

# **MAKE POVERTY HISTORY**

## **2005 Campaign Evaluation**

### **Appendix**

Andy Martin  
Carolyn Culey  
Suzy Evans



# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## 2005 Campaign Evaluation

Prepared for the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** Coordination Team.

By

### **Firetail Limited**

Studio One  
7 Chalcot Road  
Primrose Hill  
London  
NW1 8LH

[www.firetail.co.uk](http://www.firetail.co.uk)

### **Disclaimer**

This is the report of independent evaluators commissioned by the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** Coordination Team. The views expressed in this report should not be taken as being those of the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** Coordination Team or Assembly members.

Any comments regarding this report can be sent to the evaluation team by email at [evaluation2005@firetail.co.uk](mailto:evaluation2005@firetail.co.uk).



## **Appendix**

1. Evaluation terms of reference
2. Questionnaire
3. Verdict statements
4. Organisational terms of reference
5. Analysis of working groups
6. Agreements of the final Assembly meeting

# **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY**

## **EVALUATION - TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **Background**

The **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** coalition set out three broad goals: to achieve significant policy change on trade, aid, debt and HIV/AIDS in 2005; to create an unstoppable momentum for further change beyond 2005; and to create a step change in British public backing for development. During the course of 2005, the campaign has attained unprecedented levels of public recognition and participation. There has also been policy change within the key areas identified by the campaign.

Given the major investment that coalition members have made in the campaign, it is important for future learning and accountability to stakeholders, that we assess the external achievements of the campaign against its three broad goals.

Internally, the coalition was structured to be innovative in approach, on the basis of learning from previous coalition structures and ways of working. It has functioned without a central Secretariat, employing only one administrator to support the structures' functioning; one media coordinator; and one event organiser. Beyond this staffing, its work has been based entirely on the energies of its members. With an Assembly of the full membership electing a Coordination Team to oversee progress, set strategic direction and policy, its Working Groups (made up of the staff of member organisations) have been the engine rooms for Messages, Actions and Communications; Policy and Lobbying; Media; and so on.

The Coordination Team selected a chair to provide facilitation rather than to act as primary spokesperson, the latter role being shared amongst members of the Coordination Team as the need arose. Four 'core coalitions' (Trade Justice Movement, Jubilee Debt Campaign, Stop AIDS Campaign, BOND; supplemented later by the formation of the UK Aid Network, and inclusion in the Coordination Team of the Trades Union Congress) had places on the Coordination Team as of right, and provided the lead in development of advocacy positions in their specialist areas.

This approach was designed to bring out, and base the coalition's work on, the energies of members; to ensure that its work was a genuinely collective endeavour; to strengthen existing organisations and coalitions; and to avoid the formation of a new institution or figurehead that would develop a life of its own.

Given the extent of innovation and thought that went into decisions on structures and ways of working, it is crucial that their advantages and disadvantages are fully explored, and the lessons learned, so that learning can be used as a basis for decisions about future coalition work.

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## EVALUATION - TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Purpose

1. To provide the MPH leadership, by *mid-December 2005*, with a provisional evaluation of the campaign based on an assessment of progress against its explicitly articulated external objectives or agreed proxies, where such an assessment can reasonably be made by that time.
2. To analyse the structures, systems and procedures established by Make Poverty History for decision making, oversight, implementation and monitoring of its programmes and activities, *by mid February*, with respect to
  - Their contribution (or otherwise) to the goals of the coalition
  - Their contribution (or otherwise) to the unity of the coalition
  - Their contribution (or otherwise) to the effective engagement and mobilisation of the coalition's members
  - Their suitability for effective strategic decision making
  - Their efficiency and effectiveness for operational activity
  - Their effectiveness for dealing with tensions between different perspectives in the coalition
  - Relations with other national and international civil society actors
3. To draw lessons for future coalition activity on economic justice issues – *by mid February*

### Scope of this project

For Purpose 1, the project will assess progress against:

- MPH's Objective 1: policy change in 2005
- MPH's Objective 2: an unstoppable momentum for change beyond 2005
- MPH's Objective 3: public committed to further change beyond 2005.

The assessment of progress against Objective 2 will be less in depth as it is recognised that actual progress against this objective – as distinct from forecasts - will only be verifiable in time.

### Methodology

The evaluator will use a combination of the following:

#### For Purpose 1:

- Comparison of documents setting out specific policy-change or mobilisation objectives, with documents indicating outcomes. NOTE: the Coordination Team will complete some of this factual summary work in preparing end-of-year messaging; the evaluator should use these summaries where available rather than repeating the exercise.

The documents include:

- Manifesto
- Policy asks grid/Differences document
- Records of supporter engagement through MPH via website and e-mail
- Plans for key events including:

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## EVALUATION - TERMS OF REFERENCE

Feb 4<sup>th</sup> Trafalgar Square/Nelson Mandela rally; April Wake Up to Trade Justice vigil; July 2 Edinburgh Rally; White Band Day II; November 2<sup>nd</sup> Mass Lobby of Parliament on trade;

- Minutes of CT and working groups such as Policy and Lobbying, MAC, G8 mobilisation, New Media
- Surveys commissioned by Comic Relief (Andrew Darnley) and DFID

(NB: All of the above, with the exception of a detailed analysis of CT and working group minutes, is likely to have been completed by the CT and can be made available to the researchers)

- Interviews with the CT chair, past and present CT links to working groups, past and present chairs of working groups, and anyone else they recommend
- Interviews with Heads of Campaign or equivalent from a sample of 10 member organisations who have been attempting to recruit campaigners for the future through MPH.
- Interviews with representatives of a sample of 15 local campaign groups (independent or affiliated to the major thematic networks or national member organisations).
- Phone or face to face interviews with between 30 and 40 policy makers (ministers, special advisers, MPs), civil servants, think tanks, journalists, academics and other informed sources. (The CT will provide a list of policy makers and civil servants who have been most targeted by the campaign. But interviews should also include policymakers such as rank and file MPs to gauge their perceptions of the campaign)
- Time permitting; it may also be possible to send a questionnaire to a wider external group. But this will need to be assessed by CT and researchers for feasibility.

### For Purpose 2:

- Paper research on the core organisational documents of MPH (including Founding Statement, structure Terms of Reference, a selection of Coordination Team and Working Group minutes) and the core coalitions
- Interviews and discussion groups with key participants, including Coordination Team members, core coalition personnel, and those with leading roles in Working Groups
- Focus groups with members involved in Working Groups but not the Coordination Team
- Questionnaires and focus groups with members not involved in Working Groups; regional groupings; elements of civil society that were critical, chose not to join MPH, or were excluded from membership
  - This element to be in two phases: preliminary round anticipated in November/December; further round in January/February
- Presentation to Coordination Team

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## EVALUATION - TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Outputs

The evaluation will have the following outputs:

- A draft proposed report structure and contents
- An interim report (December); if possible
- A final report of no more than 30 pages with an executive summary, plus annexes of key data, for use by the Coordination Team
- A summary report for wider distribution
- A 30-minute presentation to the Assembly
- Evaluator being available as a resource person for consultations on the future

### Schedule

Key milestones in the project are (these dates are subject to review at commencement of the evaluation):

- end-February: Final report to be presented to CT
- 14<sup>th</sup> February: Draft report to be presented to CT Legacy Working Group, for comment and return within 5 days
- 19<sup>th</sup> December: interim report presented to CT Legacy Working Group
- end-November: Proposed structure and contents to be presented to the Legacy Working Group
- 3<sup>rd</sup> week in November: Research begins

### Length of assignment

A total of up to 45 person days between November and end-February

### Management & support

The evaluator will report to Richard Bennett as Chair of MPH and project sponsor.

Project lead: Olawale Opayinka, as lead Coordination Team member for the evaluation.

Project administrator: Romina Vegro in identifying and obtaining relevant documents, distributing questionnaires, and setting up interviews.

Other project facilitators: Working Group leaders and focus groups, as appropriate. Lists and contact details to be provided.

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## EVALUATION – Ways of working questionnaire

### Background details:

- A. Name of your organisation:  
 B. Position:  
 C. Type of organisation (see list below):

International NGO, NGO network, Development education organisation, Domestic sector voluntary organisation, Trade union, Faith Group, Academic institution or think tank, Not-for-profit business or Media organisation.  
 Other (please specify).....

Size	Small income under £500,000 pa	Medium income of £500,000 - £2m pa	Large income over £2million pa
Tick as appropriate			

1. How did your organisation join the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY (MPH)** coalition?

Direct Invitation from MPH	Through another Network	My organisation asked to join	Other

2. Which **MPH** structures have your organisation been actively involved in (tick more than one where appropriate):

Assembly	Working Groups	Coordination Team	Ad-hoc Teams

3. The structure of **MPH** – Coordination Team with facilitator chair, Working Groups and Assembly - were established as an alternative to creating a central secretariat under a single leader. This was an innovative way of working, and for the purposes of the evaluation we are keen to capture the pros and cons of this approach in order to inform future coalition work. We would therefore like you to rank the effectiveness of MPH's ways of working in relation to each of the areas indicated below by using the following ranking system:

Effectiveness Ranking	Assembly	Working Groups	Coordination Team	Ad-hoc Teams
Excellent				
Very Good				
Good				
Fair				
Poor				

4. How effective do you believe **MPH's** ways of working were in relation to:

- a) Meeting the overall objectives set by the coalition (**highlight or delete as appropriate**)

Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Failed to do so

- b) mobilising and engaging coalition members

Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Failed to do so

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## EVALUATION – Ways of working questionnaire

c) giving strategic direction and taking decisions

Excellent	Good ✓	Satisfactory	Poor	Failed to do so
-----------	--------	--------------	------	-----------------

d) resolving tension between different perspectives within the coalition

Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Failed to do so
-----------	------	--------------	------	-----------------

5. We are also keen to capture what members felt about their organisational engagement with **MPH**, and to what extent **MPH** enabled them to meet organisational objectives.

a) Did MPH fulfil your expectations? (**highlight or delete as appropriate**)

Above Expectations	Completely	Satisfactorily	Below expectation	Disappointed
--------------------	------------	----------------	-------------------	--------------

b) How easy did your organisation find it to engage with **MPH**?

Extremely Easy	Very Easy	Easy	Not Easy	Very Difficult
----------------	-----------	------	----------	----------------

c) To what extent did **MPH** advance the aims or your organisation?

Extremely Helpful	Very Helpful	Complementary	Fairly Helpful	Unhelpful
-------------------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------

d) Did **MPH** help you to recruit new supporters?

Above Expectations	Completely	Satisfactorily	Below expectation	Disappointed
--------------------	------------	----------------	-------------------	--------------

e) Would you join a similar coalition in future?

Unconditionally	With conditions	Careful consideration	With persuasion	No
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------	----

6. What are the three things that you thought were best about **MPH**?

7. What things would you do differently in future?

8. Finally, please feel free to make additional submissions of up to 200 words to the Evaluators; these comments will not be attributable if used in the final report.

Please SEND your response to [evaluation@firetail.co.uk](mailto:evaluation@firetail.co.uk) by 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2006

**DO NOT RESPOND VIA D-GROUPS** as your confidential response would be visible to other coalition members!

# 2005: The year of MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## THE CALL TO ACTION

One of the most powerful sounds of 2005 was the sound of fingers clicking. A stark illustration of a shocking fact: that a child dies as a result of poverty every three seconds. It was a reminder of the vulnerability of billions of people living a life of poverty perpetuated not by chance or nature, but by human decisions.

The click was a call to action from **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY**, the campaign launched in January 2005 to challenge these decisions. 2005 presented a series of exceptional international opportunities with the G8 taking place in Scotland; the UK Presidency of the European Union, the UN's planned review of the Millennium Development Goals and the World Trade Organisation ministerial in Hong Kong. By empowering a new generation of campaigners to take action **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** believed that governments could make fundamental decisions that would improve the lives of millions of people.

The campaign was organised by a coalition representing all aspects of civil society from schools and faith groups to trade unions, international development and aid organisations to grassroots campaigners. They were all united in the belief that a sea change was needed and, through mobilising massive public support, it would be possible to bring about a fundamental rethink of the rules of the relationship between the poor and the rich world.

## JUSTICE NOT CHARITY

Instead of asking for charity, the campaign called for justice: for the governments of the richest countries to make the political decisions that deliver justice for the world's poorest people. Through the G8 and Presidency of the European Union (EU), the UK Government was challenged to take a lead internationally at the G8, the UN World Summit and the World Trade Organisation, to make radical changes to its own economic policies and push for long-term changes internationally on three critical and inextricably linked areas: injustice in global trade, the huge burden of unpayable and unjust debt and insufficient and ineffective aid.

Crucial to the call for justice is allowing developing countries the freedom to decide their own economic policies. Rich countries continue to have a huge influence over poor countries through the conditions they apply to aid and debt relief. We recognise that conditions that encourage greater transparency and empower citizens to hold their government to account can be helpful in eradicating poverty. But a core demand of the campaign was an end to the undemocratic and damaging conditions that often hurt rather than help those most in need through inappropriate privatisation of public services such as water, the forcing open of markets to rich-country goods and cut backs in spending on health and education.

## CAMPAIGNING ACROSS THE UK

In February, when Nelson Mandela stood in front of 20,000 people in Trafalgar Square, no one could have anticipated the response to his rallying cry. In unprecedented numbers, people answered the call. Seasoned activists and first-time campaigners from all over the UK stood up to show that they were the generation to take action against the injustice of global poverty.

The UK coalition rapidly grew, representing over 540 organisations, and the massive participation of the UK public exceeded all expectations. After just six months, 87% of the UK population had heard about the campaign.

# 2005: The year of MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

Around the UK campaigners organised marches, bike rides, vigils, drama, walks, concerts, debates and rallies. The white band – global symbol of the campaign to make poverty history – was worn on wrists, draped on buildings, tied to lampposts, trees, statues and landmarks including London's St Paul's Cathedral. Over three million children asked Prime Minister Tony Blair to urge the G8 leaders to 'Send My Friend to School', highlighting the vital importance of education for generations of children as a way out of poverty. The C8 Children's Forum brought young people from across the world together to take action on global issues. Over 1,500 attended a Global Student Forum and pupils from G8 countries presented their own communiqué to the G8 leaders. Over 10,000 people took photos of their eyes to stress that the 'World is Watching' and waiting for AIDS treatment for all by 2010.

Supporters lobbied their MPs in huge numbers. In April, 25,000 people took part in an overnight vigil for trade justice in Westminster; the biggest protest during the 2005 UK election period. Over 500,000 people contacted the Prime Minister and over 800,000 activists campaigned online through the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** website alone. Eight million people in the UK wore a white band and, on the biggest public demonstration on global poverty the UK has seen, a quarter of a million people marched in Edinburgh ahead of the arrival of the G8 leaders - over half joining a protest for the first time.

Ahead of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) meeting in December, 375 MPs were lobbied in a single day in the largest ever mass lobby of Parliament and over 750,000 people in the UK cast a Vote for Trade Justice to show their support for change. No politician in this country can claim not to have heard their demands.

## THE GLOBAL CAMPAIGN

The UK was not alone in its efforts but part of an astonishing global movement: 31 million people from 84 national coalitions around the world united in the Global Call to Action against Poverty.

Across the world campaigners gathered together on three co-ordinated White Band Days on July 1st, September 10th and December 10th to pressure their governments through a vast array of events and activities. In Delhi, 10,000 people from across South Asia attended the South Asian People's Summit Against Poverty. Massive concerts took place in South Korea and Ghana. Brazilian campaigners marched on Rio's Ipanema beach. Thousands of Kenyans joined 'The People's March For Justice' and in Niger, campaigners toured G8 embassies for a breakfast lobby. In Dublin 20,000 took part in one of the biggest-ever gatherings of people in Ireland.

As in the UK, the white band was hung on churches, mosques, town halls, schools and landmarks to demonstrate solidarity with the global movement: the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin, the Coliseum in Rome, the Tokyo Tower, Istiqlal placate, the largest mosque in Jakarta and in Peru a white band was displayed at San Martin Square, the site of the biggest demonstrations of Peruvian social movements.

The Live 8 concerts around the world introduced the campaign to a huge global audience, playing an important role in boosting popular international mobilisation in key G8 countries. The combination of grassroots activism, popular campaigning and global action focussed worldwide attention on rich country governments to demonstrate a dramatically different level of political commitment and tackle global poverty through action and not words.

# 2005: The year of **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY**

## **INTERNATIONAL POLICY CHANGE**

The incredible level of public commitment and face-to-face lobbying was undoubtedly influential in ensuring global poverty was placed higher on the national and global agenda than ever before.

Important progress was made through the G8 in securing promises of extra financial resources for developing countries in the form of extra aid and the proposed deeper debt cancellation for some poor countries. In addition, several rich countries promised to meet more ambitious aid targets further in the future. Importantly, three crucial international principles were established at key international forums:

- The international acceptance of the principle of 100% multilateral debt cancellation.
- The undertaking at the G8 summit that developing countries have the right to “decide, plan and sequence their economic policies to fit with their own development strategies.”
- Support for as close as possible to universal access to treatment for HIV and AIDS for all who need it by 2010.

These principles provide important levers for campaigning in the future, though they do not yet live up to the scale of the challenge set by campaigners.

## **UK POLICY CHANGE**

The UK Government expended considerable political capital internationally on the broad agenda of global poverty and in many specific areas of development. In particular, the Government demonstrated leadership at the G8 summit in July and worked hard to deliver significant steps towards debt cancellation and more and better aid. Mention of policy changes on aid, trade and debt also featured heavily in UK political party manifestos during this year's election campaign and in domestic political debates this year, though progress has often focussed on the more easily attainable policy demands.

In terms of UK policy change, a number of important new changes in approach were established and campaigners are now looking for urgent evidence of them being turned into practical action:

- The UK Government's recognition that donors' imposition of economic policies on developing countries is inappropriate and ineffective for poverty eradication.
- The commitment to no longer make UK bilateral aid conditional on recipient governments making specific economic policy decisions.
- The promise to make UK aid more predictable so action against poverty can be more effective.
- The UK Government and Labour manifesto statements that poor countries should not be forced to open their markets and provide assurances that this is a priority approach in regional and multilateral trade negotiations.
- The UK demonstrated a shift in its support for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria by doubling its contribution to the Fund from the previous year.

These advances must now be turned into a strong platform to build on. Challenges remain and in some areas, especially on trade, the UK has failed to stop an EU agenda that runs counter to **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY's** demands. For instance, they have failed to block further attempts by the EU to straightjacket poor countries into liberalising their service sectors and campaigners are questioning the role they have played at the WTO in the push to pressure poor countries into liberalising their trade in industrial goods.

# 2005: The year of MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## 1) MORE AND BETTER AID

**MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY called for donors to immediately deliver at least \$50 billion more in aid per year and set a binding timetable for spending 0.7% of national income on aid. Aid must also be made to work more effectively for poor people.**

The 2005 G8 summit signalled an extra \$48 billion a year by 2010, which included between \$15 and \$20 billion of new commitments. If this promise is kept and delivered without imposing economic conditions, millions of lives could be saved. This will be a lasting legacy of 2005. However, the aid pledges made this year are not on the scale needed to make poverty history. The rate of progress towards the long overdue target of 0.7% is still far too slow.

Fifteen members of the EU have set themselves the goal of spending 0.56% of GDP on world development aid by 2010, and reaching the UN target of a minimum of 0.7% of GDP by 2015. This will mean increasing public development aid by more than €20 billion over the next five years. The EU commitment to reaching 0.7% by 2015 is encouraging but individual Member States must now ensure they fully deliver on their pledges and do not backtrack on their commitments.

On the call to ensure better quality and more effective aid some limited progress was made. G8 countries recognised that developing countries have the right to decide their own economic policies, although they failed to translate this into concrete changes in the conditions attached to aid. Donors agreed to be monitored on targets to ensure that aid is better aligned to needs and priorities, more focused on poverty reduction, is more coordinated and reduces the reporting burden.

Furthermore, Africa has been identified as a priority for Europe. The European Commission has called for the formulation of a European response to the continent's problems encompassing issues such as the quality and quantity of aid, elements of good governance, infrastructure, etc. Half of the increase in aid that EU Member States have agreed to (up from €46 billion in 2006 to €66 billion in 2010) will go to Africa. However, the targets and indicators fall short of campaign demands, especially on the crucial area of untying all the aid to all developing countries.

## 2) DEBT

**MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY called for the unpayable debts of the world's poorest countries to be cancelled in full, by fair and transparent means.**

The G8's debt deal, which has still to be finally agreed by the IMF and World Bank, should be worth up to \$1 billion per year for the 18 countries that qualify (around 20 more could also become eligible). This compares to the minimum of \$10 billion debt cancellation per year needed to help developing countries achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

The deal made by Nigeria's creditors to cancel roughly two thirds (\$18 billion) of its debt was a welcome addition to the package of debt cancellation this year. We do not support some aspects of this deal; for example Nigeria, in spite of its huge poverty needs, will be required to make a large upfront payment of \$12.4 billion. We hope creditors will return this money immediately for the benefit of people who are poor.

The principle of cancelling 100 per cent of the debt owed to multilateral institutions and recognising that debt relief must extend further than the current list of eligible countries are important breakthroughs but major issues remain unresolved. Most indebted developing countries still do not qualify for debt relief and the debts owed to other creditors such as the Inter American Development Bank have not been cancelled. Damaging economic policy conditions remain attached to financing debt relief and there is still no fair and transparent arbitration mechanism for resolving debt crises.

# 2005: The year of MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## 3) TRADE

**MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** called for:

- **Action to ensure that governments, particularly in poor countries, can choose the best solutions to end poverty and protect the environment.**
- **An end to the export and other subsidies that damage the livelihoods of poor rural communities around the world.**
- **Laws that stop big business profiting at the expense of people and the environment.**

In 2005 the UK Government changed the language it uses on trade justice including positive statements on reducing European agricultural subsidies, a changed policy position on trade related conditionality (the strings attached to financing) and important new statements on stopping forced liberalisation. Campaigners looked to December's World Trade Organisation (WTO) Ministerial for urgent evidence of their implementation, particularly around stopping forced liberalisation.

However, despite having the ability to correct some of the gross imbalances in world trade, rich countries at the WTO, including those of the UK Government and its European Union (EU) partners, favoured their own interests over the world's poor. The approaches of some, particularly the EU and United States (US), showed no respect for the poor countries whose demands and concerns were repeatedly sidelined.

In WTO services negotiations, the UK Government verbally committed to opposing mandatory approaches. Yet in direct opposition to developing countries, the EU continued to demand mandatory targets for the liberalisation of trade in services. This means poor countries will be pushed into negotiations that could see essential services such as water, health and education opened up to foreign competition.

Major developed countries failed to end the dumping of agricultural products in developing countries. The fact that the EU and the US are retaining the domestic agricultural subsidies that continue to damage poor and vulnerable farmers in developing countries, renders the agreed 2013 date for ending export subsidies an empty gesture. These subsidies account for only a small proportion of current agricultural support – less than 5% in the case of the EU's Common Agricultural Policy – and would in any case have been scaled down to almost nothing by 2013. Until the dumping of all subsidised crops and products on poor countries' markets is ended, small-scale farmers face worsening poverty. There was however progress in this area, special measures to protect vulnerable farmers in poor countries from liberalisation based on criteria such as food security, livelihood security and rural development, something trade justice campaigners have been calling for.

In manufacturing and industrial trade, the WTO introduced the most extreme method of cutting tariffs. These tariffs enable poor countries to stop the flood of industrial goods which can destroy local businesses. Unfair competition from rich countries' multinational corporations also raises the threat of massive job losses and lost revenue to poor country governments.

Urgent changes are still needed if developing countries are to protect and cultivate their economies. As the WTO reconvenes at its headquarters in Geneva, campaigners will continue to press the UK Government for urgent action within the EU to deliver on its promise of no forced liberalisation.

Two thirds of global trade is carried out by multinationals and, outside of trade talks, a key demand was for the UK Government to regulate companies. As it stands, the Company Law Reform Bill will not provide a legal framework to ensure that UK companies do not pursue profits at the expense of workers' rights, human rights and environmental sustainability. Provisions requiring companies to report on their social and environmental impacts have been removed from the bill. No meaningful steps have been taken to prevent trade rules undermining core labour standards. Campaigners are organising to insist these happen.

Trade justice is crucial to making poverty history and campaigners across the world, encouraged by the solidarity shown by developing country governments will continue to call for an end to unfair trade.

# 2005: The year of MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## 4) HIV & AIDS

**MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY called for commitment to universal access to HIV & AIDS treatment by 2010 and replenishment of the Global Fund for HIV, TB and Malaria.**

The G8's commitment to access to HIV treatment was the clearest success of the campaign, a significant and important policy shift to commit to "as close as possible to universal access to treatment for all those who need it by 2010". The target was endorsed at the UN World Summit and became an international commitment.

However, the concerns that the target would be undermined by the insufficient new aid announced at Gleneagles were proved right in September when the final pledges to replenishment of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria fell drastically short of the \$7billion it needed. This puts expansion of the Fund in jeopardy.

Whilst WHO and UNAIDS are taking forward the planning for meeting the target, campaigners will be watching to make sure the G8 do not forget the commitment they made. Achieving this target will require advances in UK policy and practice to generate increased resources, make drugs affordable and accessible and strengthen health systems.

## **OTHER CHANGES**

There have been significant changes outside of the direct demands of the campaign: the focus on ownership and conditionality has sparked a major debate on the role of rich countries in creating poverty.

Equally, many have questioned the role of poor countries own governments in delivering change, with many developing countries robustly challenging their governments to be more open and transparent and there has been a marked increase in the quality of debate around governance issues in the UK and beyond, though it is too early to say whether these gains are sustainable.

The recent impasse in high-level discussions for improving Export Credit Agency procedures on bribery suggests that not all G8 countries are taking their commitments seriously enough. In some key areas of international negotiation on anti-corruption and transparency measures there has been slow progress. Promises made by several governments, including the UK Government to ratify the UN Convention on Corruption have been slow to materialise, although the UK is still promising to do so. We hope these debates will prompt further action in the future.

# 2005: The year of **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY**

## **MOVING FORWARD**

It is impossible to look at **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** in isolation. 2005 has been a year of unbelievable tragedy with lives all over the world devastated by a series of shocking events: the Asian tsunami, famine in Niger and Mali, the earthquake in South Asia and the hurricane in Guatemala. All were stark reminders of the vulnerability of the billion-plus people on our shared planet who live on less than \$1 a day. Yet instead of reacting with a sense of helplessness, people have responded with an outpouring of compassion for humanity, solidarity and respect for the value of human life.

The unprecedented level of global campaigning on poverty in 2005 was very much a part of that incredible response. By raising awareness of the impact of global economic injustices, the campaign highlighted two key points: that poverty is not inevitable and that it is possible to make poverty history if political leaders have the will to do so.

**MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** is part of a powerful people's movement that believes in progress through democracy. The campaign has shown that it is possible for governments to deliver real change when faced with such public demand – change that can mean the difference between life and death for millions of people.

There is little doubt that the political decisions taken during the year would not have been taken without the passionate commitment of campaigners. If governments follow through on their promises without imposing harmful conditions, millions of lives that would have been lost could now be saved.

Campaigners have seen real progress but governments internationally could have done more. They have the ability and power to deliver what is demanded of them.

The billions of dollars added to aid budgets will make a difference but this must be promptly followed by further increases as billions more will be needed. Up to 40 countries could benefit from the cancellation of debts; meanwhile many are still spending more on debt repayments than on health and education. If promises hold fast, by 2010 virtually all those who need life-saving AIDS treatment will have it, but this promise risks being broken without a further injection of new resources.

While governments have made important statements of principle against forced liberalisation and economic policy conditions, these words must urgently be turned into action if trade is to be used to help developing countries protect and cultivate their economies. The continuation of injustices around trade will perpetuate poverty for generations. Any progress on aid and debt will not make poverty history without trade justice being delivered.

In 2006, the challenge will be different. The spotlight will not be on the UK in the way it has been in 2005, but the British Government must play an important role in sustaining international pressure. The Global Call to Action Against Poverty will continue to campaign, organising a global forum and at least one co-ordinated international event in 2006. Campaigners in the UK will continue to play their part and together they will hold leaders to the promises they made in 2005 and increase the pressure on them to go a lot further in the right direction to end poverty. Campaigners will maintain the push for the UK Government to change their policies and expend their political capital in the interests of the world's poorest people.

2005 is a year for campaigners to remember. They were part of the biggest ever anti-poverty movement and in doing so they made history. The fight against poverty continues and the passion, energy and momentum of 2005 will fuel future campaigning for the years to come.

The call to **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** has inspired a generation: 2005 marks the beginning of something incredible.

**2005 Mobilisation Structure  
Terms of Reference  
(revised Jan 05)**

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the structure of the 2005 mobilisation propose a simple, three-level structure consisting of an Assembly, a Coordination Team and a Support Centre.

The role and ToR of each body are set out below.

**ToR of the Assembly**

The Assembly consists of the members of the campaign, i.e. the organisations and networks who will be mobilising in 2005. The Assembly is therefore the campaign not merely the meetings.

*Role:*

- advise and be consulted on the strategy of the campaign
- act as a channel for raising queries and concerns
- ratify overall strategy and major decisions
- receive reports on progress
- elect the Coordination Team
- ensure voices of Southern partners are heard throughout the 2005 mobilisation
- ensure a diverse range of views is expressed
- agree themes of working groups

*Membership:*

- self-selected based on a commitment to the overall aims of the campaign and a capacity to contribute to it
- e-list to consist of all members of all the networks involved, and to be expanded on the basis of the campaign's outreach to wider UK civil society

**ToR of the Coordination Team**

*Role:*

- co-ordinate and oversee the working groups (ensuring where possible a member of the co-ordination team participates in each working group)
- propose and communicate the strategy and major decisions of the campaign, including determining the connecting features of the campaign (eg. common action, top line messages) and the shared calendar
- decide a mechanism for selecting spokespeople for the campaign and to brief them
- monitor and update campaign progress
- liaise with parallel bodies on relevant issues throughout 2005 (e.g. on climate change) and with other mobilisations (e.g. direct action networks) around the G8
- liaise with international counterpart networks
- ensure that gender and ethnic diversity are integrated in the campaign's strategy and overall approach
- appoint and receive offers for organisational and financial support to the mobilisation
- appoint an organisation to act as support centre for the Coordination Team
- oversee appointment of G8 event coordinator and other personnel as appropriate
- delegate tasks to the support centre as appropriate
- oversee the support centre's management of MPH finances
- oversee membership growth and engagement in the campaign
- strengthen existing organisations and networks
- ratify ToR for the working groups

*Coordination Team membership:*

- 4 Networks - Jubilee Debt Campaign, Trade Justice Movement, BOND and Stop AIDS Campaign
- 10 elected by assembly
- 3 co-opted members: TUC, Scottish MPH, Global Call to Action Against Poverty

The Coordination Team may co-opt other organisations or networks where the need arises.

#### **Role of the Coordination Team Chair:**

- Is neutral but also acts as a driving force to enforce the pace of the Coordination Team's role and decision-making in order to ensure momentum.
- Draws on the Support to the Chair Group in addressing in-depth underlying issues and for driving/developing strategy
- Ensures that the breadth of the MPH membership is appropriately reflected in MPH activities and representation
- Provides leadership to the role of the Coordination Team. However leadership of the overall mobilisation should not be invested solely in the Chair as innovation/dynamism needs to come from all of the Coordination Team
- Represents the Coordination Team as appropriate

#### **ToR of the Support to the Chair Group**

*Role:*

- Ensure coordination between core working groups to enable each to operate effectively within agreed plans and priorities agreed by CT
- Take decisions on behalf of CT within the boundaries of plans and priorities agreed by CT; refer decisions to CT where they go beyond these boundaries; delegate decisions to working groups where within their ToRs
- Oversee CT's relationship with support centre
- Advise the CT on prioritisation of use of MPH financial resources
- On basis of experience of working groups and interaction between them, ensure issues requiring political, strategic, policy and prioritising decisions are referred to CT; review and plan agenda for CT in this context.

*Who:*

- CT link people for the following Working Groups:
  - o Media
  - o Policy & Lobbying
  - o Messages, Actions, Communications
  - o New Media
  - o G8
- 1-2 others, identified by CT to ensure balanced engagement from CT, who will be rotated on a quarterly basis.

#### **ToR for the Support Centre**

*Role:*

- act as first point of contact for the campaign for the Coordination Team and the Assembly
- share information between Coordination Team, networks and members
- information process tracking/referral
- hold 'common scripts' and other shared resources
- facilitate meetings of existing functions across networks
- provide support to working groups
- manage finances on behalf of the Coordination Team
- provide support to Coordination Team

January 2005

## Detailed analysis of working groups

While a detailed analysis of each Group falls outside the terms of reference for this evaluation, and several Groups have commissioned evaluations of their own, key points to emerge from individual Groups were as follows:

### **Policy and Lobbying (77 D Group registrations)**

The Group started work early and worked together well, leading what was generally regarded – both internally and externally - as being a comprehensive and effective lobbying effort. They felt empowered by CT to get on with the job and welcomed the fact that CT did not attempt to micro-manage their work. Many of the key players had worked together before and this undoubtedly helped. Relations with the TJM policy group were “frosty” and this was seen to have hampered collective effort on trade in the second half of the year. The Group have decided that they will continue to collaborate in future.

### **Media (85 D group registrations)**

The first thing that must be acknowledged is that MPH generated unprecedented levels of media coverage, with 20 front-page mentions between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> July and over 140 articles in major newspapers between 26<sup>th</sup> June and 10 July. A media evaluation is underway, but in light of this enormous success, any discussion about the pros and cons of internal ways of working is, to some extent, irrelevant, as the column inches speak for themselves. Those questioned about the Media Group expressed differing views about its effectiveness in the early days, with some feeling that it worked well while others felt that traditional rivalries between agencies hampered progress. The one thing that everyone seems to agree on was that in the second half of the year, MPH’s media co-ordinator, who was employed to do just that, was effectively the only person delivering media work for the coalition - somewhat ironic, given that the Media Group had the largest virtual membership, with 85 D Group sign-ups. Other “ways of working” issues that emerged in relation to media work were:

- that the absence of an agreed, single spokesperson created a vacuum that sometimes resulted in others outside the coalition emerging as de-facto spokespeople;
- sharing out media opportunities between CT members inevitably led to a feeling that some got a bigger slice of the action than others;
- while incidences of coalition members briefing against each other in the media appear to have done little real damage, dealing with the consequences was an unnecessary distraction.

### **G8 Group ( 62 D Group registrations)**

As with media, the main thing to say about the G8 group is that whatever its shortcomings, it contributed to the organisation of a hugely successful event that exceeded all expectations in terms of public mobilisation, and was regarded by many coalition members as the highlight of the year. (For further details, refer to the G8 Event Evaluation by Nicki Brown). Like the Media Group, the G8 Group had the benefit of working alongside an independent, paid co-ordinator. While he admits to finding the lack of an organisational centre “baffling” in the early days, he welcomed the freedom he was given and the trust invested in him by CT to deliver the event. The main issue the Group struggled with was planning the 2<sup>nd</sup> July event against a background of prolonged uncertainty about the date in light of Live8 developments,

and managing divisions within the Group between those who were “in the know” about confidential Live8 plans and those who were not. Over-dependence on a single donor to fund much of the event was of concern to some who felt it might leave the event vulnerable to changes of plan. There was a general feeling that the Group did not have a large enough pool of people to take on all of the necessary tasks, and that some of the necessary professional skills were lacking. While additional staff were eventually recruited to support the co-ordinator, his view and that of the event evaluation is that they should have been brought on board much earlier.

### **Outreach Group/Organisational Engagement (35/51 D Group registrations)**

The Outreach Group concentrated on recruitment to the coalition until June 2005 then changed its remit to organisational engagement, encouraging existing members to become more active within the coalition. This was a sensible move, and one of the few examples the evaluation has uncovered of internal structures changing in response to the new circumstances generated by the coalition’s success. Members of the group estimate that around half of the 500 organisations that joined the coalition did so as a result of proactive outreach initiatives while the other half approached MPH spontaneously. While MPH had some success in recruiting unions, faith groups and domestic voluntary sector organisations, as the group acknowledges, it was not particularly successful in encouraging Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups to join the coalition. These groups were understandably reluctant to join a coalition that they had played no part in shaping and saw as being predominantly made up of large, white organisations. While the group had seven or eight core members and successfully developed its own strategy, it lacked a CT link for much of the time. Perhaps as a result of this, one observation was that the group attracted interest from those who wanted to democratise MPH’s existing structures and ensure greater voice for its smaller members, which in some respects put the group at odds with other parts of the coalition.

### **New Media Group**

The New Media Group have commissioned their own evaluation, the results of which are still awaited, but it should be noted that New Media played a key role for the coalition, both externally, in terms of the website and extensive use of e-campaigning, and internally, through use of the various D groups that allowed Group members to communicate with each other. Three main issues arose from discussion with Group members:

- a belief that future coalitions must treat new media as an integral part of an overall communications strategy, rather than an add-on;
- concern that the growing expertise of new media specialists was not being respected and drawn on by others, and that this reduced effectiveness;
- lack of adequate central funding for new media, which created over-reliance on a single member agency to act as the service provider and manage the website.

### **Messages, Actions and Communications (49 D Group Registrations)**

The MAC Group was established later than the other core Groups when CT realised that there was a substantial body of work that needed doing that it did not feel it had the capacity to undertake itself. The Group was responsible for keeping the overall communications calendar up to date, overseeing production of creative work, materials and resources for coalition use and maintaining an overview of media, new

media and celebrity activity to ensure co-ordination. It was by far the most acrimonious of the Groups, described by one member as “a shouting shop” and by another as being “unpleasant and unprofessional, with little respect for others expertise”. There was a clear split within the Group between those who wanted to reach the widest possible audience with simple, motivating, upbeat, messages and those who favoured expanding the existing activist base by using more hard-hitting, policy-based messages. While the first favoured carrots, the second favoured sticks but as one member pointed out “the carrot people had all the money, the advertising agency, and sign-off, so stick comments were made but ignored “. Failure to tackle these deep divisions resulted in MAC struggling on in a dysfunctional way throughout the year and everyone who raised this problem agreed that CT should have intervened to resolve the matter. Interestingly, one CT member suggested that people knew this at the time, but preferred to “contain the rot” within the MAC Group, rather than allowing it to spread to the CT.

### **Celebrities Group (No D group, around 8 members)**

The Group agreed at the outset that organisations would retain their own celebrities. Being clear about this allowed the Group to work well, as did the recognition that everyone had a day job and needed to disappear from time to time. Around six core agencies did most of the work. Links to CT and to other Groups seem to have been sporadic, as a result of which creative ideas from the Group sometimes had nowhere to go while bids for celebrity involvement sometimes came to the Group too late, and with an unclear brief. As with several other Groups, meetings fizzled out towards the end of the year and a couple of participants mentioned feeling let down by the lack of a proper year-end wrap-up, such as a party that could have involved celebrity supporters.

### **Youth Group (50 D Group registrations)**

The Youth Group continued to meet all year though attendance clearly tailed off post-Edinburgh. Main activities undertaken were the production and distribution of 500,000 postcards and the organisation of Gener8ion, the Youth Zone at the Edinburgh Rally. When anticipated central funding failed to materialise, the Group set up a business enterprise to market MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY pants and keys, profits from which were used to fund further activities. While the Group enjoyed the freedom it was given and felt that this fostered creativity, lack of a CT link and links to other Groups left members feeling that MPH as a whole paid lip service to youth issues, never seeking their active engagement in other Groups or inviting their opinion.

### **Children and Schools Group (42 signed D group registrations)**

The Children and Schools Group undertook two main activities, firstly inputting in the MPH website, producing a resource for teachers, and secondly, producing a resource for schools on the G8 outcome in September. As with the Youth Group, funding was an issue and one of the large agencies picked up the tab for the G8 resource pack. Both this Group and the Youth Group commented on the flat structure of MPH. While the latter saw this as an asset, allowing space for people to do their own thing, a member of the Schools and Youth Group pointed out that this seemingly open structure was, in practice, not very democratic as some organisations were much more able to put in time and resources than others. The fact that those attending the Group were often quite junior – sometimes volunteers and interns – was also seen to be a problem.

### **Churches Group (45 D Group registrations)**

The Churches Group did not meet on an ongoing basis but came together as a project team, initially for a Churches launch in January, then again to input into the Faith Zone at Edinburgh. It successfully brought in organisations that had no other links with MPH, and was task-limited, self-funded and specific, allowing organisations to come together to do one thing that they wanted to do under the MPH umbrella.

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## B. BACKGROUND TO PROCESS FOR DETERMINING HOW WE WORK TOGETHER AFTER 2005

- B.1 In August and September 2005, the CT first consulted the core coalitions, networks and Working Groups of **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY**, and on that basis outlined a series of options to the Assembly (at a meeting, and inviting comment from members unable to attend). Having heard feedback there, the CT prepared proposals for discussion at a November Assembly, and again invited comment from those unable to attend.
- B.2 The **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** Assembly on 31 January 2006 was asked to approve a number of proposals. These are the key areas:
1. Organisation of, and organisations' engagement in, collective campaigning
  2. Guardianship of the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** name and the legacy of 2005
  3. Representation of the UK in the Global Call to Action Against Poverty
  4. Use of the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** brand and name, and the white band
  5. How we work with the public and individual supporters of economic justice
- B.3 The Assembly on 31 January approved the decisions detailed in this paper, having made amendments to the CT proposals in some areas. These decisions, therefore, are the basis on which responsibilities will now be taken forward.
- B.4 The range of proposals and decisions here reflect the wish that there should be no diminution of active and collective campaigning into the future and that campaigning needs to draw on the value of the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** brand in a way that preserves and maximises its good name.

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## COLLECTIVE WORK FOR ECONOMIC JUSTICE BEYOND 'MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY'

AS AGREED AT THE MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY ASSEMBLY 31 JANUARY 2006

### A. THE FIGHT GOES ON

- A.1 We are emerging from an amazing year. There has been a step change in the public and political profile of development issues – we have broken records for mobilisation of the public and for MPs' engagement, and media coverage has been huge. A spectacularly diverse array of organisations have motivated their members and supporters into extraordinarily creative local demonstrations of support.
- A.2 Our pressure, along with that of partners all over the world, has helped ensure that politicians make new promises. They have not gone as far as we wanted, and whether they will deliver on their promises is still an open question. They need to know that there will be continued and unrelenting pressure in the coming years. So it is vital that all the organisations and people who have contributed to the pressure this year are still there, and still demanding change.
- A.3 2005 was always going to be special. We decided that we wanted to use it to achieve all of the above, but also to strengthen our existing coalitions and networks without setting up a whole new, expensive structure that would develop a life of its own. We wanted to get to a position in which we would have many more organisations and people wanting to work on TRADE, DEBT and AID into the future.
- We have done all of that, to a much greater extent than we thought possible. The task now is to establish ways of working to build on that, to make campaigning as productive as possible in the next few years.
- A.4 2006 and beyond will look very different from 2005, and presents different types of challenge. Working in the UK, the next years will feel more international: the UK does not host the G8 and EU, but we need to work in alliance with campaigns in the countries that do. Meanwhile, we will begin the long haul of securing the promises made in 2005 and pressing governments to go well beyond existing pledges.
- A.5 The **five decisions** outlined below are the result of substantial discussion in Assemblies and the Coordination Team (CT). Starting from a wide range of options, discussed at an Assembly meeting in September, we refined to a set of proposals discussed in November. Feedback from this led to a final paper from the CT, on which the Assembly made decisions. This paper is the final record of decisions taken at that Assembly.
- A.6 The overarching principles on which these proposals are based are:
- i. That our commitment to economic justice – and the need for it – remains the same;
  - ii. That collective campaigning by organisations in the UK increases the prospects of achieving economic justice;
  - iii. That our participation in global campaigning needs to adapt and strengthen now that the particular focus in 2005 on the UK has passed
  - iv. That our approaches need to adapt to a different context.

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## 1. Organisation of, and organisations' engagement in, collective campaigning

### Background

We have run the 2005 **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** campaign without setting up a new central secretariat. This has worked because of the time and energies invested by member organisations and core networks. This has been an important principle, that all the proposals for the future continue to reflect.

However, in 2005 the intensity of coordination, and the demands on organisations' time and resources, was enormous; we need to adapt our approach to something much less intensive, that will nevertheless work in terms of the expertise devoted to the issues; a degree of accountability to organisational membership structures; and continued coordination of effort.

### Decisions

- 1.1 That the core networks and coalitions (TJM, JDC, UKAN, Stop AIDS, BOND and TUC) form the heart of future campaigning for economic justice.
- 1.2 That the Trade Justice Movement, Jubilee Debt Campaign, UK Aid Network and Stop AIDS Coalition continue and strengthen their work in leading on their respective areas; and work together when their issues, or the decision makers they are targeting, overlap. Where appropriate, these networks may consider using the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** brand, but only in ways consistent with the attached guidelines.
- 1.3 That all organisations who are members of **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** coalition be encouraged to join one or more of the issue-based coalitions.
- 1.4 That organisations that are not ready to join these coalitions be supported by BOND to continue to engage in economic justice campaigning.
- 1.5 That BOND facilitates the continued involvement of the full range of organisations that have been part of **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** in 2005, by:
  - i. Managing twice-yearly Forums for the full range of organisations involved to explore and debate current issues
  - ii. Organising occasional, smaller forums of senior policy and campaigns specialists to look well into the future, explore common understandings of trends and key moments, and thus operate as a 'reference group' to help the wider Forums with strategic frameworks
  - iii. Maintaining a database of, and support for, organisations wanting to continue campaigning for economic justice
  - iv. Producing action-based e-newsletters to support those organisations' engagement in actions and activities led by the above networks and coalitions
  - v. Developing systematic working relationships with the key umbrellas of segments of civil society that have engaged, or could do so, in economic justice campaigning (e.g. TUC, DEA, Connections for Development)
  - vi. Preparing toolkits on where to find support for the work that they do; how to connect with networks and organisations on specialist issues; and what issues and events are coming up in the next period
- 1.6 That coalitions campaigning on other issues be invited to work with us if our campaigning on their issues would strengthen the cause of economic justice

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## 2. Guardianship of the MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY name and the legacy of 2005

### Background

Whatever other arrangements we have, it is important that the strong values and qualities attached in the public mind to the name '**MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY**' are maintained; and that the legacy of our work in 2005 is retained and remembered.

The CT which has carried this responsibility in 2005 will soon cease to exist; it is vital that we have a new means of managing this good name.

Comic Relief has applied for registration of the brand and name, and licensed all member organisations to use it. The license includes a requirement that a minuted decision of the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** Assembly determines the use and guardianship of the name.

### Decisions

- 2.1 That Comic Relief retains ownership of the registered brand and name, and liaises with the appropriate body (see 2.2 and 2.3 below) in managing guidelines for its use and corrective action for its misuse.
- 2.2 That BOND, in association with Comic Relief, is guardian of the MPH name, and is guardian of the legacy of the 2005 campaign; and that BOND coordinates closely with TJM, JDC, UKAN, Stop AIDS and TUC in fulfilling these duties.
- 2.3 That this guardianship role includes responsibility for any decisions to make active use of the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** name for major collective campaigns for economic justice in the future

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## 3. Representation of the UK in the Global Call to Action Against Poverty (GCAP)

### Background

While establishing the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** campaign in the UK was a key stimulus to the formation of GCAP, our heavy domestic focus in 2005 has meant that, as a coalition, we have not played a central role in helping to steer its development; and though we have operated within its decisions, we have not been led by them.

In 2006 and beyond, it is important that the UK plays, and is seen to play, a key participatory role in GCAP. Our campaigns need to be part of a global effort, and we need to hear and absorb the lessons and messages of our partners in other parts of the world – both the South, as the peoples most affected by economic injustice, and the North, as partners in persuading leading governments.

Without a Coordination Team, an alternative arrangement, that reflects representivity and accountability, and that is consistent with our organisational arrangements (see proposal 1 above) needs to be in place. We would expect lead person(s) to take part in GCAP's central decision making bodies; a number of others to participate in its specialist working groups; and the lead person(s) to be responsible for coherence and consistency between these.

### Decision

- 3.1 That BOND manages processes for deciding UK representatives in GCAP, and holds them accountable; doing so in close coordination with TJM, JDC, UKAN, Stop AIDS and TUC.
- 3.2 That BOND, through its role in section 1 above, ensures appropriate involvement in this of organisations that are not members of these campaign coalitions, and for making sure that small organisations feel that they are part of the platform and are kept informed.
- 3.3 That BOND ensure that experience of what GCAP is doing and experience from other countries is shared through the networks

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## 4. Use of the Make Poverty History brand and name

### Background

The **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** name and brand have been extremely powerful in 2005. They have captured the imagination of wide swathes of the public; attracted considerable media attention; and have come to embody an ethic, a commitment to justice, and a package of economic justice issues. Our debates, at Assemblies and Coordination Team discussions, have revolved around how best to build on this extraordinary resource without – in a necessarily less intensive period – the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** name appearing to be attached to a declining profile, and thus becoming a liability rather than asset.

Assembly members are required by the terms of their licensing agreements to decide on future use of the trademark and logo, through a minuted decision at an Assembly meeting.

This includes use of the words **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** 'in the course of trade', which includes charitable and political activities.

### Decision

4.1 That all organisations including local and regional groups licensed or currently active on the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** Manifesto may continue to use the name for that purpose and in their ongoing work, in accordance with attached guidelines. . These would allow use of the Trademark, alongside use of the logo, in a way that recognises 2005 as a special, landmark moment (especially in the UK) and that enables organisations to actively invoke the power and spirit of the campaign in 2005 for future campaigning.

### Guidance

4.1.1. CT believes this is the most positive way to channel and sustain the energy created by the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** name in 2005. Our campaigning in 2006 and beyond will be vigorous, but will not and cannot sustain the levels of energy created in 2005. So continuing actively to associate the name with the period of highest profile will retain its values more effectively than continuing to use it for all campaigning.

4.1.2. Since our collective campaigning will be led by the coalitions and networks (see proposal 1), they are particularly encouraged to make use of this approach to drawing value from the name when their activities build on our 2005 work.

4.1.3. Nationally, any decision on future *active* use of the name for campaigning will be the responsibility of the guardians of the brand (see proposal 2). The coalitions and networks (see proposal 1) are guided in its use by this proposal

4.1.4. Beyond this, any organisation using **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** as their name at a national level would be in breach of guidelines, and action would need to be taken through the guardianship arrangements (see proposal 2).

4.1.5. Local or regional groups, that have come together under the banner of **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** and have used **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** as their coalition name, may continue to use the name for that purpose and in their ongoing work, in accordance with attached guidelines.

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

4.1.6. The attached guidelines continue to require that the trademark and logo relate to the policy positions in the manifesto. They incorporate the fundraising guidelines produced during 2005; and require that the trademark and logo never appear without an organisation's own logo, so that there is no implication that there is a body called **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** in existence.

## **The White Band**

### **Background**

The White Band has been similarly powerful this year. There is no legal instrument for control of the white band as a symbol of people's commitment to see an end to poverty. Although it originated in the UK, it has been taken up globally and used very effectively through GCAP.

### **Decision**

4.2 That the UK follows GCAP's lead on future use of the white band; and that the UK supports any proposals in GCAP decision making that encourage continuation of people's use of the white band as an anti-poverty symbol, particularly at any event aimed at tackling global poverty.

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## 5. How we work with the public and individual supporters of economic justice

### Background

We have supported the engagement of large numbers of a whole new range of activists during the year. We are already seeing the spin-off for self-education on development, in much greater numbers of people registering for courses, teachers seeking curriculum materials, etc. This presents us all with a big challenge for the coming years: we need to make it as easy as possible for these people to continue and deepen their engagement.

Our approach to their continued involvement is focused on enabling organisations themselves to take up the challenge – in the spirit of organisations being at the heart of activity beyond 2005.

Visitors to the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** website in 2006 and beyond will be encouraged to join the live campaigns of individual organisations on the issues **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** campaigned on in 2005; a 'campaign chooser' tool for doing so now appears on the website.

Individuals have been given the opportunity to opt in to a central e-mail list that will run actively to the end of July 2006 (as the 2005 list ends on 31 January due to data protection considerations). Subscribers will receive regular e-mails that both encourage actions promoted by the networks and provide updates. They will also be encouraged to continue a decision making process about what organisations to sign up to directly in the longer run in order to keep campaigning.

The **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** website will continue with background on the issues and links to sources of further information; and guides to how to be involved in campaigning (in addition to a legacy overview of 2005).

Organisations will be encouraged and supported by the coalitions and networks of which they are members, and by the BOND-run newsletter and Forums (see 1.5 above), to take a lead in deepening people's understanding of, and engagement in, economic justice issues.

### Decision

- 5.1 That individuals continue to be given the opportunity to opt in to a central e-mail list that will run actively to the end of July 2006. Subscribers would receive regular e-mails that both encourage actions and encourage them to continue a decision making process for signing up to campaigning organisations in the longer run.

# MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

## C. THE FINAL WORD

- C.1 2005 has shown us just what we can achieve through collective effort, by working co-operatively to the extent – particularly for larger organisations – of submerging our own brands under a collective brand that has created enormous power.
- C.2 In 2006 and beyond, it is vital that we continue to work collectively. We cannot sustain the intensity of this landmark year, but we can build on our existing collective strengths – through the coalitions and networks that have been at the heart of **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** – to continue the campaign for economic justice together.
- C.3 We have to build on the advances we have made – pressing for delivery of promises, implementation of new principles, and progress far beyond 2005's commitments. And we have to build on new levels of public awareness and recognition.
- C.4 These decisions will help us to do this. We commit to working together for a future in which poverty really does become history.