



**PUBLISH WHAT
YOU PAY**

Policy name	PWYP joint fundraising and re-granting policy
Date of implementation	November 2017
Date of revision	June 2020

Introduction

The Publish What You Pay (PWYP) Secretariat contributes to the implementation of PWYP's global strategy, Vision 2025, by coordinating effective, evidence-based advocacy; and by supporting a diverse and inclusive global movement. To deliver on these objectives, the Secretariat has six core functions: connecting advocacy; coordinating advocacy; campaigning; supporting effective national coalitions; fostering an effective network; and building effective partnerships. These are the Secretariat's core and primary functions and are outlined in detail in the Secretariat's [Operational Plan 2020-2022](#).

Over time, the Secretariat has played a role in supporting efforts to financially resource the implementation of PWYP's global strategy. It has done this by undertaking joint fundraising with coalitions; by leveraging core funds to support coalitions' work; and by providing technical advice to coalitions for their independent fundraising efforts. In the Secretariat's 2020-2022 Operational Plan, this type of support is envisaged as part of its function to support effective partnerships. When it comes to funding partnerships, the role of the Secretariat is strictly subsidiary to coalitions' own fundraising efforts, which remain critical to resource coalitions' work and for the overall sustainability and impact of the PWYP movement. Support provided by the Secretariat is further limited in scope and ambition by the scale of the global PWYP movement: with nearly 50 affiliated coalitions, comprising over 1,000 member organisations, the PWYP Secretariat cannot realistically extend support to all its coalitions simultaneously; the administrative burden alone would be prohibitive. A Joint Fundraising and Re-granting policy was therefore established in 2017 to clearly delineate the criteria that drive, and limit, the Secretariat's involvement in joint fundraising and the use of core funds re-grants. Chief among these is that all of the Secretariat's efforts must be aligned with PWYP's Global Strategy and the Secretariat's own Operational Plan.

This version of the policy was updated in May 2020 following a review of implementation to date, with inputs from select Secretariat staff, PWYP donors and PWYP coalitions. The review found that joint fundraising has allowed PWYP to obtain funds that coalitions alone would have not been able to secure due to donor requirements, such as cross-country scope or administrative burden. It also surfaced that joint fundraising has not led to competition for resources with coalitions and that re-granting has not created disincentives for coalitions to pursue and succeed in their own



PUBLISH WHAT YOU PAY

fundraising efforts. Overall, the review suggested that joint fundraising and core-funds re-granting amplified PWYP's fundraising success and increased the total amount of resources available to implement its global strategy across the movement. The review also offered a number of lessons on how to strengthen the policy, which are reflected in this revised version, by increasing clarity on the different roles played by the Secretariat, the criteria that drive fundraising and regranting decisions and related processes.

This policy covers three mechanisms that the Secretariat uses to work with coalitions in resourcing the PWYP strategy. These are: 1) Joint fundraising with coalitions, 2) Core funds re-grants, and 3) Support to coalition-led fundraising. For each typology of support, the policy provides a definition, eligibility criteria and an overview of related processes. Annex 1 provides further detail of key questions that the Secretariat considers in assessing when and how to engage.

1. JOINT FUNDRAISING

1.1 Definition: The Secretariat pursues funding opportunities involving multiple countries/ coalitions, where its participation is essential to access funding that coalitions would not be able to access alone (e.g., due to cross-country scope, large size of grants, significant administrative burden or requests from donors to pool funding,¹ etc.). Joint fundraising between the Secretariat and coalitions involves collaboration on proposal development in line with the scope of the funding opportunity and accounting for coalitions' comparative advantage; and, if funding is approved, on ensuing project implementation. The Secretariat is the lead recipient of funds and re-grants funds to coalitions for implementation. Where several member organisations within a coalition bring complementary expertise that is relevant to the project, the Secretariat will seek to work with all relevant member organisations, within coalition structures where these exist. It will also ensure coordination with other players in the extractive governance field that bring critical expertise relevant to the project or implement projects that offer opportunities for partnership and synergy. If/when the Secretariat is made aware of opportunities that coalitions could also access directly, it reaches out to the relevant national coalition(s) and assess the added-value or lack-thereof of engaging in joint-fundraising efforts for that proposal.

1.2 Eligibility criteria: Decisions to pursue joint fundraising with coalitions are driven by the following criteria:

- Evidence that funding would be difficult to access by individual coalitions or coalitions without Secretariat's involvement

¹ Historically, some PWYP donors have asked to channel funding to multiple coalitions via the Secretariat to strengthen coordination or reduce the number of grants that they had to administer. These "conduit funding" arrangements are now considered a form of "joint fundraising" in this revised policy.



PUBLISH WHAT YOU PAY

- Alignment with PWYP's global strategy and the Secretariat's operational plan
- The coalition organisation meets donor requirements (e.g., the themes and countries of work specified in calls or discussed with donors and governance and financial management systems are robust)
- The coalition adheres, or strives to adhere, to PWYP's Operating Principles and coalitionship Standards
- The coalition has actively engaged with the movement at regional or global levels, the Secretariat and other coalitions
- The coalition has, or can realistically develop, sufficient programmatic and financial capacity to absorb the funding and to manage the proposed project well.
- The Secretariat has, or can build, the programmatic and financial capacity to manage re-granting and to coordinate project implementation.

1.3 Process: The Secretariat and PWYP coalitions can identify opportunities for joint fundraising. The Secretariat encourages coalitions to approach Secretariat staff to discuss joint fundraising opportunities, particularly when coalitions have identified an opportunity that matches their priorities and also corresponds with the priorities identified in the PWYP strategy. The Secretariat will assess whether to pursue a funding opportunity, by verifying alignment with the above-mentioned eligibility criteria and consulting coalitions and, where needed, the relevant governing bodies (e.g. PWYP Global Council, Africa Steering Committee and/or PWYP Board). Proposal development will be coordinated by the Secretariat, seeking timely inputs from participating coalitions, including on necessary due diligence. Where funding is approved, the Secretariat will provide overall coordination of implementation and reporting to donors. Coalitions (sub-grantees) will for their part be responsible for implementing projects to a high standard and against agreed time-frames, ensuring timely narrative and financial reporting and regular monitoring of progress and lessons learnt. They would also be expected to signal emerging risks or required adjustments as early as possible. Joint projects will be governed by principles of mutual accountability, whereby the Secretariat and participating coalitions are accountable to each other, as well as to donors and the ultimate beneficiaries of the projects.

2. CORE FUNDS RE-GRANTS

2.1 Definition: The PWYP Secretariat serves a set of core functions (outlined above) for which it seeks to secure funding in its own right. As part of its annual strategic planning process, the PWYP Secretariat assesses whether it is possible and appropriate to re-grant some of its core (unrestricted) funding to support coalitions, by assessing coalition needs and the extent to which



PUBLISH WHAT YOU PAY

core funds re-granting contributes to the achievement of the PWYP strategy². Core funds are typically used to support:

- *Coalition core functions*. These include essential functions that donors are generally less interested in funding, such as:
 - Annual General Meetings
 - Coalition Strategy development, planning, evaluation and peer-learning meetings
 - National Coordinator costs (salaries and overheads)
 - A contribution towards representation, networking and training costs (e.g. travel to regional conferences, etc.)
- *Exceptional programmatic support* for coalitions suffering from demonstrable funding gaps that are beyond their control and prevent them from building on impacts from past implementation.

Traditionally, core funds re-grants have been limited in number and small in size. The Secretariat's ability to provide core funds and the size of funding available are ultimately influenced by the Secretariat's overall funding environment, which will change over time; as well as the Secretariat's limited operational capacity in managing and administering sub-grants.

2.2. Eligibility Criteria: Decisions on core funds re-grants are driven by the following criteria:

- Alignment with PWYP's global strategy and the Secretariat's operational plan
- Evidence that the coalition has clear plans to use the funds strategically, with clear results in mind
- Evidence that the coalition has tried but has been unable to raise funds to deliver the project, functions or activities that would be supported by the core funds re-grant
- Funding could lead to new funding opportunities (e.g., plan to invite donor(s) to the AGM, fundraising is a priority focus for the national coordinator, sustained project impact could rally new donors in support of the coalition etc.)
- The coalition adheres, or strives to adhere, to PWYP's Operating Principles and coalition Standards
- The coalition has, or can realistically develop, the programmatic and financial capacity to manage the funds effectively
- The coalition is actively engaging, or plans to use funding to re-engage, with the movement, the Secretariat and other coalitions.

² The PWYP strategy is informed by consultation with national coalition members and is endorsed by the PWYP Global Council and board.



PUBLISH WHAT YOU PAY

2.3. Process: The PWYP Secretariat considers core funds re-grants as part of its annual budgeting process, assessing availability of funding and alignment of re-grant opportunities with the Secretariat's operational plan. Coalitions can signal requests for support in their interactions with Secretariat staff, clearly outlining their request and how it aligns with the above-mentioned purposes and criteria. Final decisions on core funds re-grants rest exclusively with the Secretariat or, where appropriate, PWYP's governing bodies³. Coalitions that receive core funds re-grants commit to using the funds transparently against agreed priorities and time-frames, and ensuring timely narrative (progress, lessons and results) and financial reporting to the Secretariat.

3. SUPPORT TO COALITION-LED FUNDRAISING

3.1 Definition: PWYP coalitions traditionally raise most of their resources autonomously and without the Secretariat's support. In select circumstances, the Secretariat may extend technical advice to coalitions' own fundraising if this increases the likelihood of securing funding and if it positions coalitions to secure donor support independently over time. Support to coalition-led fundraising may include, but is not limited to: advising on funding pitch, making introductions to potential donors, reviewing draft proposals, or joining meetings with donors to advance the case for funding. If fundraising is successful, coalitions are generally responsible for implementing the resulting projects independently, with no dedicated implementation support from the Secretariat. As a result, unlike joint fundraising, no funding transits via the Secretariat (i.e., all funding goes directly from the donor to the coalition). However, on occasion, donors and/or coalitions may request (although it is important to note again that there is no guarantee that this will be possible) that the Secretariat's support extends beyond fundraising to encompass support on the implementation of the approved project. In this instance, expectations about the Secretariat's support and related costs (e.g., staff time or travel funds to support project implementation) need to be clarified and agreed in advance by the Secretariat, the coalition receiving the funds for the coalition and the donor.

3.2 Eligibility criteria: Decisions on Secretariat's support to coalition-led fundraising are driven by the following criteria:

- The Secretariat has the capacity and bandwidth to provide the requested fundraising support. If the coalition and/or donor expect the Secretariat to also support implementation, this is conditional on Secretariat's capacity and bandwidth and the establishment of open and active communication protocols about project progress to enable the Secretariat to support effectively.
- Scope of fundraising is aligned with global strategy

³ PWYP's board approves the PWYP budget on an annual basis, while the PWYP Global Council and Africa Steering Committee provide guidance on strategic priorities for the movement.



PUBLISH WHAT YOU PAY

- The coalition has, or can realistically develop, sufficient programmatic and financial capacity to absorb funding and to manage the proposed project well
- Evidence that the coalition needs Secretariat's support to succeed in its fundraising
- Evidence of clear plans to use the funds strategically, with clear results in mind
- Evidence that the coalition suffers from demonstrated funding gaps that prevent them from leading important work
- The coalition adheres, or strives to adhere, to PWYP's Operating Principles and coalition Standards
- Evidence that fundraising could lead to a long-term partnership between a donor and a coalition

3.3. Process: coalitions can request technical support for their fundraising from the Secretariat, outlining clearly what support they need and how the request aligns with the above-mentioned criteria. It is important to note that making a request is not a guarantee of receiving support as the Secretariat needs to manage fundraising support with its other functions. If the coalition and/or donor expect the Secretariat to be involved in implementation, this should be made clear before funding is approved. Where the Secretariat can realistically extend support in implementation, any related costs (e.g., Secretariat's staff time, or travel costs) need to be considered and accounted for. Further, clear communication protocols must be established with the coalition to enable the Secretariat to play its support role effectively.

Transparency

As of 2017, the Secretariat tracks and publishes in its annual audited accounts the proportion of its budget that is re-granted to coalitions, either as a result of joint fundraising or because it has taken a decision to re-grant some of its core funds. Information disclosed includes the name of the PWYP coalition organisation that received the funds and the amount re-granted in pounds sterling. Reports can be accessed on the PWYP [website](#).

Feedback

This policy is a living document and will be updated periodically to reflect lessons and emerging practice. Coalitions are encouraged to share their feedback with the Secretariat staff.



**PUBLISH WHAT
YOU PAY**

Annex 1 - Eligibility criteria

This annex provides PWYP coalitions with examples of key aspects or questions considered by the Secretariat in assessing eligibility criteria, and therefore, whether to extend any of the types of support outlined in this policy. The Secretariat recognizes that capacity across the PWYP network varies and some coalitions may not be able to meet all criteria at once. It therefore adopts a flexible approach that recognizes opportunities to grow the capacity of coalitions as support or funding is extended. For instance, joint fundraising projects are generally designed with capacity building and learning opportunities that allow coalitions and the Secretariat to develop capacity, hire new posts and/or share lessons between coalitions in the course of implementation.

Further, the Secretariat aims to play its movement building role by actively considering how, through joint fundraising, to resource several coalitions within a PWYP coalition who together bring complementary expertise that is necessary for the successful implementation of funded projects. For instance, some joint fundraising projects may involve partnering with multiple coalitions that work on different themes relevant to the donor grant or that bring complementary skills that are critical to success (e.g., advocacy capacity, research track-record etc.)

In all cases, the capacity of the Secretariat to oversee the management of the funds and to provide on-going support, and the extent to which the funding contributes to the achievement of the PWYP strategy, will be taken into consideration when considering resourcing opportunities for PWYP coalitions. Coalitions are encouraged to review PWYP's current strategy documents - [Vision 2025](#) and the Secretariat's [Operational Plan 2020-2022](#) – together with these criteria.

1. Joint fundraising

- **No competition for resources:** Is there evidence that funding cannot be accessed by the coalition(s) without the Secretariat's involvement? Does the funding opportunity concern two or more countries? Is the involvement of the Secretariat essential, or of clear added-value, to meet donor requirements (e.g. track-record of project management; track-record of financial capacity; ability to meet hefty due diligence requirements; ability to re-grant funds etc.)?
- **Strategic alignment:** Does the funding opportunity align with the Secretariat's operational plan and notably the fulfilment of its six core functions (effective coalitions; effective network; effective partnerships; connected advocacy; coordinated advocacy; and campaigning)? Does it align with PWYP's development plan and the principles that drive the Secretariat's fundraising? Would the funding opportunity add resources to aspects of the strategy that are currently under-funded? Would the funding opportunity result in, or open doors for, important new donor partnerships and sustained funding support?



PUBLISH WHAT YOU PAY

- **Relevance to funding opportunity:** Is the coalition in a country that is a priority for the donor, or eligible under a call for proposals? Is the coalition working on themes that are relevant to the call for proposals and PWYP's strategy? If the coalition has not to date worked on those themes, is there evidence of a strategic rationale that explains why they plan to work on them now?
- **PWYP Operating Principles and coalition Standards:** Does the coalition adhere to PWYP's Operating Principles and coalition standards (Refer to PWYP's [Governance Manual](#) for more detail)? Specifically, does it engage honestly and transparently with other coalitions and the Secretariat? Does it possess governance structures that ensure participation and minimize conflicts of interest? Where it falls short of some principles and standards, is there evidence that it is taking action to address gaps?
- **Active engagement with the movement:** has the coalition actively supported or led campaigns or research of relevance to the strategy? Has it engaged media and policymakers strategically to further the goals of the movement? Does the coalition share knowledge, information and materials from its work with the Secretariat, governing body representatives and other national coalitions?
- **Coalition absorption and project management capacity:** Does the coalition possess relevant comparative advantage and a track record of expertise on the theme of the donor grant? Does/do the coalition member(s) that would manage the sub-grant(s) possess sufficient programmatic capacity, including staff with the requisite expertise and competences? Does/do the coalition member(s) who would manage the sub-grant(s) possess financial management and audit systems that meet the requirements of the donor; and demonstrated capacity to meet in a timely and responsive fashion the project delivery and reporting requirements of the donor grant? Where no one coalition member brings all the relevant capacity, are there opportunities for multiple coalition members to work together to bring complementary expertise to the project? And/or are there opportunities to partner with other organizations (including those who may be allies but are not necessarily member organisations) that have the requisite expertise?
- **Secretariat's absorption capacity:** Does the Secretariat possess sufficient programmatic and financial capacity to manage re-granting and to coordinate project implementation? Can it realistically build this capacity by adding new staff, or training existing staff, with additional funding? Are new systems and processes needed to manage the grant and can they realistically be put in place?

2. Core funds re-grants

- **Strategic alignment.** Does the grant align with the Secretariat's operational plan and notably the fulfilment of its six core functions (effective coalitions; effective network; effective partnerships; connected advocacy; coordinated advocacy and campaigning)? Would the grant support aspects



PUBLISH WHAT YOU PAY

of the strategy that are currently under-resourced?

- **Evidence of clear plans:** Are plans to use funding clear and strategic? Are these oriented to the achievement of results? Have plans been clarified in a concept note?
- **Evidence of funding gaps beyond the coalition's control.** Is there evidence that the coalition has reached out to potential donors but has been unable to raise funds for the project and activities that would be supported by the core funds grant? Does the coalition operate in a country context with limited to no funding opportunities for work on extractive sector governance?
- **Funding could help leverage more funding:**
 - Where support is for core functions: Can the funding for core functions be used to leverage new funding opportunities? For instance, when supporting an AGM, is it appropriate and are there plans for donors to be invited to build trust and networks? If funding is to develop a revised advocacy plan, are there details on which donors will be approached to fund the resulting advocacy plan? If funding is a contribution to national coordinator costs, is fundraising a clear priority for the post? And have fundraising priorities and targets been set for the post holder?
 - Where support is for programmatic work: are there indications that additional impact could rally new donors in support of the coalition? Are there plans to work with donors as part of the implementation of the project in a way that could motivate them to support additional work in the future?
- **PWYP Operating Principles and coalitions Standards:** Does the coalition adhere to PWYP's Operating Principles and coalitions Standards (refer to PWYP's [Governance Manual](#) for more detail)? Specifically, does it engage honestly and transparently with other coalitions and the Secretariat? Does it possess governance structures that ensure participation and minimize conflicts of interest? Where it falls short of some principles and standards, is there evidence that it is taking action to address gaps?
- **Active engagement with the movement.** Has the coalition actively supported or led campaigns or research of relevance to the strategy? Does the coalition share knowledge, information and materials from its work with the Secretariat, governing body representatives and other national coalitions? If the coalition has recently not actively engaged with the movement, is there evidence that funding will be used to implement core functions that are necessary to re-engage?
- **Coalition absorption and project management capacity:** Does/do the coalition member(s) that would manage the sub-grant(s) possess sufficient programmatic capacity, including staff with the requisite expertise and competences? Does/do the coalition member(s) that would manage the sub-grant(s) possess financial management and audit systems that meet the minimum requirements of the Secretariat? Where there are gaps in programmatic or financial capacity, what support may be needed to deliver the project and activity? Can the Secretariat or a



PUBLISH WHAT YOU PAY

partner organization realistically provide this support?

3. Support to coalition-led fundraising

- **Strategic alignment:** Is the fundraising opportunity that the Secretariat is asked to support aligned with the four strategic goals of Vision 2025 and related themes of work? Does it align with the Secretariat's fundraising principles (e.g., no funding from extractive industry)? Would the funding opportunity add resources to aspects of the strategy that are currently under-resourced?
- **Demonstrated need for fundraising support.** Is there evidence that supporting the coalition will increase the likelihood of securing funding from the donor? Can the Secretariat add to the coalition's own fundraising capacity? On which specific aspects of fundraising does the coalition need support (e.g., review of draft proposal or aspects of it, preparing pitch for a meeting with the donor; support during meeting with the donor to make the case for funding etc.)?
- **Evidence of clear plans:** Does the coalition have clear and strategic plans for the funding opportunity it is pursuing? Are these oriented to the achievement of clear results? Is there a proposal, concept note or advocacy plan that illustrate the coalition's priorities for fundraising?
- **Evidence of funding gaps:** Is there evidence that the coalition suffers from demonstrated funding gaps that prevent them from leading important work? If the coalition has a solid funding base, are there other strategic reasons that would warrant Secretariat's support to its fundraising efforts?
- **Support could help leverage more funding:** Is there evidence that the funding opportunity targeted by the coalition could lead to sustained multi-year support or open doors for a long term partnership with the concerned donor? Conversely, are there concerns that this may be a time bound, one-off funding opportunity (in which case, it may not be prioritized)?
- **PWYP Operating Principles and coalition Standards:** Does the coalition adhere to PWYP's Operating Principles and coalition Standards (refer to PWYP's [Governance Manual](#) for more detail)? Specifically, does it engage honestly and transparently with other coalitions and the Secretariat? Does it possess governance structures that ensure participation and minimize conflicts of interest? Where it falls short of some principles and standards, is there evidence that it is taking action to address gaps?
- **Active engagement with the movement:** has the coalition actively supported or led campaigns or research of relevance to the strategy? Has it engaged media and policymakers strategically to further the goals of the movement? Does the coalition share knowledge, information and materials from its work with the Secretariat, governing body members and other national coalitions?
- **Coalition absorption and project management capacity:** Does the coalition possess sufficient programmatic capacity, including staff with the requisite expertise and competences, to deliver



PUBLISH WHAT YOU PAY

the project it is fundraising for? Does it possess financial management and audit systems that meet the minimum requirements of the donor? If it falls short in some areas, can funding be used to develop capacity?

- **Secretariat's absorption capacity:** does the Secretariat have capacity and bandwidth to provide the requested fundraising support? If the Secretariat is also asked by the coalition and/or donor to support the implementation of the funded project, does it realistically have the capacity and bandwidth to do so? Could Secretariat's costs for supporting implementation be recouped? Is there evidence from past engagement that the coalition will maintain an open and active communication about project progress to enable the Secretariat to play its support role effectively?