are doing. Working with survivors of domestic violence for example, providing resources for shelters and refugees but also counseling for women who have survived domestic violence. These are important investments that need to be made. However, if you take all the work that foundations are supporting, domestic violence and beyond and think that tomorrow all the gods that we believe in come down to earth and say "Every foundation and every non-profit organization, I'm going to give you a five thousand percent increase in your budget". If you can imagine this being a baseline, we would go, from reaching this number of people to reaching that number of people when the need will still be there.

So the point that I am making is, putting all our eggs solely in the delivery of services 'basket' without understanding how that delivery of services can have an impact on policy and so on, won't get us too far. So, in the area of domestic violence for example, violence against women, counseling, of course it is important but unless we look at the policy level and ask ourselves "Is there domestic violence act that's recognized as a policy that promotes and protects women in their homes?" "Is it worth to ask why do men abuse? And try to look at dealing with the question of masculinities constructed in society and so on. Unless we do that and try to engage in the policy level on any issue that foundations are supporting, we would only get so far.

But I come from South Africa and if I just take the youth example, in the old days, during the apartheid system, trying to intervene only in policy will also only get you so far. Because if I went to lobby, to the apartheid government, and said 'you need to change your policy and education' you only can go so far, when the entire government arrangement was actually undemocratic. So today the strategic choices that foundations must make- and I'm not making a value judgment saying that delivery is more important than policy is more than government... I think all are important. But I think if foundations are committed to making lasting fundamental sustainable change, and the key word there is "sustainable", because it's very easy to start a project and support an organization, it runs for two years or three years and then it collapses once the resources dry up. So thinking about how we do this, requires a thoughtful strategic set of choices about how you actually support delivery, policy change as well as government changes where it's necessary.

I want to commend the Sabanci Foundation though, about the way it has framed its current grant making program and outline a few things that I think we should look at very closely for those of you outside of the foundation as a resource and for inspiration. The one important thing is; it draws on one of the wisdoms actually from the woman's movement and my apologies to the interpreters because this is a wonderful idea from the woman's movement but a terrible word. And the word is "intersectionality". This word "intersectionality" basically the woman's movement had to say, is our issue of advancing woman's rights but we need to understand how this intersects with young people, with the issues of race, with the issues of class and so on. And what I like so much reading the program is once you've chosen the socially excluded groups women, young people and people living with disabilities, so that is a target constituency that sadly is often neglected. And I just want to make one point that the term social exclusion that is used in EU discourse and literature, importantly whenever they talk about social exclusion; it is talked about as if it's minorities of citizens. But actually if you add people with disabilities, people living with HIV AIDS, people living with terminal diseases, women and young people up, you're actually talking about the majority of citizens. So that's the one thing I want to strongly encourage and urge all of you to look at.

The second is the way that we're saying when you're dealing with the youth problem, also look at the gender dimensions to it. What are the people living with disabilities dimension and so on. But I want to challenge you to go a little further and that is when you look at all three of those programs today, I think you also need to be looking at when you say employment is one of the key things that you're concerned about, which again then should be commended. Thus then a challenge to you that you need to understand what are the trade negotiations, what are the climate change developments, what are the broader issues in society? I think, today the challenge that we have is to be looking at a range of external factors as well, and to look at interactions. For example you can't ignore all the stuff going on about accession to the European Union that has implications of how it can actually affect your different programs.

And just if I can make a naughty remark, as I begin to round up, I've been following the whole accession talks, I've come to the conclusion that the European Union probably needs Turkey much more than Turkey needs the European Union.

And so I want to end with this point that we're living at a moment in history where we are either going to make a set of choices that moves us down and a road of greater sustainability, greater equality, greater justice and hopefully allows us to give to the future generations a world that they would be happy to inherit. However there are tough choices ahead of us. And in our small way, in our different countries, in our different communities, we have a responsibility to ensure that we begin to question the paradigms and the frameworks that we have accepted as given. We have to think about how we equip our citizens to be able to understand the changes that are happening in their country, in the world and what impacts they have on our lives, and to empower them to be able to actually deal with those changes.

And here I want to quote - share with you a quick proverb which many of us take as a God given fact; it goes like "If you teach a man to fish, you feed him for a lifetime. If you give a man a fish, you feed him for a day." How many of you have heard that and think that's a really good proverb? All of you. OK. Now here's the thing, that's a paradigm that we all have accepted for a long time. And somebody from the World Bank came to a CIVICUS conference and challenged that proverb. He said, and I quote, "If you teach a man to fish, does he today have access to resources to buy the fishing rod and other fishing equipments to actually engage in the active fishing? If you teach a man to fish, does he have access to unpolluted stocks of water with fish that is edible that you can actually fish in? If you teach a man to fish does it get to anybody else in the family or does it stay with the man?" My friends in the woman's movement say they like this proverb because they say if you teach a man to fish at least we'll have a peaceful weekend to ourselves. But the point is, it's good that we have to start challenging some of the things that we're given and try to imagine a world that is very different.

So let me conclude by saying that I'm sure that there are times when you feel despondent and you feel "Does my investment, does my effort actually make a difference?" And I want to leave you with a story which is very personal. It's about my best friend whose name is Leni Naidoo. When we were twenty two years old we were both activists in Nelson Mandela's movement to democracy in South Africa, we were fleeing into exile. Leni, was a very special person, vegetarian and passivist and so on. He asked me a question. He said "Kumi, what is the biggest contribution that any one of us can make to the cause of humanity, and I said "that's a simple question, it's giving your life". He said "you mean going out participating in the democracy demonstration and being shot and killed and becoming a martyr?" and I said "I guess so". And he said "that's the wrong answer, it's not giving your life but giving the rest of your life."

I was twenty two years old at that time I didn't know what he was talking about to be honest. But a year later while I was in exile at Oxford University I got a telephone call telling me that my friend Leni and three young women from my home city were killed by the apartheid regime. There were so many bullets in their bodies that their parents couldn't recognize them at the mortuary. And I had to think deeply about that last conversation I had with him before we went to exile in different ways. What he was saying was; the struggle for youth empowerment, gender equality, ending global poverty, genuine democracy and so on, are a marathon.



And those of us like all of us in this room and all the institutions that are represented here today, we've had an opportunity and a privilege to be involved in public service, need to recognize the biggest contribution we can make is a life-time of commitment until these issues are actually addressed. And the thing that I say to young people - and I do a lot of work with young people in my role at CIVICUS - we must break the idea about understanding patriotism as dying for your country. We must build a new understanding where patriotism is about living for your country and living in a way that creates equality, fairness and in short, this plan that we have can be equally shared by all the citizens that are part of global humanity. Thank you very much.

Filiz Bikmen: I first met Kumi in 2004 at a CIVICUS conference in Botswana, my first time in Africa and my first time in a CIVICUS event. And, I have to say it's been 4 years now and I've heard Kumi speak one or two other times in different events and each time I feel like I am listening to him for the first time. Because as someone who actually works in this sector and dedicating myself to this kind of change, the words are inspirational, the perspective of the global issues is so important to the work that we're doing in Turkey. So thank you very much, Kumi, for once again another very inspiring speech, and for reminding us of the big picture.

Kavita manages to reach local and act global at the same time, probably one of her biggest challenges as well as assets. Kavita will talk to us today about how grant making as an instrument can advance social development. Talking about the different forms of grant making, Kavita has a background in the private foundation sector, she also has a background with the Global Fund for Women and she's also on the advisory panel regarding global development at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. So, from very different places she has a perspective to share with us on what grant making really is and what kind of change we can help create. Just a few words about Global Fund for Women and some of the issues they focus on. Actually, they are quite parallel to CIVICUS's overarching goals of civic, political, economic and social justice. The Global Fund for Women has identified several areas, economic security, violence, education, health and safety, leadership and two hot topics: trafficking and empowerment. So, Kavita will be sharing with us some stories, some lessons learned, and examples about how the Global Fund for Women is creating change all over the world including Turkey.

Kavita Ramdas: Selamun aleykum. It is very nice to be here. I am a very fortunate visitor to Istanbul which I consider to be one of the most beautiful cities in the world and one of the places I really somehow have a strange sense of feeling at home. Thank you for the "salwar cameez" (translators note: traditional Anatolian rural dress) which you gave to our civilization, which we still wear.

I am really honored to be here with such a distinguished panel of speakers and indebted to Filiz for her invitation and indebted to the Sabanci Foundation and to so many friends and supporters here. The Global Fund has had a long history of grant-making to support women's rights organizations in Turkey. Turkey is really fortunate to have very impressive and strong civil society organizations so I think when you are starting a grant making program here, you are starting with an advantage that many different parts of the world would actually be envious of having a civil society that is actually so ready to participate in a grant making program such as the one Sabanci has launched.

I would like to begin by asking for a little bit of your time to tell you about my own background, particularly as a person of philanthropy. I was born and raised in India, which like Turkey has a long tradition of philanthropic giving but in a different way- in a way primarily through religious traditions: either through temples, or mosques or like in Turkey the VAKIF. There are many traditions of giving, which are not formalized in the sense that we understand and certainly my years of experience in USA. It was not until I came to the USA in 1983 on a scholarship that I began to understand how philanthropy works in the USA. My scholarship to college was made possible because number of individuals who had graduated from the same college had actually be making gifts and charitable contributions back to the college to a scholarship fund that enable someone like me to come from another country who could not afford the education in USA without that a kind of system. My first job on campus was calling to thank such graduates and donors and all alumna of the college. They were interested to hear from me because I was the living impact of their grant making. So it made me have a different understanding of how to understand philanthropy.

In 1988 after my graduate studies, I had the chance to work at a large grant making foundation as Filiz mentioned; John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation in Chicago. There is a tax code in US that enables wealthy individuals to receive a tax break if they choose to establish a private foundation which gives a way to worthwhile causes that advance the public good. And it is a very interesting notion that private money can be used to advance a public good. At such foundations in the US, the notion is that if you develop a few areas of focus in which you can improve or enhance the well being of the public good, you can make a genuine contribution. Because in US a strong value is placed on citizen-led associations actually going all the way back to the Tocqueville in the 18th century. He noticed that Americans really like the civil associations of different kinds. There has been an understanding that citizen-led organizations play a strong role in democracies and private foundations feel comfortable seeking that partnership in advancing the goals of their society through the mechanisms of grant-making.

I thought for Sabanci Foundation, which has so much experience with scholarships, maybe I could make an analogy in fact that the process of running a grant making program is not that different than applying for a scholarship. Organizations that seek to educate girls or improve the environment or advance the arts or plant more trees or provide legal aid to the poor, write to private and public foundations in US describing how their programs and activities contribute to advancing a particular cause. The foundation in turn hires a fairly skilled set of staff who are mainly generalists but who are also good analytical thinkers - you have Filiz- to make assessments to ask problems and to kind of dig a little bit deeper into the ways in which those civil society organizations are planning to try to make a difference in the area that they have chosen. Then the staff recommends that set of groups that they believe most closely meet the criteria that they're seeking to have them live up to, and make that recommendation to a board of directors who finally approve the set. This is not a dissimilar process to the one that we use at the Global Fund for Woman, the place that I worked at for the last twelve years. But what we have chosen to do is to make an impact in the area of advancing women's rights globally. As a public charity that is as an organization that we actually receive funding as well as make grants, we do not have any single wealthy benefactor or a single family that left us money in an endowment but rather we raise all the money that we give away each year in grants to women's organizations around the globe. Of course if you call yourself "global", which the Global Fund for women did in 1987 when we were founded, much before global became a fashionable word. It has a very large scope.

So part of your challenge is to have a somewhat different approach to grant-making. The Global Fund chose grant-making model because it believes that it is important for us to hear directly from the communities that we are seeking to serve about how deep your priorities on the grant. So some of what Kumi was talking about, it is easy for us to sit at national and international meetings and to discuss what we think should happen for climate change or should happen for women's rights, or should happen for democracy... But it is very different when you're actually living in a poor community without access to clean drinking water, without ability to raise your voice. In a society where women are not supposed to express any kind of opinion whatsoever, making that connection is one of the big challenges for the Global Fund. And we believe that choosing to be a grant making foundation allows us to hear the voices of those who we might not otherwise have heard from because they can tell us in their own words what are the challenges that they are facing and bring these very large concepts down to a very grounded place from where we can understand how to make a difference.

At the Global Fund, we're interested in learning from new approaches and we also want to understand what is similar or might be different. How do women face certain struggles in Turkey that is very similar to women in Bolivia, or Argentina and how are they different? How are they unique? So our grant making program has allowed women from around the world to speak to us in their own languages to define their own agendas and to offer and share their own analysis of the challenges that are facing them and also to offer their best solutions for how we might overcome these challenges. Particularly, we try to understand how they believe that these solutions can help them overcome the barriers of discrimination, violence and poverty that face so many women and girls particularly all over the world.

For us at the Global Fund it seems now like a given that we understand advancing women's rights increasing women's access to technology, to education, to political participation not only allows women to be a powerful force in the world but also in one of the most effective ways to advance some of the other much larger global agendas that Kumi spoke about earlier. If you want to make a difference in health in the world, if you want to make a difference in water, if you want to make a difference in addressing HIV/AIDS, if you feel to include fully 50% of the world's population, you simply are not going to get the kinds of outcomes that you actually want to see. And more and more people are coming round to that position. The numbers and the statistics are speaking fairly loudly and clearly for themselves. When you ensure women's rights to education for example child mortality drops significantly 10% or more and the risk of contracting HIV/Aids drops almost 50%. If you can ensure that women have more than fourth grade education, that will make a difference. But for us, the statistics are not enough; we also make investments in women's courage in women's expertise, in their tenacity, in their creativity and in their leadership.

Today we raise about 10 million dollars a year from over 15,000 individuals from 43 countries around the world. Individual donations make up about 48 % of our revenue. Foundations make up about the 31 % and corporations about 6 %. We don't take any government funding in part because of being located in US. We have really resisted the connection with advancing particular foreign policy of a given country at any time. One way of ensuring that we, as an organization, keep much focused on this mission by looking at questions of governance and I think that's an issue that maybe many foundations don't think about but it is one that we need to think about.

As Filiz said, I serve on a committee of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, which has only three people on their board of directors: Bill, Melinda and Warren Buffet. If you think about the contradiction between an entity that is a private entity and that has so much ability to influence the public good and you think about the structures of accountability, how is it possible to have structures that allow a foundation like that to become more accountable to the communities that they're serving? In the Gates Foundation case, they're trying to do that by creating advisory panels such as the one I now serve on, such as the one Kumi serves on, where they are bringing different voices to influence and educate and bring different perspectives.

In the case of the Global Fund for Women, more than two thirds of our board is composed of woman activists, from different parts of the world who actually allow us to hear first hand from their own experiences what it is really like to challenge discrimination or what it is like to live with a disability in a developing country or what it is like to live in a country where the actual law discriminates against women, or against young people. We've also created a network of advisors because we work globally and we know that by sitting in San Francisco and New York, we cannot possibly know how to do the right thing in Turkey or in India or in Botswana. Advisors who are based in their own countries on the ground who can give us advice about what the best ways in which to support civil society in their own countries and also what are the challenges that local organizations face. They visit groups, they give us a sense of what groups are facing in their own context and they make assessments about capacity.

But how does one run a grant making program that is effective around the globe? And how does one do it in a really practical way? I want to share a few of our lessons. First, you have to be really clear about what it is that you're trying to do. If you're trying to strengthen women's voices as trying to ensure that you get money directly into the hands of women in their own communities, you have to be really clear in your own minds as a grant maker, that it is what you want to do. Second, if you want to hear from groups on the ground, you must make it possible for them, so as Kumi said, if men cannot reach the fish, or cannot reach the pond where the fish are, you have to do something about that. So one way in which the global fund has done is that you can write to us in any language. Turkish grantees can write to us in Turkish, groups from the Middle East can write to us in Arabic, groups from India can write to us in Hindi. That may not seem like a big thing but I think we're the only foundation in the United States that accepts applications in the language of the people who are applying themselves. If you're trying to reach out the people with disabilities and you don't accept an application that is written in Braille, what does it say about your intention to solve problems of people with disabilities? Thirdly, you need to define some broad areas and you heard Filiz describe the ones that we are trying to see whether we can have some impact in, such as health education, environment and ending violence. And finally, we have to be prepared to ask ourselves "Are we, as grant makers, willing to take risks? Are we willing to put that out there that we are willing to take those risks? Are we willing to invest in women who are really entrepreneurial and visionary and therefore also sometimes controversial in the issues that they're taking on?"

Let me share three stories. In 1992, in China, a small group of women wrote to us saying they wanted to establish the first-ever hot line for domestic violence in China. At the time, the issue of domestic violence was very hotly contested and the Chinese government said that it was a western problem and did not exist in China. They received 10,000 dollars from the Global Fund for Women and within the first nine months this hot line received over 3,000 phone calls. Today, they receive over 70,000 calls a year from women all over the country.

What started as a hot line has grown to include educating women about the laws that protect them and training community members to intervene to stop domestic violence. The hotline has been replicated in 17 cities across China and has forced the government to acknowledge that domestic violence takes on public health, economic productivity and on community safety. This organization Maple Woman's Center now leads national efforts to reform and propose legislation to protect women's rights. And in 2001, they succeeded in adding anti-domestic violence law to the marriage law in China. Speaking of this connection Kumi was making, on the one hand providing the service, which was the hot line, and on the other hand, making the shift to impact policy and holding the governance accountable for the responsibility that they actually have to take.

We're also very proud as I said earlier to have supported groups here in Turkey. In 1995, we gave 7.000 dollars to Women for Women's Human Rights, led now by Pinar Ilkcaracan, they were just one among many groups, as I said. They were researching women's rights in Turkey and violence against women in Ankara, Istanbul, eastern and south eastern Anatolia. They used that grant to do this research and learnt that many women were unaware of the rights granted to them under Turkish law. And there were virtually no women organizing or networking other than in big cities in Turkey. So they decided to dedicate themselves to providing Turkish women with legal literacy skills and reforming civil and penal courts to advance women's rights in Turkey and internationally. Since 1995, they've educated over 4.500 women on legal and economic rights in community centers that exist in 36 Turkish provinces. A recent external evaluation found that they were so effective that they had actually - Pinar and the Coalition for Sexual Bodily Rights in Muslim Societies won a prestigious international prize called the Gruber Women's Rights Prize for their ground breaking leadership in reforming Turkish laws and advancing the rights of Muslim Women. Pinar, previously not only served as the grantee of the Global Fund but has now joined our advisory council and helps us to make good decisions on grants not only the ones we make in Turkey but also in forms of grant making in other parts of the world.

Lastly I want to share a story with you about our work in funding women with disabilities. The Global Fund is actually one of the largest funders of women with disabilities around the world. Since the early 90s we made grants to groups of women with disabilities who face the double-discrimination of being a woman in a society and the fear of being ostracized that women with disabilities experience. We've not only made grants directly to the groups of women with disabilities in countries as diverse as Pakistan, Egypt, Columbia but also funded leadership training and awareness raising efforts. I want to end with a story from a gathering that I was at last year.

A gathering called the Women's Institute on Leadership and Disability which hosted women leaders from 30 different countries, speaking in 23 different languages including sign language, were present at a training program to really develop the skills of women with disabilities. I don't know how many of you have ever been in a room like this but if you can imagine we were in a room where people were on wheelchairs, some people were both deaf, dumb and blind, there was a woman from Botswana who was blind and had started a business of braiding hair in her village and was now one of the most skilled hair-stylists in her village. They were learning not just how to live with their disabilities but also particularly to deal with violence; because women with disabilities are disproportionately subject also to sexual violence. So it was watching them sort of saying "no!" and resisting and learning the techniques. But then there were also women who were leaders of the women's movements in their own countries.

So it's not just a question of "Oh, you're living with a disability, maybe you can do something for people with disabilities." No, these are women who are actually leaders around issues like countries accepting CEDAW (the Convention for Elimination of Discrimination Against Women), these are leaders who are running for parliamentary office, these are leaders who are challenging their governments to actually live up to the conventions on human rights that they have actually signed but have failed to actually implement.

So I think again, changing our own ideas about what we understand from investing in women who are making a difference is very important. I'll share with you this one quote they say, "We should think beyond our atrophied legs, we should feel good about ourselves, let us tell our story the way we are. We are loud, proud and passionate." And this is the way in which they actually brought their energy. In the following piece I'd like to be able to share some of what I both see as the challenges of being a grant making organization but also what I think are incredible opportunities to connect with people like this, both at the grass roots and at the local level, people who have the vision and the ability to see how transformation can really have profound implications for transformative change at the global level. Thank you very much.

### Filiz Bikmen:

Thank you Kavita, for another inspiring presentation. There are so many lessons that you've shared with us in both of your speeches. You've both covered a range of really important issues and topics: The existence and role of advisory panels, working with experts, being able to see the big picture but not at all forgetting the local picture, "keeping your ear to the ground" as they say, balancing investment in services such as buildings, institutions and also thinking toward policy and systemic long term sustainable change. Kavita talked about the impact that a small grant can make and the story that she told about Women for Women's Human Rights, the organization in Turkey and how 7000 dollars can go a long way to change so much including the penal code in Turkey. So that really gets us thinking about the impacts of grant making.

Now I would like to talk to you both about the subject of impact. One is how do we increase the impact that grant making can have, and manage this natural tension of addressing global versus local issues. Also I was speaking with the colleague who is in the audience today working on education reform and we were talking about foundations and their ability or desire to either set the agenda or follow the agenda. So an example of setting the agenda for the Sabanci Foundation is thinking about women, youth and persons with disabilities together and adding those lenses to each of those areas so that we are not excluding any of those groups within our work. Yet on the other hand there is also an agenda of the country and its development plan going forth within the EU and other democratization reforms. So the question is how do you as a grant maker, balance the national agenda with what is happening at the local level? Moving on from that we can talk more about how foundations measure impact and work with their grantees in achieving this goal. So we are going to continue that discussion after a fifteen minute break.

### DISCUSSION

Filiz Bikmen: I'd mentioned a few points that would be discussed with our speakers today, one of them was about the impact of grant making, what kind of impact it could make, what we can do to increase its impact and most importantly how to measure it.

The second issue was around agenda setting versus agenda following; to what extent do foundations set some parameters of the agenda but ultimately leave the approach in the hands of the local organizations to determine what needs to be done? And how do we strike the good balance between that? And finally, the challenges and opportunities that come. So let's start with impact.

Kavita Ramdas: So I think you know Kumi talked about the fact that there is a tendency in grant making in general but I think even more in the last five-ten years where some of the very, very wealthy individuals and particularly in the west have kind of emerged from maybe a technologically driven background with its engineering or software or computers. And there is a kind of a notion that well; if you could just find the one solution you know whether it is a vaccine or whether it is a particular intervention or something. But as I was seeing recently in a meeting at the Gate's foundation this is not like solving a software problem, in the work of development you are not going to be able to find the virus and then isolate the virus and say now we don't have to worry about this virus anymore. So I think one of the challenges for us is to think about the world of impact in a context we will be dealing with fundamentally very messy human problems and to emphasize the notion that you must understand impact in a variety of different views. And that it also takes a period of time over which you have to actually understand the impact.

So for us at the Global Fund, if you think about the first grant that we made in Afghanistan I was talking a few minutes in the break we made a small grant of maybe six thousand dollars during the time that Taliban was in power in Afghanistan to a group of women who were running secret schools, underground schools during the time of Taliban in their house. How do you measure the impact of that? You know. Did it bring down the Taliban? No. Did it actually have impact, you now could you actually see, could we go in then measure whether the children had first begin studying at second grade level and by the time they finished, they will finish you know either fifth grade level not necessarily. But the fact that we stayed with that group over a long period of time and that group today runs teacher training programs for the ministry of education for Afghanistan and reaches three hundred and fifty thousand students, now we can look and see something about impact. I would just add that when looking at the work we are doing in this field it's important not to be looking for immediate outcomes but rather be able to look at it over a period of time.

Filiz Bikmen: Which means having to stick with grantees and their work for a longer period of time?

Kavita Ramdas: Yes. If what you are looking for is making a difference long term then you will also have to stay with the grantee long term, if you are saying "Well, here is money and use it to feed this many children and this soup kitchen" for one time-then you can count exactly how many children came and how many hospital beds were filled. But if you are trying to see how do we increase empowerment for women in a community and the only way will judge that is you know world women coming to meetings ten years ago no one was leaving the house and today when you see the same women in that village for running for the village council elections then you can say okay, now we have made an impact but you cannot see it in one year. You won't see that change in a year.

Kumi Naidoo: When Albert Einstein put it in a different way when he said “not everything that counts can be measured and also not everything that can be measured counts.” And quite often grantees of foundations are increasingly being put under tremendous pressure to spend more time filling in forms, reporting being “accountable” and actually if you think about it, right, you end up being less accountable, to your vision, your mission, your purpose and you actually really are counting dollars. I think it is really important that foundations also understand that the development is a process, a set of processes that involve human beings. It's by definition somewhat messy at times. Social development should not be seen as a set of products. Far too often we commoditize the whole social development process. As somebody who pushes accountability very strongly, I am not saying that we want people who are recipients of resources not to be accountable. We want them to be accountable. And in fact in the context of transparency, I should say that in the meeting this morning with Filiz and Kavita, we decided that we want to have some debate however we are too similar in our thinking and we agreed to fake some differences.

Based on what Filiz and Kavita said, I agree the temptation to fund at the service delivery level and multiple policy level because you can get quick at the terms on the service delivery. And I will tell you about EU and the reason why I made a point about EU before. My background is in adult education one of the worst legacies from the system that left about sixty percent of all people from South Africa not able to read and write. When I was working on adult education I once signed a grant agreement with the EU for about a twenty million Euros, which is a lot of money and I am sitting down and negotiating Grant agreement with EU and I am telling them the methodology, the development of curriculum, etc. and the guy on the other side of the negotiation in EU said “Kumi, I am not interested in your methodology and approach, tell me how many ‘bums’ are you going to put in the seats (translator’s note: People in classroom seats)? Meaning, how many people will receive that adult education program.

I think that we have to understand that the process can sometimes be just as important as the final product if indeed. If you go with what the Sabanci Foundation was talking about in its sort of specific areas of focus for example, we are talking about participation, creating opportunities for people who have confidence in terms of employment we are talking about social justice and also the last point I will say is that the whole advocacy of research component in thinking about impact is important. So my appeal to you is that you need to have obviously some resources that are tailored towards monitoring, evaluation and assessment. But don’t overkill, don’t do it in such a way that your grantees end up spending more time worrying about pleasing you with their efforts and so on and less time on focusing on their goals.

Filiz Bikmen: Did you want to add something?

Kavita Ramdas: Well, I think actually these goals are some of the biggest challenges about choosing to do grant making as opposed to deciding “well here is three or four things that we want to fund and we are just going to fund them” and not going through this process of hearing what groups themselves have to see and what perspective they would bring in. So I was just going to sort of disagree a little bit, as some of the challenges that come from exactly what Kumi was just talking about. Because I think the other issues are very connected to what it is your trying to make a difference in.



So if you are seeking out on purpose the most marginalized i.e., women, young people, people with disabilities then you also have to understand that, that will show up there, marginalization will show up also in the quality of what the applications are. These are the people who are most likely to be not literate; these are the people who are most likely never to have filled out any kind of application before. They may not write well, they will lack confidence or on a very practical level many times women's organizations have no safe space to meet, the issues that they are raising or planning to work on or already working on are considered threatening to the status quo because they are going to change the ways things have always been, or their efforts are actually directed toward family and society by which I mean even the programs that they are planning to run they may not be let out of the house, they may not be allowed to go to a meeting, they may not be able to get from one place to another.

So I mean, I think some of that means that as a grant maker you are going to be required to do that much more to actually reach out to those constituencies and actually be willing to go to them. I mean that in some ways that is not just literally going to them but it also is this question what I was saying about access: If you have like a ten-page really intimidating application process and your grantees are groups who are for the most part illiterate you have to really think about what does that mean so in some of that in terms of kind of thinking about challenges and then I think the second question is because they are disproportionately marginalized the results are also going to be much slow in the comings. So they are starting from a place where the challenges they face are so old and so deeply and entrenched in terms of how society views them. That is what you are going to measure in terms of the progress that they have made also has to be connected with a set of an incremental process of transformation; it isn't going to happen over a night.

Filiz Bikmen: Well that transitions us into the discussion around challenges and opportunities. One that I see happening just within the context of the Sabanci Foundation is that there is a capacity need in the foundation as well, making grants to local NGOs and projects in six provinces across Turkey, which we are doing through a partnership program with UN, the Ministry of Interior and the Sabanci University. It requires a serious amount of time and effort, as you do not always receive the perfect project proposal. So I think what makes Global Fund for Women in that sense very unique is that it has the capacity, expertise and outreach to be able to have people working with those local grantees. But on the other hand a foundation that has just starting out with its grant programs is looking to work with the organizations, which have the kind of capacity and ability to articulate those goals and outcomes that make measuring and monitoring and realizing the strategies possible. There is a little bit of tension in that sense and being able to really work with local groups. What are your observations on that Kumi? What do you think that foundations can do in balancing on their own capacities to be able to empower local organizations if they don't have the ability to run the program directly?

Kumi Naidoo: I think that there are real opportunities to look at intermediary organizations and that it is a particular challenge, building on Kavita's example. I just strongly endorse that if you want to work with the most marginalized they are going to be particular capacity deficit so if as a grant maker you identify they need some financial management they need some general management, they need some PR support and then you say well we don't have the capacity actually give that to them. But in Turkey you will find organizations that actually can provide that sort of capacity building so that is one thing.

The second thing is I also think foundations should also relax a bit you know I say this because you see it is a broad scheme of things that foundations are putting out there and the kind of success rates foundations are having and they return it in investment and just compare it in the current reality when we are talking about bankers that have destroyed virtually entire countries like Iceland and so on.

Now I am putting this in a provocative way because I do think that sometimes let's be clear; the level of accountability that we have seen on some of the big global corporate players in the private sector versus foundations; you can't even compare that real sense of accountability. So it is important that we don't allow the impact question to actually limit our risk taking ability because once we limit our risk taking ability actually it is not the risk that we are limiting. What is more problematic is that we are limiting our innovation and in this all world of social development what is needed now is not business as usual what is needed now is the willingness on the leadership of foundations to take risk in a way that say "We can't simply be doing what we have been doing for the last twenty thirty years." Because it has not had the impact and the only way we get to learn new things is if we are willing to be brave enough to stick our heads out even though sometimes they may get chopped off.

Kavita Ramdas: And actually I would add to that that. I think this willingness to both for you as a foundation to make mistakes but also to encourage mistake making in your grantees. I think this is a very important point, I think the whole way in which the power dynamics of those who have money and those who need money; a structure that makes it almost impossible for the people who are actually asking for support to be allowed to make mistakes. And if I use that example of my being a scholarship student again if I felt that coming as a student to study at college meant that I could only think those classes in which I knew I was already good and I would get straight A's. Then I would never have actually opened my mind and taken a dance class or a class on international politics or a class in cultural geography or a class on women studies. I would have just done the economics that my father said ok, and study economics and that would have been it. In the same way if a foundation allows the organization that it is granting to try things and to recognize that in trying they may not actually succeed that they may actually fail and also to see that the failures are actually something that you learn from.

Actually if you can get to that place with the people who you are giving grants to feel free to share the failures with you then I think you have really achieved a remarkable advance in terms of kind of what you also can do as an organization. And I think it really will go to that question of innovation because you can only innovate if you are ready to take the risks that your idea which you thought could do, you may or may not actually do- but you have to be willing to actually try it and that is I think the specialness of the foundation money as opposed to say government money or you know very large private sector investments which has to be safe. Your (Sabanci Foundation) one million dollar grant program actually you should think of it as social innovation fund. It is a small amount of money that can actually spark a lot of creativity and give Turkish civil sector organizations a chance to take risks in ways that they couldn't do if they were sending a huge application to the EU for funding.

Filiz Bikmen: So just few more minutes until we go into the question and answer session, I'd like to get both of your views on what your opinion is about the opportunities facing Sabanci Foundation and this new grant program, just to give a little bit of background.

Most of our guests probably know but this is the first time a private foundation in Turkey is taking a step in this direction; we have a few foreign foundations making grants in Turkey we have the EU making grants through their grant scheme funds- but it is the first time for a Turkish foundation. What kind of opportunities do you think that poses for Turkey and potential grantees?

Kavita Ramdas: Well I will talk about a few things that I think really give us opportunities and I say us, more broadly grant makers in general but I think Sabanci Foundation in particular.

One: If you are willing to engage with civil sector organizations in your country as equal and respected partners as opposed to kind of recipients of your charity and that is an important distinction because your work actually couldn't be successful if they want successfully doing their work so it is not that they should just be “thank you so much for this money” but is also you should be “thank you so much doing this work that you do”.

Two: I think you can learn about emerging issues long before they come to play on the world screen. So I gave the example of Afghanistan the Global Fund was aware of the situation with gender apartheid and what was happening with the Taliban because we were willing to hear from groups on the ground long before it became a headline in the New York Times.

Three: You can head to shine a light on good work and bring other resources to bear. Your one million dollars is not going to be transformational but it can shine a light on those efforts in Turkey which maybe other people didn't know about and maybe now the Sabanci Foundation made a grant to a small women's group in Diyarbakir, maybe the EU will look at that next time when that group makes an application; they will look at them with a little bit more you know a possibility.

Fourthly, I think you have the opportunity to learn from, as Kumi was saying, these very creative social entrepreneurs who don't come with the usual kinds of credentials that we are used to look for when we say experts, so they may not have gone to any universities, they may not have big degrees, they may be from very small communities, they may be literate or illiterate but they may have really creative ideas for how to change the dynamics of poverty or unemployment or environmental disaster in their own community. Yesterday's Financial Times I don't know if any of you had a chance to look at had a big picture about a story about “Professor Goo” as he is called in Bangladesh. This is the person who has succeeded in transforming the process of using hygienic sanitation methods and building latrines and he is called Professor Goo but he is not a professor of any kind, he is just a local person who lives in the community but he has become a professor in clean sanitation method and has challenged and has really transformed the ability of Bangladesh to really make a huge difference.

Lastly, you have to expect this from me, but I think at this moment, choosing to invest in women; it is like seeing for the last seven thousand years of human history we've neglected fully fifty percent of our human capital and resources. And given the kinds of global challenges that Kumi's talking about, we need hundred percent of our human resources, we need hundred percent of our human creativity, we need hundred percent of our abilities and if you leave out fifty percent of the world who are women and girls then we don't have a chance at really succeeding in the struggles that we have ahead.

Filiz Bikmen: Thank you Kavita. Kumi?

Kumi Naidoo: I one hundred percent endorse all of that interest in two initial points. One is fully endorsing particularly the last point about the multiplier effect of investing in women. Well it is a politically correct thing to do and ethically correct thing to do. It is also from an econometrics point of view if you want investing in women ensuring that they have a level of educational skill for example so that they can create educationally nurturing environment for their children in their homes. But I want to also suggest that with the young people. We need to also look at young people in a very different way in the current global context particularly in predominantly Muslim societies.

Well, I often say that it is very comfortable for adults and adult leaders to say "Young people are the leaders of tomorrow" but actually in very real ways certainly in the context where I come from, in Africa where we have more than twelve million teenage headed households, because of the decimation caused by the HIV AIDS, you can't tell me that those teenagers that are bringing up two or three siblings are leaders of tomorrow. They are having to make adult decisions right now and it is also important that the way we deal with the young people has to be different particularly from the foundation community point of view and we are saying that the European and US foundations do solve still in a very paternalistic way where they focus on young people more from what they don't have rather than what they do have.

If you start with what the problems of the young people are then you don't see young people as a resource the innovation, the creativity. They can beat any one of us here with the Internet and are to navigate through it, they have so much capacity, and they have lots of deficits as well. But often when we talk about youth empowerment, we start by looking at the problems and not by looking at the way things are. So that's my one additional point.

The second additional point that I want to say is still when I read the documents when Filiz sent to me, I was so excited to see that there was use of a language of rights based approach to the work of the Sabanci Foundation. Because if you look at Turkey, South Africa, India, Pakistan, a whole range of countries and you combine what our political leaders have passed in terms of laws at the national and local level and the way they look at all the international conventions that they have signed, that they committed to all kinds of very ,very nice things. If you take those in fact it is not so much an issue of fighting for new demands which our governments have not committed to. It is actually getting our governments to comply with the commitments that they have actually made.

So when we think about a rights based approach it is about saying that human beings are endowed with certain basic rights through the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that on the 10<sup>th</sup> of December we will celebrate its 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary. It was adopted by the world of nations at the UN so what we are talking about is that there is a whole range of rights that citizens have naturally but also through the policies that are in place nationally and globally which our governments have signed. What we have is a big compliance deficit so foundations also I think have to shift from a charity approach to an approach of saying "well our citizens have certain rights and our job is to actually to make them aware of these rights, empower them with the skills to access their rights, provide them with networking opportunities and alliance building opportunities such as that they can campaign for their rights". And in the end, you have to do it through programmatic delivery as well through concrete programs. Because through the concrete programs that Kavita's organization and the Sabanci Foundation and other foundation's programs what you are doing is holding up you a mirror to society, you are saying actually "if you make these investments, look where seven thousand dollars to a group in China can lead to in a period of less than ten years". That is really extraordinary.

## QUESTION AND ANSWER

Filiz Bikmen: Thank you Kavita, thank you Kumi. It is good to know that we are on the right track; at least in terms of program design. So I'd like to now open the floor for questions from our guests. I think we have some microphones traveling. Can you please share with us which organization you are coming from?

Question 1: Hi, my name is Ozgul Erdemli Mutlu. I am the director of the New Center we are establishing under KAGIDER called women entrepreneurship and leadership center. I am also here representing the ARI movement which I am a member of, ARI movement focuses on youth empowerment and democratization of Turkey and promotion of democracy. My question is to both of our distinguished speakers-regarding the experience of most of the NGOs in terms of applying for these several grant programs. From what I see they fail to apply, they fail to come up with innovative ways and they repeat applying for a grant which includes conferences, workshops, lectures and such that so I was wondering whether or how important it is to encourage the grant applicants to come up with more innovative ways. Obviously some traditional methods work and it is important to repeat them whenever they are possible, for example, the case you gave about the hot line. In the Turkish case, I would imagine it could work more if that hot line is complemented with seminar programs targeted towards the imams, the Muslim preachers- instead of just meeting with the women or husbands and such. So I was wondering, what could be the best method to encourage the grant applicants to come up with innovative ways? And related to that some people ask repeatedly some of the grant applicants about lessons learned so I was wondering because not everyone can be aware of the mistakes, past mistakes and several programs, would it be useful in the case of say Sabanci's new program or for Global Fund to share some tips for the applicants? Thank you.

Filiz Bikmen: Thank you. I will take a few questions and then we'll take our speakers responses.

Question 2: Batuhan Aydagul, Education Reform Initiative, thank you for both speakers' visionary comments, my question will be about the global agenda and what both speakers think about the Millennium Development Goals and how they affect national agenda. You both mentioned how too much emphasis on delivery is actually damaging the way we do our work and you gave the examples of the EU. We are moving towards a scenario where as long as you deliver the donor or the funder does not really care how we do it. But you could be creating a lot of bad practices; you may not be valuing so many other things that are as important as deliverables. And I think Millennium Development Goals could be interpreted in a much more critical way as much as it has advantages and I would like to hear your perspectives about that.

Filiz Bikmen: Let's just take one more question.

Question 3: Nihat Gokyigit, one of the founders of a number of foundations in Turkey. Regarding policy in grant programs, don't you think we should give a big emphasis and importance to the problem that the world is facing-because of the conflict between mankind and nature? Now because of this which if it continues like this may end up with more important damages of a third world war and the signs are already here; like food security, concern, water saves, climate change and you name it. Now, in giving grants I think we should be also considering that this production whatever it is should be friendly to nature as well as sustainable and just to give an example; for instance silk production which again has to grow because of being a very natural product.

But also productions like plants which are resistant to water saves and to salty soil or addable herbs for instance, which these are all involved in rural areas where poverty is developing. So we should think in such lines as well as in other areas which are very rightly stressed on. That is all.

Filiz Bikmen: Thank you. So that's three interesting different perspectives one is as a grantee or potential grantee; what kind of things can we do to encourage organizations to be more creative in their applications and to give them that space for innovation. Second question was the Millennium Development Goals and what kind of perspective where we take to promote some "good practices" and the third is well I think is really important putting or adding in environmental lenses on the work that we are doing with youth and with women and with persons with disabilities. So we start with Kumi or Kavita?

Kumi Naidoo: On the innovation question, I think the moment you put it down on paper as said of innovative practices they become not innovations in the sense they become a formula. So part of what I think we are seeking to do is defining what innovation is based on the specific interest that you are working on within the particular moment of history that you find yourself in terms of the dynamics that are within the country within the world. So your challenge is searching for innovation. I think part of innovation is not having super clarity and how you get it. But it is about creating a space and spirit of exchange between foundations and the grantees where there is openness about how you can explore that independently where it makes sense and collectively where it does as well.

Kavita Ramdas: Kumi can I just add to that? I would give one additional piece to that which is this notion which I think is somewhat still unfamiliar for in the grant making field which goes back to that issue of treating the people who you are giving grants to as your equals and as people you really respect. So creating the room for this kind of conversation and it is not an application- that is really the difference. It is not like "Oh, your application talks about this workshop and that workshop, and this why I am thinking about bringing imams in". It's more about saying "when we saw what you did last year, what worked what didn't work and have you thought about this because this group in this part of the world has actually had success doing this".

So it is being willing to engage in a conversation that doesn't close down the space, because I think the thing you have to remember is as the person with the money the tendency of the other part of that partnership is always going to be like "Yes, yes!". I mean, I remember suddenly thinking that I had become the most brilliant person in the world when I worked for the Mc Arthur Foundation. So all of a sudden people were really impressed with my ideas and really impressed with everything I had to say. "That is a very good idea, you know, absolutely, we'll immediately put that in our application!". You have to be really careful about that the power that money gives you from being on the side of the person who is actually giving away the money makes it very easy for people on the other side to the all of the things you want to hear about how brilliant your strategies and ideas and whether or not they actually agree with you. So I think that is a really challenging thing and I would just add to Kumi that it is not just about kind of how you create that space for it is also about kind of how you actually practice it and a lot of that is about the art of listening and dealing with respect than equality across that divide which is a difficult one.

Kumi Naidoo: It is quite a powerful question about understanding the power relationship between a grant maker and a grant seeker and the first time I came across the idea I remember it was a close friend of mine who has sadly passed away couple of years ago and she has said to me “You know, because I have got the check book, people are trying to get”. So therefore the term that is sometimes used quite often is “partners” by foundations or international NGOs like Oxfam that affiliate to grantees in South and in developing countries as partners. I just want to insert the word “partnership” into the conversation because in a lot of the conversations in the whole civil society development, social development area “partnership” has become one of the most used words but also it has become one of the most overused and abused words. It is important we look at what we can draw from the notion of partnership but not in a way that it masks the power differentials that exist in the relationship.

About the Millennium Development Goals; when the Millennium Goals were first put on the global agenda in 2000 my colleagues did not respond with enthusiasm. Because we said “ If you take gender equality for example; the way huge, big expensive global summits such as The Beijing Summit in 1995, where there were much more ambitious goals on gender equity and what we found in Millennium Goals was that it was reduced to parliamentary representation and maternal mortality and education. Important as it is, many of us were not satisfied. That's why in the first piece that I wrote on MDGs, I called it the “minimalist development goals”. Because it was really minimal and then also when you have a goal which says “how we reduce extreme hunger by 2015?”, who makes the moral choice about which half you are going to take out of extreme hunger and which half you are going to leave in extreme hunger?

But importantly goal seven is on environment and goal eight is on the responsibilities of rich countries on trade, justice and so on whereas goals one to six are very clear benchmarks which have the responsibilities of the developing countries. Goal eight took the responsibilities of the developed countries that can have no more targets. So MDGs, even though it is imperfect, it is the best show in town. I would say that all weaknesses that my friends in the women's movements when it first came out figured and a friend from Guiana wrote that MDGs stand for “masterful diversionary giving”. Because it was going to diverge us from our work but not withstanding that in the words of Roberto Bissio, the Executive Director of Social Watch, a global organization based on Uruguay, he said in 2003 “while we might have dismissed the Millennium Goals when it first was put on the table, in the post 9/11 world, in the current global context the Millennium Goals is a revolutionary document”.

So right now one of the roles that I play is, I am the co-chair of the Global Call to Action against Poverty. Some of you might know, our slogan is famous; “Make poverty history!” and we are actually pushing for the meeting of the Millennium Goals and we always say “Meet and exceed the Millennium Goals now!” In conclusion if we cannot deliver on these minimalist goals then it will be a terrible statement about the failure of multilateralism and these huge expensive conferences where we seek solutions. And I should just give you on simple statistic; to cancel all of Third world debt, which is one of the demands and it is largely being accepted, we need five hundred billion dollars. I have been under mistaken impression that five hundred billion dollars is a hell a lot of money. In the last two months I discovered that five hundred billion dollars is a little bit more than peanuts. I just want to conclude on the Millennium Goals to say that if there is an opportunity for us to bridge the differences between rich and poor countries and to get greater equality in the world which will give us greater security in the long run, then it is really kind of important that we begin to see an issue like climate change for example as a real opportunity.

Sadly, I want to say that the solutions to the current crisis that have been put on the table are fundamentally flawed. If you ask people in the streets who are reading newspapers, they will tell you “well if the climate change is a problem and then what yearly does the President of the US say in terms of how we address the current problems”. You remember after September 11 we were asking “what can we do” and he said “go shop, shop, shop until you drop!”. Let's think about the part of the problem we have in the world and it has to be put on the table; it is unnecessary, over consumption. Maybe to conclude with this point to give you another statistical example; what Western Europe and North America spend annually on pet food alone could provide the entire African continent with three nutritional meals (a day). The EU subsidizes every European cow to the tune of two Euros per day given current exchange rates, half the people on this planet have less than that to actually live on and so all these contradictions are there but the challenges with in fact at a minimal level we can meet those goals and I still believe with seven years left it can be done if political will is there with the good conversations of Obama and his team. We think a lot depends on how the US administration performs after 20<sup>th</sup> of January.

The last point I can't agree with you more that we are totally out of balance with what we are giving to our future generations or we have a responsibility, every single one in this room, to our nephews, our nieces, our children, our grandchildren and what kind of world they going to live in. I was in a meeting with Al Gore and Mary Robinson in early August in Aspen Colorado, in that conversation Al Gore broke down, you know he gave the opening address and he said “We are nine years to turn the tide around the climate change if we don't do it this planet is finished!” It was a bit dramatic but it was quite heartfelt I thought and bottom line is, that if we cannot get that balance between environment and the needs of people and get it more balanced which is totally out of sync at the moment- we are not only betraying ourselves, we are betraying future generations and therefore the way we deal with the global financial crisis. Here is a suggestion to the Sabanci Foundation; even if you think about young people and you think about one of your objectives which is employment what you need to be doing- and that's why I am saying you have got to look at through so many lenses; try to think of how you can “green” our economies in a very, very serious way.

There is economic opportunity as much as environmental sustainability at play if we can get it right. And there is space for tons of innovation because there are no blueprints on the table. This is also Obama's big vision and if he can pull it off he will transform the world. Sabanci Foundation's structure, the way I read from the print, is presented as if there are two separate worlds; there is buildings, scholarships on the one hand and there is the grant making on the other hand. But I am saying you can connect that as well. You can connect your scholarships program with the youth program. Because if you say “we agree to target our scholarships to the hundred best ideas coming from young people who want to go to masters level or PHD level to study developing a new green technology” for example, that is the way in which I think you can infuse your scholarship program with the grant making program.



## CLOSING

Filiz Bikmen: What great advice! Thank you very much. We are running a bit over so I think we are going to have to unfortunately save the additional questions. You can approach Kumi and Kavita after the seminar.

I'd like to just first thank Kumi who traveled twenty five hours to get here from Johannesburg, through a number of different hurdles and challenges so I'd like to thank him for making time for us. And thank you to Kavita for traveling all the way from California stopping in Europe to be with us here today, it has been an amazing inspiration and a wealth of knowledge and experience that you have shared with us. So thank you very much and thank you all for coming and we hope to see you next year.