

Campaigning for International Justice

Learning Lessons (1991-2011)

Where Next? (2011-2015)

Contents

PART ONE: LEARNING LESSONS

- 4 Executive Summary
- 7 Introduction

The Case Studies

- 9 The International Campaign to Ban Landmines
- 12 The Treatment Action Campaign
- 14 Make Poverty History
- 17 Jubilee 2000
- 20 Publish What You Pay
- 23 The Save Darfur Coalition
- 27 The Global Campaign for Climate Action
- 30 Make Trade Fair/Our World Is Not For Sale

Identifying Themes

- 33 Outline
- 34 Collective Action
- 37 Structures
- 42 Campaign Objectives
- 44 Leadership
- 45 Political Strategy
- 53 Branding
- 54 Celebrities
- 57 How Global Is Global
- 59 Funding and the Roles of Funders

- 60 Recommendations

PART TWO: WHERE NEXT?

- 64 Introduction

What's New?

- 66 The Fiscal Climate
- 67 Shifting Power Dynamics
- 69 Changed Global Infrastructure
- 70 Where Poor People Live
- 70 Digital World
- 71 Changes in Civil Society
- 72 Climate Change
- 72 Why Global Still Matters

Opportunities

- 74 Inequality
- 75 Women's Rights
- 77 Social Protection
- 78 Absolute Zero
- 79 Democratisation and Governance
- 80 Trade
- 81 Climate
- 82 Moments

- 85 Conclusions

- 87 Interview List

This publication is based on research either wholly or partially funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The findings and conclusions contained within are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect positions or policies of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Campaigning for International Justice

Part One: Learning Lessons (1991-2011)

Executive Summary

The international development movement has been one of the most successful movements in the world, creating truly great campaigns and changing the daily lives of millions of people. However, in the last five years the sector has been unable to replicate the scale of previous successes. This is due in part to a change in the international context, but it is also because the sector has become increasingly bad at learning the right lessons from its past successes. This study looked at eight high-profile international campaigns to try and identify transferable lessons.

The most apparent lesson from this study is that coalition is king. The most successful campaigns are all coalitions—and generally big ones. In some ways, this is obvious. It makes sense that the biggest campaigns, particularly the international ones, could only be waged effectively by coalitions. However, despite the clear evidence of their potential, effective coalition campaigns are harder to form by civil society because of their high transaction costs, the growing need for clear attribution and organizational differentiation, and the fact that many NGOs are now internal coalitions. At a time when the ambition of civil society is growing, this is a major constraint that needs leadership to overcome.

Of course, it is not just the presence of a coalition that matters—the nature of it is also important. While collective action is a necessary characteristic for large-scale impact in almost all cases, it is clearly not the only one required. There are numerous examples of coalitions that have been insufficiently focused, badly structured, or had such high transaction costs or unrealistic political agendas that they were condemned to being ineffectual from the start.

A key consideration to ensuring effective coalitions is their structure. Three types of structures were identified as underpinning the coalitions studied: secretariat-led, collaborative and flotilla. Clearly, there is no such thing as an ideal structure that should be applied as a blueprint in each and every case; the form has to respond to the strategy. However, the case studies do show that the structure of a campaign is one of the key determinants for how campaigns evolve and the tensions they produce. It is also clear that the characteristics of certain structures make them more suited to certain types of campaign. The recent trend toward lowest-common-denominator "coalitions," in which groups loosely collaborate with each other but fail to align strategy, branding, or even policy, should be entered into only as a last resort.

Structures are also important for enabling campaigns to reach beyond one country. We tend to talk about global campaigns rather glibly, but few, if any, campaigns have been truly global. While many campaigns, especially Internet-based ones, claim a world-wide presence, few actually reach the bar of being a concerted campaign in more than a dozen countries. This is usually not a problem given the objective of the campaign. However, in an increasingly multipolar world, engaging more countries will become more important. From the campaigns studied, the model that appears best able to deliver multicountry campaigning is the one followed by the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and Publish What You Pay (PWYP). The structure in both cases was based on a clear delineation of responsibility, with national coalitions joining an overarching central campaign that was responsible for the overall direction. The central campaign would consult with member organisations and delegate national implementation and strategy to national coalitions. This structure is predicated on a willingness to have a strong centre and to plan the international structure before rolling out national campaigns. The evidence suggests that campaigns that start as nationally focused and try to go international struggle to achieve the sense of ownership and clarity of structure needed to make international work effective.

Linked to this concept of structures is the question of leadership in coalitions. The tension is obvious: Good leadership requires significant empowerment of an individual to set direction, make judgments and take considered risks. Traditional coalitions, on the other hand, are generally defined by joint work, diffuse decision-making and compromise. While far from ideal, the case studies show that "internal" leadership—or leadership in the areas of campaign planning and implementation—may need to be compromised in some cases in order to keep the coalition together and ensure ownership over decision-making. However, external leadership—presenting a clear voice to the public and targets—must not be sacrificed if the campaign wishes to keep control of its message.

While structures and leadership are important, what makes or breaks most campaigns is the political strategy underlying it. This includes both the definition of the “ask” (not necessarily the same as the objective), and defining a set of tactics necessary to achieve it. The most effective campaigns were those that astutely judged their own abilities and shaped their strategies and political asks accordingly. Those campaigns that decided their ask irrespective of strategy or ability to motivate a constituency were much less effective.

One of the most contentious areas of political strategy is the balance between insider and outsider approaches and the risk of being co-opted, generally by government. It is vital for the credibility of civil society to be independent and be willing to speak truth to power. However, it is equally true that the credibility of civil society is just as damaged if it is seen as being oppositionist for its own sake, regardless of the position a government adopts. In most of the international campaigns looked at, there was a balance between insider and outsider strategies and a willingness for the political circumstances to determine the balance between them. Nevertheless, there remain some groups whose response to government is conditioned by their organisational identity rather than their strategic objectives.

The insider/outsider division also tends to mirror an incremental/radical divide. This divide has become artificially enhanced over time. What is clear is that more radical groups and campaigns have a strong record of trailblazing, shifting the political center of gravity, and investing in controversial policy areas and making them safe over time. However, it is equally true that the evidence strongly suggests that campaigns willing to balance ideal policy objectives with political strategy are the most successful in actually achieving change. The opportunity for complementarity between the different strands could be increased by an acceptance of their respective roles and strengths, increasing dialogue between the different approaches, and more radical groups focusing on longer-term policy objectives that they want to bring into the mainstream rather than short-term campaigns where their radicalism can be ineffective. It is also clear that there will be circumstances where the more radical groups are actively counterproductive or irrelevant, and if progress is to be secured the more mainstream groups will need to have the confidence to push on without them.

While strategic considerations are obviously the most critical, key tactical judgments also play a major role in campaign success. High among these are decisions over branding. From the evidence of the campaigns studied, it is clear that the creation of a unified campaign brand helps the campaign have real impact, particularly in the case of mass mobilisation campaigns. Despite this evidence, civil society is increasingly averse to creating jointly branded campaigns, primarily due to concerns over individual brand visibility. It will take renewed leadership from the major players in the movement if joint campaign brands are to be built. In an era when those big organisations are facing budget pressures due to the financial crisis and campaigning competition from smaller, more agile Internet campaign groups that tend to be more brand precious, it seems less likely that this will be forthcoming without significant changes in the sector.

Almost as contentious as decisions over branding is working with celebrities. Although there are some principled views on whether to work with celebrities, most of the arguments over the utility of working with celebrities tend to come down to individual celebrities and campaigns rather than generic arguments. What is clear from the campaigns studied is that celebrities can motivate the media, decision-makers and the public in a way that civil society cannot always do as effectively. They provide reach, a brand and political influence that civil society groups might not have. They can also help broaden the coalition beyond the usual suspects and reach into younger demographics in particular. Critical to moving from celebrity photo calls to real campaigning influence is engaging credible voices who the public, politicians and the media take seriously on the issue. This comes with risks. A credible individual will necessarily be thoughtful, independent minded and committed. All of these things will strengthen their ability to have impact, but also make them harder to control; they cannot simply be expected to parrot policy lines developed by others.

Finally, what all campaigns have in common is a need for resources. Perhaps surprisingly, none of the campaigns studied was initiated by an individual funder or group of funders. Many of those interviewed argue that this is critical to campaigns being seen as legitimate and ensuring that there is a group of committed people at the core of the campaign, rather than groups primarily interested in funding opportunities.

Based on the lessons of the campaigns studied, this report makes five additional recommendations that offer opportunities to nurture future effective campaigns:

- **Renewed commitment:** Commitment to real collaborative working appears to be decreasing in the sector at present. NGOs and INGOs, in particular, should use the current opportunity to review their collaborations and the added value they provide. Doing this effectively will require strong leadership from within the INGOs in particular, because they have the most resources and convening power, as well as a willingness to accept the trade-

offs involved in working closely with others. Lowest-common-denominator coalition arrangements should be challenged and rejected.

- **Evaluations:** The quality of current evaluations within the sector is extremely variable. There is a clear opportunity for funding bodies or NGOs themselves to set up a commonly recognised body responsible for high-quality evaluations. These gold-standard evaluations would help improve future campaigns but would also give funders and supporters benchmarked evidence that an organisation's investment in a campaign was worth it—thus making future engagement more likely.
- **Incentive structure:** Beyond effective evaluations, the broader balance of incentives needs to change to encourage effective collaboration. Funders have a key role in this. Forcing organisations to work together can often be counterproductive, but changing funding guidelines so that applications based on effective multi-organisational collaborations are viewed more favorably would help significantly.
- **Strategic discussion:** One of the problems within the sector is that there are far too few opportunities for joint strategic conversations at the right level. CEOs of the most effective and high-impact organisations rarely meet for collective conversations. The Berlin Civil Society Centre has done some effective work at bringing together chairs of boards, but this needs to be replicated at the CEO level with a small but international group of leaders from the sector—a G20 or Davos equivalent for civil society.
- **New types of collaboration:** While we may all wish to think that organisations in the sector are mission-focused to the extent of prioritising impact above their own organisation, there are real reasons why this does not happen. The sector has recently tried to navigate these tensions by creating looser and looser structures that, while effective at protecting individual organisations' interests, have failed to deliver the impact they aimed for. Another alternative that should be considered is for organisations to create a standing structure that brings them together on a regular basis around key opportunities. This would provide a forum to discuss campaigning opportunities and would reduce the lag time and transaction costs involved in creating new structures.

Introduction

“Those who cannot learn from history are doomed to repeat it.”

–George Santayana

This quote is a useful entry point for any evaluation. However, for the sake of this study, it should be inverted, “Those who wish to repeat their successes must first learn from them.”

The international development/justice movement¹ has been one of the most successful and high-impact movements in the world, creating truly great campaigns and changing the daily lives of millions of people by doing things such as securing debt relief, increasing investment in public services and banning landmines. With such a track record, one might assume that the tactics and strategies used by the sector are being honed all the time, preparing the ground for future impact.

However, in the last five years the sector has been unable to replicate the scale of previous successes. This is due in part to a change in political circumstances, especially since the financial crisis at the end of 2008, but also because the sector has become increasingly bad at learning the right lessons from its past successes.

Indeed, rather than learning from them, there are several instances where some of the core components of success have been intentionally jettisoned from future campaigns. This is particularly true regarding structure and branding, which are often among the most contentious decisions for participating NGOs.

This brief study aims to highlight some of the core components of the most successful and high-profile campaigns run by the sector in the last 20 years. It aims to identify transferable lessons about what has and has not worked in the past. This is not designed to be an academic exercise, but rather to help inform future approaches by practitioners, activists and campaigners.

The conclusions of this report should not shock; to the astute campaigner they should come as no surprise. However, they will hopefully provide impetus, evidence and ballast to win internal arguments about what works; encourage organisations to summon up the courage for the compromises needed; and reinvigorate leadership within the sector.

Of course, campaigning does not stand still. Campaigners innovate, targets shift and tactics evolve. But in looking at recent and not so recent campaigns, the extent to which many of the strategies stand the test of time is striking. From the campaign against the slave trade to the Make Poverty History campaign, strategies such as collective action, counterintuitive alliances, public mobilisation, insider/outsider pressure and media work have consistently had impact when tied to a politically savvy model of change.

Structure

This study is based on lessons from a number of high-profile campaigns on issues of global poverty and justice, namely: Make Poverty History (MPH), Jubilee 2000, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), the Treatment Action Campaign (TAC), Publish What You Pay (PWYP), the Save Darfur Coalition (SDC), Trade Justice—comprised of the Make Trade Fair (MTF) and Our World Is Not For Sale (OWINFS) campaigns, and the Global Campaign for Climate Action at Copenhagen (GCCA and TckTckTck).

This report starts by setting out the basics of each of the case studies with a short campaign summary. This summary is designed to provide the key characteristics and features of the campaigns rather than be a comprehensive study, evaluation or history of each. Readers who have limited time or know enough about the campaign already should skip the case studies and start with section two.

¹ In defining this broad sector, this report refers to the different and largely self-selecting groups of nongovernmental organizations that have traditionally been involved in international campaigning to change public policy on issues of justice and development. This includes INGOs, NGOs, faith-based organizations, grassroots associations and organisations, trade unions, and others.

Section two focuses on the common elements that were critical to the success or failure of the case study campaigns, drawing on and contrasting examples from each of the campaigns examined.

Finally, this report sets out a brief set of recommendations drawn from the study.

Methodology

This report is based on approximately 150 semistructured interviews with campaigners, politicians, celebrities, journalists and academics. Most of those interviewed are listed in an appendix, while some have asked to remain anonymous. All of the informants were interviewed between September 2010 and February 2011 in person or by phone. Interviewees have not been quoted directly in order to enable a more open and honest exchange.

A weakness in many evaluations of campaigns is that they base themselves exclusively on the views of those involved in the campaign. They distribute questionnaires to the participants and report back on who thought what. Indeed, in reviewing some of the major academic evaluations of previous campaigns, some of them seem to have been conducted without any reference to the decision-makers they were trying to influence. This report has tried to include corporate, governmental and media targets, as well as campaigners themselves in all of the case studies.

In addition to these interviews, a wide range of secondary literature was reviewed, including internal and external campaign evaluations, media articles, and academic analyses of social movements. A list of key sources is available.

The campaigns were chosen for one of two reasons. MPH, Jubilee 2000, PWYP, ICBL and TAC were all chosen because they are widely recognised by the sector as unusual in the scale of the impact they achieved, although the exact extent of their impact is disputed in most cases. SDC, Trade Justice and Copenhagen were chosen for the specific insight they provide rather than the scale of their impact, around which there is less positive consensus:

- SDC provides a helpful insight into mass mobilisation campaigning on an international issue in the U.S. context, a nut that many campaigns fail to crack.
- The two Trade Justice campaigns provide an insight into the opportunities and difficulties in campaigning on complex areas of economic justice.
- Copenhagen is the most recent major attempt at a coalition campaign and pioneered the “flotilla approach” to campaigning.

While this list is necessarily limited, it does provide a good basis for conclusions because it incorporates a wide variety of policy issues, types of campaign, and southern and northern focused campaigns. While this report has an international scope, it is concentrated in the countries where the campaigns being studied have operated, which gives it a Northern emphasis, with a particular focus on the United Kingdom.

This report highlights any strong disagreements that emerged about the success or impact of a particular tactic or strategy. However, unlike many other evaluations into coalition campaigns, which have an understandable tendency to avoid alienating future clients, this report tries to come to conclusions based on the available evidence.

Acknowledgements

This work has benefitted hugely from the access provided by people at the highest political levels, leaders of civil society, and those involved in the day-to-day running of the campaigns. Thank you to everyone who took the time, especially those who may disagree with the conclusions.

Thanks to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for supporting this work, to Save the Children UK for providing hosting services, and for those who reviewed the first draft.

About the Author

Brendan Cox has worked in international development for the last 10 years, including periods working for Oxfam, as executive director of Crisis Action, and, most recently, as special advisor for international development to the British Prime Minister Gordon Brown.

Case Studies

CASE STUDY: THE INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO BAN LANDMINES

Overview

The International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) began in 1991. Initiated by a small group of like-minded organisations (first by Medico and Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation, then joined quickly by Handicap International and Mine Action Group, and later HRW and PHR) the campaign quickly grew. Strong leadership and a clearly defined issue helped hold a diverse coalition together in almost 100 countries. Working closely with like-minded governments, the campaign successfully focused on key targets via a predominantly elite-level strategy, which resulted in a treaty being agreed upon in just over a year from the start of the Ottawa process. The campaign continued to ensure monitoring and implementation until 2010, by which time there were more than 150 state parties to the treaty.

Objective and Messaging

One of ICBL's strengths was its clarity of objective, which was to ban landmines as soon as possible and to do so via an international treaty.

Even here, though, there were initial disagreements between groups that favoured a broad definition of landmines and those that favoured a more restricted one. Those in favour of a broader definition covering cluster munitions and antitank mines argued it was perverse to ignore these weapons, whose effect was identical to landmines. If your leg was blown off by a hidden explosive device, it made no difference what exact purpose the device was built for. However, those pushing for a tighter definition won the argument on the basis that taking on antitank mines and cluster munitions would enable the opposition to blur the boundaries, characterise the campaign as a broader disarmament campaign and generally make it harder for it to succeed.

The second major controversy came during the treaty negotiations, where the United States suggested amendments as a condition for its support. While governments wavered, the campaign held to a strong line against these compromises and vigorously took on the Canadian government when it looked like it might be ready to acquiesce.

Strategy

The overarching strategy of public education, awareness raising, global coalition building and targeted campaigning remained consistent throughout the campaign. However, the implementation of that strategy and the political strategy alongside it varied as the politics changed. The campaign started with a focus on educating the public and building a global alliance of organisations willing to work together on the same objective. Initially, the campaign engaged in the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) as a way of making progress, but it soon became clear the consensus-based process would not deliver for the campaign.

At that stage, a group of like-minded countries—led by Canada and backed by pressure from the campaign—decided to take the issue outside the U.N. process and start what became the Ottawa process in 1996. Whereas the early strategy of the campaign had been predominantly outsider-based, the failure of the CCW and the core group of supportive countries headed by Canada and Norway convinced the campaign to work closely with this new governmental process. From this moment on, the campaign effectively became a collaboration between ICBL and a group of supportive governments with a shared objective, in which the ICBL had a formal role alongside its outsider campaigning.

Despite the obvious success of the campaign, many of its admirers attributed a large amount of the campaign's success to the opportunity of the moment rather than the strategic brilliance of the campaign: the end of the cold war, the coming to power of progressive governments in key countries, and the fact that landmines were only a tiny and

increasingly irrelevant part of the arms industry. While most of these points are true, even with this fair wind it took a savvy strategy to steer the campaign to success, as the continuing opposition from key states proved.

Impact

This is one of the clearest cut examples of impact of any of the case study campaigns. In 1992, when the campaign was launched, no states and few organisations were even willing to contemplate banning landmines. By 1997, an international treaty had been agreed upon banning their stockpiling, transfer, production and use, as well as agreements to clear mines and assist other countries in doing so. By the end of 2010, when the ICBL merged with the Cluster Munitions Campaign, more than 150 countries had ratified the treaty.

The few critics of the campaign argue that its failure to get key countries such as the United States, Russia, China, India, Pakistan, Israel, North Korea and South Korea to sign up undermines the utility of the treaty. However, the campaign can point to the norm-setting nature of the treaty, specifically that although these countries may not have signed up to the treaty, they have broadly abided by its provisions. Furthermore, the only country to use landmines in 2010 was Burma.

Nevertheless, there remains the legitimate question of whether more could have been done to influence and bring onside governments such as the United States. Those involved had split views. Some felt the United States had been on the brink and a better grassroots mass mobilisation could have pushed it over the edge, while others felt that the campaign would have had to be absolutely enormous to have any impact on the U.S. position. Both groups accept that the failure of the campaign to build a high-profile movement in the United States was a weakness that reduced the campaign's leverage.

Structure

ICBL had a very small secretariat, initially of just one person. This secretariat saw itself as helping to facilitate decisions, aid communication and also help lead the global coalition. The steering committee (later renamed coordination committee) was at the centre of the campaign and was made up of the core group of NGOs. Initially, this comprised the six founding groups, but it grew in 1996 and 1997 to include key southern campaigns in particular. Nevertheless, the strategic alignment of the groups remained high, and despite personal disagreements and tensions, it helped provide strong leadership and strategy.

Beyond this close-knit, highly structured center, the campaign was very decentralised. Groups simply needed to sign up to the principle of banning landmines to join. National coalitions had a high degree of autonomy to decide their own strategies and approaches. At least once a year, the campaign would come together and the steering committee set out its plan for the year.

The structure worked very effectively for the campaign. The mix of a strong global centre with national decentralisation helped bring the campaign together but also freed up groups to have an impact and lead strategy at a national level. The well-defined objective and the high degree of strategic alignment among those at the centre of the campaign were critical to this.

Tactics

Given the high degree of autonomy, the tactics of the national campaigns varied widely. The Cambodian campaign organised mass protests, for example, whereas others focused on media pressure and advocacy. In addition, the close cooperation with the core group of supportive governments enabled not only sharing of intelligence between campaigns and governments but also the strategic use of bilateral pressure.

Overall, the campaign is best characterised as a predominantly elite-level campaign. There were not many countries where the public pressure was significant enough to force a change in itself. It required working with insiders, advocacy with the military, strong bilateral pressure and strategic media work to create the shift needed. This worked extremely effectively, particularly as the campaign picked off target by target, concentrating resources and focusing on key countries to get them onside before moving onto the next target. It worked best when targeting states opposed to banning landmines but for whom landmines carried no strategic or economic importance. In these cases, elite-level pressure and acclaim were enough of a stimulus, especially once the first group of states supporting a ban made it a mainstream position to take.

The main drawback with this elite-level strategy was that for countries where landmines were more of a strategic issue and therefore opposition to a ban was more grounded, the campaign struggled to achieve success. In some cases, this was probably inevitable. For countries like Korea, where mines are seen as critical to holding the defensive line, almost no amount of popular pressure would have succeeded in shifting the government's position. However, a mass campaign in countries such as the United States may have paid more dividends.

Scope/Internationalism

ICBL was set up from the beginning to be an international campaign. Significant emphasis was placed on building up national coalitions and catalysing local action. The campaign used the ICBL meetings in key strategic regions to spread the campaign to new areas.

Almost 100 countries had their own national campaigns working on the issue as part of ICBL. The strength of these varied from fully functional campaigns in some countries to committed individual campaigners in others. The campaign achieved fully fledged coalitions able to exert influence in around 20 states.

ICBL also managed to inject itself into the international process so that even where there were not active campaigns, governments still came under pressure from ICBL.

Resources

ICBL was initially funded by its founding organisations, and much of the national work was funded through the resources of the organisations involved. In addition, foundations and supportive governments helped fund specific events, such as the ICBL meetings. George Soros also invested significantly via his Open Society Institute (OSI) in supporting national-level campaigns and their work.

CASE STUDY: THE TREATMENT ACTION CAMPAIGN

Overview

The Treatment Action Campaign (TAC), which works toward universal access to treatment for HIV/AIDS, was launched in Cape Town on December 10, 1998. It built a grassroots movement that went on to support and oppose the South African government, harass drug companies, educate the population, and challenge international policy. While President Thabo Mbeki was in power, the campaign struggled to secure the breakthroughs it sought. But even with a denialist president in place, it achieved real policy wins. Once President Jacob Zuma came to power, the South African government ultimately transformed its policies toward HIV/AIDS treatment, and now 1.2 million South Africans are on anti-retrovirals (ARVs).

Objective and Messaging

The initial objective of the campaign was a broad one of accessible and affordable treatment for those with HIV/AIDS. Beyond this, the objectives and messaging were dictated by the strength of the campaign and a sense of what was winnable. The campaign has recently broadened its objectives to include creating a health system that provides equal treatment to all South Africans. In 2008, following the xenophobic attacks that took place, the organisation widened its focus to include addressing them.

This broadening of TAC's objectives has caused some concern, both from internal evaluators and external supporters. Nevertheless, the campaign continues to be held up as the most successful in post-apartheid South Africa.

Strategy

TAC was highly strategic from the beginning. It recognised that to win on this issue, it needed to build a constituency. And once that constituency was in place, it needed to engage the public with the issue in order to combat the rampant discrimination. TAC effectively focused on targeting an audience in the heart of the black ANC supporting community that was most likely to have impact on the administration.

TAC started its campaigning not with the generic issue of HIV treatment but a focus on mother-to-child transmission. Even those unsympathetic to HIV sufferers felt their children should be spared the same fate, if that was possible. Once they had won on one issue, they moved the argument forward.

The campaign was also willing to shift its political positioning depending on the circumstances. It moved from supporting the government by challenging the drug companies to attacking the government for failure to act, and eventually to formally working with the government once Zuma came to power.

Impact

TAC has had both direct and indirect successes. Directly, it has succeeded in:

- Forcing the government to re-engage in combating mother-to-child transmission of HIV following a court case brought by TAC
- Forcing drug companies to reduce their prices through public pressure (e.g., Fluconazole) or legal action of various kinds, such as with the competition commission that put a 5 percent ceiling on royalties
- Supporting the South African government's decision to import generic medicines by forming global alliances and using northern public opinion to embarrass the U.S. government and the pharmaceutical industry out of pursuing grievances against the South African government
- Taking on the South African government and forcing it to roll out anti-retroviral treatment through the public health care system (This came as a result of Zuma's intervention following threats of an election boycott and civil disobedience from some within TAC.)

In addition, TAC has been credited with:

- Empowering and educating individual members
- Increasing the public's understanding of treatment
- Helping destigmatise HIV and to an extent sexuality

This is an impressive list of achievements and there are few who doubt the crucial role of TAC in them.

Structure

TAC now has more than 130 branches in seven out of the nine provinces of South Africa. Above this are regional, district and national levels. The national council is the management body of the campaign and brings together the chairpersons of provincial and district councils plus the national level partners. National level partners include groups such as faith communities, trade unions and others NGOs. This group meets every three months.

In addition there is a biannual congress that passes resolutions on the big questions confronting TAC, though this will soon begin meeting only once every five years.

Internationally, there is no structure, but there is extensive working with other groups.

Tactics

One of the key reasons for TAC's success was the mirroring of the ANC's tactics and constituencies. By focusing its recruitment on ANC's core supporters, the movement became much more of a threat to the government than had it focused on mobilising the white middle-class opposition. The recruitment of people living with HIV, or their families via clinics and support groups, gave the campaign a highly motivated constituency. The investment of education and regular information that followed helped turn these highly committed activists into highly informed and articulate ones.

Beyond this, the campaign's tactical successes were based on a variety of approaches. These included:

- High-level media stunts, such as Achmat's attempt to illegally import generic medicines
- International cooperation to mobilise supportive constituencies overseas, who are often felt to have more impact on drug companies
- Direct action, such as the occupation of the health minister's office, and broader civil disobedience
- Mass mobilisation, such as the march on parliament in February 2003
- Strategic litigation

The willingness to work with and against government at the same time also reflected a tactical flexibility, as well as the confusion that was the ANC's position on the issue.

TAC was criticised on occasion for engaging in litigation without having first built the alliances and constituencies needed to ensure that litigation was strategic. When this happened, the action tended to be less successful, but, in general, TAC recognised the importance of a political strategy alongside a legal one.

Scope/Internationalism

TAC worked closely with groups such as MSF, Oxfam, Health Gap and AIDS Alliance. However, most of this cooperation was ad hoc and informal rather than structural. The international campaign for access to medicines brought together some of these groups, but TAC remained a predominantly national player.

Resources

TAC is financed by a wide range of donors, including governments, NGOs and foundations. Its budget has expanded rapidly from approximately 200,000 rand in 1999-2000 to 38 million rand by 2005-2006 to 50 million rand by 2009-2010. In the early days, the funding came predominantly from other NGOs.

CASE STUDY: MAKE POVERTY HISTORY

Overview

Make Poverty History (MPH) was a U.K.-focused coalition campaign designed in 2004 to take advantage of the year when the United Kingdom chaired the G8 and the E.U., as well as make the most of the opportunities of the U.N. Millennium Plus 5 Summit and the WTO ministerial. The campaign set out a policy manifesto based on the three pillars of aid, trade and debt.

With a responsive U.K. government willing to make poverty the centerpiece of its G8 and E.U. presidencies, the campaign took off. Through grassroots mobilisation and highly effective mass marketing, the campaign reached almost the whole population of the United Kingdom in only six months. The Gleneagles G8 summit was the climax of the campaign, securing significant progress on aid and debt but very little on trade. Following the G8, the campaign lost its way and struggled to have further impact.

Objectives and Messaging

“Trade Justice: The UK must fight to ensure that governments, particularly in poor countries, can choose the best solutions to end poverty and protect the environment; end export dumping that damages the livelihoods of poor communities around the world; and make laws that stop big business profiting at the expense of people and the planet.

Drop the debt: The unpayable debts of the world’s poorest countries should be cancelled in full by fair and transparent means.

More and better aid: Donors must now deliver at least \$50bn in aid per year and set a binding timetable to achieve 0.7% of national income spent on aid. Aid must also be made to work more effectively for poor countries.”

These objectives were the result of long and fraught negotiations between the different NGOs involved. Many sound like the compromises they were.

One of the criticisms of the objectives and the policy recommendations underneath them was that only the aid objective was sufficiently well defined and specific. The lack of clear consensus on trade in particular meant that the language was much more loosely defined and open to interpretation. This was a result both of political differences and the real difficulties involved in moving from generalities to specifics. The problem with the compromises reached was that they strengthened the existing incentive for politicians to focus on the easier, better defined objectives of aid quantity rather than a much more difficult and hard to define trade objective.

Strategy

The strategy was centred on using the U.K. government as a convening agent to force progress and concessions out of other governments. In order to do this, it was felt necessary to build a high-profile campaign that would convince Tony Blair and Gordon Brown, in particular, to keep investing.

In addition, the campaign decided early on to try and support as broad an international movement as possible. Although a lot of this was driven by groups in the United Kingdom, it was not controlled by them. The Global Call to Action Against Poverty (GCAP) was the loose global coalition that came together during 2005 and continues to this day. By seeding campaigns in other countries, it was hoped that other governments would feel domestic as well as bilateral pressure.

Impact

The Gleneagles G8 achieved the following main agreements:

- An extra \$25bn in aid for Africa by 2010, more than doubling aid to Africa (compared to 2004)
- An extra \$50bn in aid overall by 2010 compared to 2004
- 100 percent debt cancellation of outstanding debts of HIPC-eligible countries to the International Monetary Fund, African Development Bank and International Development Authority—approximately \$40bn in total and \$55bn over time

- A commitment to end export subsidies (though with no date attached), and language recognising that developing countries should, “decide, plan and sequence their economic policies to fit with their own development strategies, for which they should be accountable to their people”
- A commitment to as close to 100 percent ARV coverage by 2010 as possible

Even though this was an impressive list, it was strongly criticised by many of the NGOs involved in MPH as inadequate.

In addition, not all that was agreed upon was fully delivered. For example, by 2010 Africa had received only \$13.7bn of the \$25bn promised, and only \$27bn of the \$50bn aid increase promised overall was delivered.

The lack of delivery on some of the commitments, combined with the sense of inadequacy when the agreements were reached, has convinced many in the campaign that the effort was wasted and the campaign unsuccessful. However, even if the promises and focus on delivery are discounted, the progress on aid and debt remains highly significant, and even greater than would have been delivered without the pressure to live up to the G8 commitments.

Those groups that were highly critical of the agreements themselves struggle to articulate how more could have been achieved. In addition, the idea that the United Kingdom did not expend political capital on the issue is rejected entirely by other governments.

Where the G8 and the broader MPH campaign did fail was on the issue of trade, which is the issue many groups felt was most important. Trade was touched on by the G8, but no substantive agreements were reached. MPH was designed to continue up to the WTO ministerial in December 2005, but the impetus behind the campaign evaporated following Gleneagles. This failure to impact on trade stemmed from a number of sources:

- The NGOs involved in the campaign had very different objectives about what they wanted to achieve on trade and how they viewed it as a policy area.
- The campaign failed to articulate trade in a way the public and campaigners could grasp, so they and the media gravitated towards aid and debt.
- Trade negotiations were multilateral, with the U.K. government having no convening ability and very limited direct influence. While a U.K. campaign could force progress via its E.U. and G8 presidencies, it could not exert real influence on trade.
- The MPH campaign was never big enough globally to have an impact on the multilateral negotiations, especially when these went to the core of national economic strategy.
- In the wake of recriminations within the coalition post-Gleneagles, campaign momentum was lost.

Another area where the campaign had mixed success was in changing the relationship between the U.K. population and poverty. Though this had not been an overt objective, it had been assumed that MPH would capture a new generation of activists and encourage the general public to see the policies being lobbied for as justice not charity. In part this worked. By the time of the G8, 87 percent of the British public had heard of the campaign and 15 percent claimed to be part of it. These are incredible figures. However, the numbers saying they were concerned about poverty hardly changed during this time.

There were also U.K.-specific successes. For example, the United Kingdom's stance on trade moved toward that of the campaign, and the British government adopted a 2013 timetable for reaching the 0.7 percent target, something it had previously wanted to avoid. The public support mobilised in 2005 is also credited with creating a cross party consensus behind the 0.7 percent target that continues to this day.

Structure

The campaign was a coalition of more than 500 groups. At its core was a coordination team that was responsible for running the campaign. This was designed to ensure joint ownership and avoid the dangers of an overpowered secretariat with its own agenda. Ultimately, this structure was effective in its main goals of keeping the coalition together and engaging the talents and capacities of the members. It was much less effective at providing leadership or in taking difficult decisions. In addition, it also struggled to present a coherent voice to the outside world.

There were also working groups, whose effectiveness varied enormously, and an assembly that elected the coordination team and was briefed on the direction of the campaign.

Tactics

MPH was perhaps the first mass marketing campaign on international development. In addition to the standard tactics of marches, lobbying, policy reports and media, the campaign invested heavily in building a brand and communicating that to the public. The success of this strategy can be seen in the saturation awareness it achieved in just six months and its ability to engage millions of people.

Key tactics for the campaign included:

- Creating a common policy platform and assembling a broad coalition behind it
- Mass lobbies of parliament
- Celebrity engagement ranging from Nelson Mandela's speech in February to the "click ad" involving Bono, George Clooney, etc.
- The creation and propagation of white bands as a campaign symbol
- Dedicating a day during the 2005 U.K. election to the campaign
- The Edinburgh rally

The diversity of activity was a core strength, as was the marketing approach pioneered by film director Richard Curtis and Comic Relief, in particular. It was the breadth of the campaign that so excited many of the politicians, a sense that it was reaching beyond the usual suspects into new audiences and making international development a domestic political issue. This was achieved by the breadth of the coalition but also innovative approaches such as interspersing MPH messages into a popular British TV program and using donated advertising space.

Also critical in the United Kingdom, but even more so in building international momentum, were the Live 8 concerts. These were much denigrated by some within the campaign at the time (for clashing with the Edinburgh March and for being policy light) but there is no doubt that policy-makers saw them as a core part of the campaign and one of the most effective ways of building global expectations and pressure. A senior European decision-maker interviewed for the report said Live 8 in their country was infinitely more impactful than the months of low-level coalition work, which, according to them, had gone almost unnoticed.

Scope/Internationalism

While this study chose to focus on the U.K. campaign as the most innovative and successful, campaigners in the United Kingdom sought international alliances early on. As a result of this work and similar thinking that crystallised in a Maputo meeting of NGOs in 2003, the Global Call to Action Against Poverty (GCAP) was formed in Johannesburg in late 2004 and launched in Brazil in 2005.

GCAP was a very loose coalition of disparate groups with quite different policy perspectives and demands. It united under the broad objective of ending poverty and inequality and continues to this day.

In 2005, there were coalitions in several of the G8 countries, including Germany, the United States, Canada and Japan. Although none of these national campaigns reached the scale and impact of the U.K. push, they did help ensure the 2005 push was not seen as a purely U.K. initiative, and in a few cases, the national coalitions gained real domestic traction, including post 2005. Nevertheless, most of those spoken to in non-UK G8 countries put the impact of their national campaigns low down on the list of pressures. The international campaign, the celebrity pressure and the bilateral pressure from the U.K. government were all bigger drivers of change in their view.

Resources

The campaign mainly relied on the pooling of collective resources and capacity to have impact. Groups contributed central funding depending on their size, but, more importantly, they committed to mobilising their own resources and utilising their own staff. The central mobilisation budget, therefore, remained under 1million pounds, although far more was spent by individual groups for which no collective accounting exists.

CASE STUDY: JUBILEE 2000

Overview

Jubilee 2000 was an international campaign to abolish the debts of poor countries by the year 2000. Emerging in 1997 from the U.K. Debt Crisis Network, it quickly gained momentum. The U.K. coalition was organised by a strong secretariat, which also facilitated the loose global coalition. Focusing on the G8s in 1998 (Birmingham) and 1999 (Cologne,) the campaign mobilised faith activists but also a wider audience. The campaign culminated in the 1999 debt relief deal in Cologne, which saw the clearance of an extra \$27bn of developing country debt.

Objective and Messaging

The campaign's objective was deceptively simple: the cancellation of the world's poorest countries' unpayable debts by the year 2000 through a fair and transparent process. However, there were a series of nuances within this seemingly straightforward objective. The first was the fact that the campaign focused on the poorest countries rather than on all developing countries' debts, as some had wanted. Secondly, it specified unpayable debts rather than all debts. And finally, it accepted the need for a process and not simply the dropping of debt or the refusal to pay.

Those groups that criticised Jubilee 2000 tended to argue that it was not radical enough. Groups like Jubilee South wanted all developing country debts wiped out, without any process and with no exceptions, together with compensation for the exploitation they had suffered. The broadly anti-capitalist position they adopted appealed to few beyond the already revolutionary.

Jubilee 2000 was also criticised for not taking on structural adjustment policies as a core issue. The leadership of the campaign argued robustly that although they shared many of the concerns over structural adjustment policies, to widen the campaign would have been to blunt its effectiveness.

Strategy

Rooted in the Christian concept of Jubilee (the bible references a jubilee tradition of writing off poor people's debts), the campaign sought to educate the public about the moral implications of debt and by doing so change the way it was perceived.

With this achieved, the campaign aimed to mobilise activists in the United Kingdom and overseas to push for government action in cancelling some of the debts of the world's poorest countries, using the year 2000 as a crunch moment.

Based on the twin pillars of mass education followed by mass campaigning, the strategy turned out to be highly effective. An issue that had been seen as both technical and controversial became mainstream and broadly accepted within a period of a couple of years. Engaging faith movements was particularly critical to this mainstreaming.

The decision to curtail the campaign in 2000 was a controversial one. Many involved felt more progress was needed and more would be forthcoming. However, most felt that they had exhausted the issue for the time being and continuing to focus on it would have limited impact, especially compared to the other opportunity areas of HIV/AIDS and trade. The experience of the groups that continued into the Genoa summit suggests this judgment was probably right. Further progress did ultimately come in 2005, when multilateral debt relief was agreed to at the G8 in Gleneagles as a result of the Make Poverty History campaign.

Impact

Partly due to NGO pressure, but mainly due to leadership within the U.S. and U.K. governments, the IMF created the Highly Indebted Poor Countries' Initiative (HIPC) in 1996. At this stage, it was a highly limited and difficult process to go through. By 1998, only one country had reached completion point.

Jubilee 2000 took this existing infrastructure and pushed for its widening, for speeding up the process and for linking it more strongly to poverty alleviation. As a result of the campaign, HIPC II was agreed to in Cologne in 1999, creating an extra \$27bn in new debt reduction. In late 1999, President Clinton said he would move to 100 percent cancellation—greater than the 90 percent of HIPC II—an initiative followed by many other creditors. The campaign claims to have led to the clearance of \$100bn of debt owed by 35 governments.

While it is hard to ascribe responsibility for HIPC I to the campaign, since it was only brewing at the time, it is fairly clear that HIPC II came about as a direct result of its work. Of course, it is unlikely it would have been as successful without the coming to power of progressive governments in the United Kingdom and Germany ahead of their respective G8 summits, but that does not make the campaign any less critical to what happened. Ministers and officials involved at the time were clear that both Blair and Schroeder felt pressure from their domestic constituencies, mobilised by effective campaigns in both countries.

Many of those in government, both then and now, identify Jubilee 2000 as one of the most effective campaigns because of its focus, its constituency and its ultimate impact. Several suggest that Jubilee was at least partly successful because it was "easy" for governments to agree to its asks. Officials from several governments argued that once their finance ministries had gotten over their purist intellectual opposition and worries over "moral hazard," they knew practically that most of this money would never be repaid in any case. These same people argued that the big figures associated with debt cancellation are somewhat misleading. The constant rescheduling of these debts had meant many governments had effectively written them off, and the HIPC deals were merely a formalisation of that. In addition, the debt relief that came was generally funded by aid budgets not additional contributions—therefore coming at limited extra cost and even offering some finance ministries the chance to effectively win back money they thought they had lost forever.

While this may lessen the perception of the scale of success, the success was still very real. In a matter of three years, the world's attitude to debt had been turned on its head. In addition, as a result of the political progress, many developing countries that had been paying out significant amounts in debt repayments had those repayments cut or stopped. Money flowed into social spending as a result.

Structure

The U.K. campaign evolved from the Debt Crisis Network, which is a mainly policy-based network. This provided a coalition basis for the campaign, but the recruitment of Ann Pettifor helped strengthen the secretariat at the centre. This secretariat took the campaign to new prominence, recruited new organisations and recruited activists directly. The leadership style of the director gave the organisation strong strategic direction but over time also reduced the coalition nature of the structure and moved it closer to being an independent organisation.

Internationally, the network was much looser. A meeting in Rome in 1998 had created a loose grouping that shared information and policy thinking. Many organisations shared the same name as Jubilee 2000 and often adopted the logo. Information, intelligence and policy positions were shared but the coordination that existed was generally informal.

Tactics

The campaign was based on two main sets of tactics: public awareness/education and public mobilisation.

The education process took place via the media and at the grassroots level, especially with church congregations. Educating activists about debt gave them a sense of empowerment that further enthused them. The degree of complexity was appealing to many who enjoyed the feeling of development sophistication; this was not just asking for more money.

Mobilisation activities varied from local work targeting MPs to national protests with high-level celebrities. The three most significant individual initiatives were:

- The global Jubilee 2000 petition, which was ultimately signed by 21 million people
- The human chain surrounding the Birmingham G8, formed by between 50,000 and 70,000 people
- The human chain surrounding the G8 in Cologne, formed by approximately 30,000 people

These peaks in activities were designed to show the scale of public concern and were followed up with effective lobbying and grassroots letter writing campaigns. U.S. officials speak specifically of the high-level advocacy by Bono, which was felt to be a critical part of the campaign, especially targeting Congress.

Scope/Internationalism

Jubilee 2000 saw national campaigns develop in about 60 countries. The strength of these varied enormously, with some of those involved feeling that, in reality, fewer than five were powerful domestically. It was fortuitous that two of the

strongest campaigns (those in the United Kingdom and Germany) were hosting the G8 summit in successive years. The other campaigns, while not as powerful, were visible enough to give the impression to campaigners and governments that this was a real global movement.

Resources

Jubilee 2000 was predominately funded by its member organisations. Christian Aid, in particular, which hosted Jubilee 2000 in its offices, put in significant resources to make the campaign possible.

CASE STUDY: PUBLISH WHAT YOU PAY

Overview

Publish What You Pay (PWYP) was created in 2002 by a small group of mostly London-based NGOs. The original core included Global Witness, Save the Children UK, Oxfam GB, CAFOD, Transparency International UK and OSI. The campaign followed a series of exposés of corruption involving natural resources, especially in Angola.

The campaign's push helped spur the British government's launch of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), which was announced by Prime Minister Tony Blair in South Africa in 2002. Blair omitted mention of the campaign from his speech, leaving Number 10 to announce it via press release. Making EITI work became the major focus of the campaign, which now has more than 30 implementing countries. In recent months, the campaign has shifted focus back to supporting a regulatory approach.

Objective and Messaging

PWYP aims include requiring full transparency in the payment, receipt and management of natural resource revenues; public disclosure of extractive contracts; and civil society participation in the monitoring of revenue expenditures.

The simplicity of the ask was one of its key strengths. While it was never one likely to connect with the mass public, it did with policy-makers and companies themselves. Publishing what you pay was a very basic concept, but one with very significant positive benefits if you believed the case PWYP put forward, namely that transparency of payments would enable national publics, NGOs and the media to hold governments accountable for how they spent that money, meaning more of it would be spent on development priorities than personal ones.

Strategy

The coalition decided early on that it would adopt a predominately elite-level strategy. It was felt that the issue was too complicated to engage the mass public and that impact could be secured without the need for mobilisation. This decision meant the campaign had to go with the political impetus at the time, as its leverage was limited. So it decided to work within the EITI framework, despite the initiative falling short of what the campaign ultimately wanted, which was a predominantly voluntary structure rather than a regulatory one.

This decision was a controversial one among the coalition. There are some, particularly in the United States, who believed sticking to a stronger ask at the outset and refusing to support EITI would have been more effective at getting a stronger outcome. Initially, the campaign was so dependent on alliances with insiders in both governments and companies that there was no other viable strategy. Seeing EITI as a building block enabled PWYP to win the intellectual debate, build its network and create a demonstration effect, since EITI became a mandatory in implementing states. All of this contributed to PWYP's ability to move back to a regulatory strategy, as it is now.

The other strategic quandary was whether the ultimate ask was even the right one. Once countries and companies started publishing more data, the campaign realised that data alone, without the ability to interpret and utilise it, was of limited benefit. As a result, the campaign increasingly began to focus on capacity building of civil society, the usability of that data and the next stage of the process: ensuring transparency in the management of revenue. The PWYP focus on transparency of company payments and government revenues was a crucial step forward, but it is increasingly clear that it is a multistep process in improving governance—not a silver bullet.

Impact

PWYP has been largely responsible for advancing the transparency debate around extractive industries and the progress that that has led to. Critical to the campaign's early impact was the quality of its analysis and its willingness to forge alliances with governments and extractive companies themselves. These alliances meant that the EITI developed before the campaign had really gained much in the way of external leverage—though withdrawal was always a potent threat. The British government, in conversation with Shell, BP and other companies and informed by Global Witness's work, was the early mover that initiated the process ahead of the Johannesburg 2002 World Summit on Sustainability. However, while EITI may have happened without PWYP—though not its constituent members—it's unlikely it would have achieved the progress it did without the campaign.

The campaign, largely through a strategic partnership with OSI, succeeded in building national coalitions and partnerships in countries around the world. The growth of civil society engagement in the issue helped create and channel the demand for transparency and bring pressure to bear at the national level. It also started to create a constituency of organisations for which the information would be useful.

In the United Kingdom, which continued to lead the EITI process, the political impetus behind the initiative diminished following Clare Short's departure, and it looked as if EITI would soon become yet another weak voluntary initiative that companies and governments signed up to without any intention of faithful implementation. The campaign at that stage essentially threatened to withdraw its support from EITI, and as a result a set of minimum criteria were drawn up and a validation process implemented. This strengthened EITI, led to the expulsion of the worst offenders and enabled those following the standards to get clearer recognition.

PWYP has recently become re-energised by the United States' adoption of a regulatory approach—for which the U.S. PWYP coalition was significantly responsible—and is now pushing for similar moves in the E.U. This shift in focus back towards a regulatory approach could be read as an acceptance of the failure of a voluntary strategy. However, it is more accurate to see it as the next phase of what has been a highly effective strategy. Step one was win the argument and build a critical mass, step two was to use that power base to push for a stronger approach.

The more difficult question is not the impact of the campaign in securing progress—where the evidence is fairly conclusive—but the connection between the wins on process and actual impact. In particular, linking the progress towards transparency with concrete development outcomes is difficult. Where transparency of payments from extractive industries has been put in place, the debate has moved to how that revenue is used. In this way, PWYP should be seen as a necessary but far from sufficient condition for real progress in effective transparency.

Structure

PWYP was set up in the United Kingdom but soon became an international coalition. At its centre was a small secretariat housing the international coordinator, who facilitated the coalition, shared information and recruited members. The secretariat was designed to be small enough to ensure the onus of the work fell on coalition members.

In addition, there was a management committee made up of five people from the core group of founding NGOs. They had a high degree of strategic alignment and trust.

While overall strategy was quite centralised, at least initially, national coalitions had a significant degree of autonomy to frame their own approaches. They did not even have to sign up to the mission statement. Although the international coordinator would step in if asks started to become contradictory or out of line with the global strategy.

Tactics

As noted, PWYP was predominantly an elite-level campaign. There were attempts to popularise it, especially in developing countries, but these had limited results.

The core tactics that had the greatest impact were:

- A willingness to work and co-strategise with supportive governments
- The targeting of institutional investors as a way of putting pressure on companies to sign up
- Making EITI a benchmark for transparency and getting it adopted by the World Bank and donors as a key standard
- Getting EITI recognised as a good thing by IFIs—thus providing an incentive for developing countries to sign up
- Getting large elements of the extractive industry to see transparency as a good thing for their own interests and thus embrace EITI

Once countries or companies had adopted the language of transparency, the campaign had at least some leverage over them. The reliance on elite-level influencing did, however, mean that those companies or countries that were unwilling to even engage with the campaign were not reachable by it. The more recent campaigning in the United States and Europe shows the potential impact that creating outsider pressure can bring. Now that transparency is a more commonly accepted concern, it may be time for the campaign to reconsider whether grassroots work could become a more powerful tool in its arsenal.

Scope/Internationalism

There are now more than 600 members of PWYP in 65 countries. Thirty of these have become fully fledged national coalitions. The nature of EITI and its dedicated space for civil society has meant that even small PWYP campaigns have direct input into the process and thus a prominence that many campaigns struggle to achieve.

Resources

Funding for the campaign came from a number of sources and varied according to country. Members of the coalition committed their own resources to the campaign in some cases, while other groups fundraised specifically for activities related to the campaign. A small group—including those on the management committee—help fund the small secretariat.

OSI's funding of national coalitions and individual NGOs has been critical to widening the campaign beyond a few NGOs in a few countries.

CASE STUDY: THE SAVE DARFUR COALITION

Overview

The Save Darfur Coalition (SDC) was set up in the United States in July 2004 by an ad hoc group of individuals and organisations. The lightening rod of genocide mobilised the Jewish community, in particular, and the issue captured the broader public's imagination. The coalition grew rapidly and, for all intents and purposes, became its own organisation. While tensions over leadership plagued its development and its policy impact is highly contested, it is still seen as one of the most effective mobilisations on a foreign policy issue in recent U.S. history.

Objective and Messaging

SDC was broadly focused on ending the genocide in Darfur. Especially initially, its objectives were not much more formed or sophisticated than that. It could be summarised as: The U.S. government should do all it can to end the genocide in Darfur.

Even the headline objective was a controversial one. Most countries, the U.N., and most INGOs refused to characterise events in Darfur as genocide. A U.N. Commission of Inquiry defined them as war crimes and crimes against humanity—not genocide. The International Criminal Court (ICC) at first turned down and then later upheld an arrest warrant against President Omar Hassan Ahmed Bashir for the crime of genocide. The U.S. government—partly pushed by the campaign—called it a genocide and in doing so raised the diplomatic stakes. For a while, the broader international campaign risked getting bogged down in definitions of genocide and disagreements over language. Eventually, most groups agreed that whether it was defined as genocide or a crime against humanity, the policy responses needed to stop it were very similar.

As the campaign developed, it created more detailed policy asks and interim objectives, such as the deployment of a U.N. force, pressure from other Arab/African governments and divestment from Sudan. There were differences both inside and outside the campaign over whether this agenda was too aggressive or not aggressive enough. These debates remain contested, but those arguing for a more aggressive approach struggle to connect it to a viable change strategy. For example, if the United States were reluctant to take relatively small steps on Sudan, why would it have been willing to consider much more radical action?

There is more consensus on the slowness with which the campaign took action on the broader Sudan debate—connected to the peace process and independence referendum in the South—and the political process needed for peace in Darfur. The movement was accused of chasing ghosts, becoming dangerously out of step with developments on the ground. This was based on an assessment that the nature of the conflict had changed fundamentally between 2003-2004, when the killings were at their height, to 2006-2007, when the movement was at its height. While the campaign characterised events as ongoing genocide, the conflict had significantly changed by the time the campaign was fully established, both in its nature and in its intensity. This would have been an academic debate had it not had implications for the policy focus of the movement. An ongoing genocide suggests the need for forceful intervention; a lower-level conflict starting to smoulder requires a very different set of responses.

Strategy

The strategy evolved over time, but at its core remained the basic idea that if there was a big enough mobilisation of the public in the United States, the U.S. government would feel obliged to act to end the genocide. This basic calculation remained essential to the campaign throughout.

In addition, the strategy focused on pressure for action, putting the onus on the government to decide what action would be effective.

The strategy of the campaign had three major flaws:

- First, the United States was unwilling and/or unable to single-handedly resolve the crisis and was very badly placed to lead the international community's response. The Darfur crisis came when George Bush was at his most unpopular around the world. The Iraq war was divisive internationally and even more so in the Arab world, whose engagement would have been critical to affectively addressing the crisis in Darfur. The notion of the United States confronting another predominantly Arab/Muslim country concerned and alienated many.

- Second, and intimately linked to this, SDC waited too long to focus on building international networks and coalitions. Once its funding arrived, SDC was better able to stimulate activity in several key countries, but it was too little too late. Not only was there a long lag time between funding groups coming through and the campaign achieving influence, but also the preeminence of the U.S. campaign and the resultant mobilisation of the U.S. government's rhetoric meant that SDC was forever seen as having a U.S. agenda, even once the campaign had been broadened.
- Third, the initial strategy of building generic pressure was not effective. It enabled the U.S. government to respond with rhetoric rather than policy initiatives, further polarising the diplomatic community while having limited real impact on the situation.

While these flaws are significant, they do not overshadow the strategic judgments the campaign got right. Most importantly, the campaign proved that a real grassroots mobilisation, rather than the smoke and mirrors attempted by many other campaigns, could transform a marginal, unstrategic area of the world into a real issue for the United States, and thus help it gain global attention.

Impact

SDC took off in a way few organisations or commentators could have guessed at the time. This was in part due to the work of the campaign; the strategy of reaching out beyond the Beltway; and the alliances with people like George Clooney, Brian Steidle (a U.S. soldier who spent time in Darfur as part of the African Union (A.U.) mission), Mia Farrow, and New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof. But it also owed a lot to fortuitous timing. The campaign started at the time of the 10-year anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda, when films like "Hotel Rwanda" were reaching a mass audience and Samantha Power's new book, "A Problem From Hell: America and the Age of Genocide," was influencing an elite audience. In addition, it came at a time when human rights groups and others in the United States were looking for a positive foreign policy agenda that they could have impact on, following their powerlessness over Iraq.

Those involved in the campaign argue it achieved the following:

- Making Darfur a high-order foreign policy priority for the United States (George Bush was reputedly nicknamed "the Sudan desk officer" by some in the White House, a reference to his personal interest in the issue.)
- Boosting U.S. financial support for peacekeeping and the humanitarian effort and helping secure access for aid workers
- The appointment of United States-Darfur envoys under two presidents
- The deployment of a U.N. peacekeeping force (the biggest in the world at the time) with a strengthened mandate
- The passing of a U.N. Security Council resolution referring Sudan to the ICC

Most of these achievements would be acknowledged even by the critics of the campaign, and all of them are significant. The U.N. peacekeeping force, despite its numerous weaknesses, was certainly seen as more effective than the A.U. force it replaced.

However, there is a divergence between those who argue that the broader impact of the campaign was to provide false hope of outside intervention to the rebels, who were encouraged to fight on, thereby increasing the suffering of the people, or whether the global attention the campaign generated reined in the behaviour of the government and its militia and led to an early decline in the violence. Neither of these scenarios is well supported by the evidence. They are based on assumptions of motivation rather than any robust analysis.

Sudanese academics have been particularly critical of SDC, accusing it of simplification and distortion. While both charges are probably true (certainly the former, by implication the latter), it is hard to see the increased global attention that SDC won for Darfur—and which slowly broadened to the whole of Sudan—as in aggregate having anything other than a positive influence.

Structure

SDC struggled over whether it was a campaign or a coalition from its inception in 2004 to its merger with Genocide Intervention Network (GI Net) in 2010. Certainly it was called a coalition and started off as one. However, as most of the big NGOs were hardly working on Darfur at the time, they were happy for SDC to be the focal point and lead the work. Those most involved at the start tended to be from smaller organisations that were less concerned with branding,

sign-off procedures, board governance and other systems, and more concerned with “just getting the work done.” Those intimately involved in the instigation of the campaign feel that its focus on genocide also led groups to be much more flexible than normal.

At the inaugural meeting of the group, a funder volunteered to support the appointment of a convener. David Rubenstein, who volunteered for this role, set up a small secretariat and a website, which quickly became the focal point of the campaign. Campaigners were referred to the SDC website by the various groups involved in the campaign and its e-mail list quickly grew. The secretariat was able to fundraise directly from this list and from other funders looking to invest in the issue. The secretariat quickly became well resourced and took on large numbers of staff. It focused almost solely on activities rather than any coordination/facilitation function.

Partially as a result of SDC’s success in popularising the issue of Darfur and fundraising from it, other organisations started spending more of their own time on the issue. This led to a desire for more control over the organisation, its policies and activities, and a growing tension developed between the secretariat and some of its members. Eventually, the board, which had been a marginal player, decided to remove David Rubenstein and appoint Jerry Fowler after a hiatus. In doing so, the board reasserted the coalition nature of the campaign. But as the board and the member organisations stepped back again, the secretariat reasserted itself once more.

Setting aside the questions of individual leadership, many of those involved feel that when the campaign became more of a coalition organisation and less of a centralised campaign, politics became more overbearing and the organisation became less successful. In any case, the campaign tended to move back to being more centralised as organisations involved fluctuated in their levels of interest.

Tactics

SDC was rooted in a mass mobilisation mindset. It focused on grassroots action and building a nationwide bipartisan constituency.

This mobilisation was strongly faith based, and, at least at the start, strongly Jewish. The Jewish community, led by groups like the American Jewish World Service and the Jewish Council for Public Affairs and galvanised by what they viewed as an ongoing genocide, put aside rivalries and political differences and spread the message of the campaign through their networks very effectively. In addition, Christian communities were mobilised through strategic outreach, made easier by the fact that many groups had been engaged in advocacy around the north/south conflict in Sudan.

The movement also took off on campus, creating a powerful mix of young people and faith movements that appealed to a diversity of political audiences. This was true grassroots stuff. A speaking tour by Captain Brian Steidle sparked all sorts of local media and activity, while other coalition leaders went from campus to campus. One of the first activities of the campaign was the September 2004 Day of Conscience, which specifically targeted faith communities.

The grassroots movement came of age with a mass rally in Washington, D.C., in April 2006. Barack Obama, George Clooney and Nancy Pelosi all spoke. Organisers claimed that more than 100,000 people attended. Through the million voices campaign, SDC recruited more than 1 million campaign supporters. These supporters were encouraged to become activists, contacting their senators, taking part in vigils and pushing for the divestment of shares in Sudan. The political strength of the grassroots coalition was recognised in the 2008 U.S. presidential campaign when John McCain, Hilary Clinton and Barack Obama signed a joint statement essentially saying that Darfur would remain a priority whoever won. The campaign claims that the last time such a statement was issued so close to a presidential election was during World War II.

In addition to the grassroots work, SDC used the media to project its message to broader audiences. Nicholas Kristof preceded the movement but also helped reinforce it with his high-profile and forcefully argued columns in *The New York Times*. The coalition really took off in media terms when it joined forces with high-profile celebrities such as George Clooney and Mia Farrow. Finally, the coalition was bolstered following the D.C. rally sponsored by an anonymous donor offering tens of millions of dollars for advertising. Overnight, the campaign started pouring out advertisements across the country (and, less successfully, internationally), ensuring awareness about Darfur came top down as well as bottom up.

Scope/Internationalism

SDC was first and foremost a U.S. campaign. The set of people engaged at the start were very U.S. focused, and the leadership was understandably focused on getting it right in the United States before spending time and resources elsewhere.

It took a while for the coalition to realise that even though it was achieving real influence over the U.S. government, this did not equate to change in Sudan. It was felt that a broader international coalition was needed to create a powerful enough coalition to change Sudan's behaviour. In later 2006, the campaign started to invest substantially in international work. Some of this was direct, but most of it was through supporting groups such as Crisis Action, the Darfur Consortium and others that were already coordinating activities in other parts of the world.

An early difficulty in this attempt at internationalism was a suspicion among many non-U.S. groups of SDC's agenda. Being U.S.-centred and faith based worried many, as did the more militant messaging and the description of Darfur as an ongoing genocide. This was particularly the case in Africa and the Arab world.

There was also a clash of cultures between the campaigning zeal of SDC and the policy emphasis (and often campaign stasis) found within many groups in Europe. The established NGOs in Europe saw SDC as simplistic and naïve, while some within SDC wondered what it would take for these so called Sudan experts to move beyond talking about policy and start trying to influence it.

Despite these tensions, SDC's work did help galvanise a broader international movement under the Day for Darfur/ Globe for Darfur banner and helped support the creation of more diverse groups like the Arab Coalition for Darfur. Though campaigns only truly resonated and changed policy in a handful of other countries (e.g., France and the United Kingdom), the international effort did reduce the extent to which it was seen as purely a U.S. movement.

Resources

SDC started small but grew incredibly quickly. Following some seed funding from a humanitarian foundation at the inaugural meeting, the number of supporters recruited by the campaign also gave it the ability to raise resources internally. Attracted by SDC's success, other trusts and foundations supported its work. Finally, an anonymous donor offered tens of millions of dollars strictly for advertising, though some of it was later diverted to international work.

SDC spent approximately \$50 million in 2007 alone. This was at the peak of its advertising spending but reflects the sheer scale of resources it was able to mobilise. In addition, members of the coalition put in their own resources for their own events and activities. Over time, SDC took on an increasing role as a funder of other groups, helping to galvanise broader activity.

CASE STUDY: THE GLOBAL CAMPAIGN FOR CLIMATE ACTION

Overview

The Global Campaign for Climate Action (GCCA) was conceived in 2006 at a meeting on the outskirts of Berlin. It reflected a realisation that the issue was too big for one organisation to win on and that a collective approach would be critical. In part due to lack of funding, it took until early 2009 to launch the campaign. Focused on the Copenhagen Summit of COP15 but continuing after, it was designed to harness and mobilise public opinion and push decision-makers into a transformative deal. TckTckTck was the branded campaign element of GCCA.

Objectives and Messaging

- To demonstrate irresistible public demand for a fair and strong post-2012 U.N. agreement in Copenhagen through a series of coordinated public actions at key moments in 2009
- To identify, empower and amplify the human voices most profoundly affected by climate change and bring them directly to the decision-makers
- To communicate the urgent need for action and the opportunity and hope associated with a Copenhagen agreement through a sophisticated communications campaign
- To utilise existing and new online tools to engage millions of citizens in online and offline actions focused on Copenhagen
- To connect the intelligence gathering and sophisticated advocacy provided by numerous NGOs in order to target and maximise the collective impact of groups on every continent

More specifically around Copenhagen, the objective was for a fair, ambitious and binding (FAB) deal, including a 40 percent cut in carbon emissions for industrialised countries based on a 1990 baseline, a legally binding agreement, and large-scale adaptation and mitigation financing.

Outsiders and some insiders questioned this policy messaging. Most targets of the campaign felt that by the time of the summit, these asks were so "out of the ballpark" that they were too easily dismissed as irrelevant and set up a dynamic wherein no matter what was agreed to in Copenhagen, it would be decried as an abject failure.

Many of the campaigners concede that groups should have been more flexible, especially at the summit, which could have led to a more fruitful dialogue with decision-makers. For example, there should have been more willingness to say, "If governments manage to get to X, we'll see that as something we can welcome, despite the fact that it is not everything we wanted." However, by sticking to a "sub-two degree" message, campaigners felt that to do anything else would have been to vacate the moral high ground and the scientific basis of their position.

Strategy

As the objectives suggest, the strategy was to build a mass movement of groups and individuals concerned about climate change, unite their demands, and create an unstoppable momentum that would climax in Copenhagen in a global FAB deal.

Both observers of the campaign and participants in it shared fundamental critiques of the strategy that GCCA pursued:

1. GCCA saw Copenhagen and international agreement as a way of driving national change, whereas it should have invested more in national change strategies that would culminate in an international agreement.
2. The campaign positioned itself as pushing developed countries to move, with almost no pressure put on emerging economies. This came from the politics and sensibilities of those organisations involved and resulted in missed opportunities and a fundamental misunderstanding of the dynamics of the negotiation.
3. The strategy was based on painting an apocalyptic picture of the world to come, not talking about future opportunities of the low carbon economy, which turned off too many people.
4. The dominance of environmental and development groups within the campaign meant it was never able to reach into the mainstream.

Impact

The campaign failed to achieve its substantive policy goals at Copenhagen, but those involved argue it did succeed in:

- Creating a real media focus on the Copenhagen summit
- Pushing climate change from being something environmental ministers dealt with to being a top-order priority, partly by getting heads of state to attend the summit
- Creating a momentum for future change, despite the failure at Copenhagen itself
- Helping give birth to the start of a movement by representing the first time that a climate change campaign was able to mobilise more than a few thousand people

The most significant claim by the campaign is that it created a momentum that will ensure future progress. This is disputed by others, who point to the lack of heads of state engagement since Copenhagen, disillusionment with the process and the low profile of the campaign. What is difficult to judge is whether the more moderate successes of Cancun were simply delayed by the failure of Copenhagen, and therefore a reflection of poor strategy among those who overhyped its potential, or whether they were only possible because of the high-profile crash. Opinion is evenly split on this.

There is, however, a clear consensus that the campaign failed to achieve its core objectives, and most involved were disappointed with the scale of its achievements. Some of the reasons for this were strategic (see above) and some were structural (see below). Other reasons include:

- Funding came very late for the coalition. U.S. trusts and foundations, in particular, were focused on their own U.S. battles, only looking at the global picture very late.
- The late start of the campaign was a real drawback and meant that only by September—three months before the summit—did things really start to happen. This was much too late to have a serious impact on decision-makers.

Structure

The campaign pioneered the flotilla model of campaigning, whereby groups agree on broad objectives and coordinate loosely around tactics but keep their own brand and do not create strong coordination structures. This came about for a number of reasons:

- Those involved wanted to show the diversity of the movement.
- It was felt that this would reduce transaction costs associated with other coalitions.
- Environmental groups were used to cooperating but not working in coalition.
- Development NGOs remained burnt by previous GCAP/MPH alliances.
- There remained strong brand competition between the groups involved.
- INGOs were more focused on their internal coalitions than the external ones.

The structure was both a symptom and a cause of the difficulties faced by GCCA. Many of those involved felt that the structure was chosen to avoid brand competition with the big organisations, rather than picking a structure best suited to building a mass mobilisation campaign. This loose structure then contributed to:

- The lack of a strong core group to show leadership and get on with campaigning, although this did develop very late
- Low levels of senior-level and cross-organisational buy-in due to a minimal sense of investment in the campaign
- Limited and late secondments to the central team

The core problem with the coalition structure and the lack of investment in building a campaign identity was that the disparate activities taking place around the world were never effectively harnessed. The coalition was a massive grouping and lots of activity took place, but GCCA remained less than the sum of its parts.

Tactics

The coalition based its work on a few key moments, including three days of global action and a mass march in Copenhagen. The campaign says it recruited 15 million supporters overall and mobilised 100,000 marchers in Copenhagen. In addition, members of the coalition worked very closely with each other in the run-up to the summit—lobbying officials, ministers and heads of states—and at the summit itself, via the "nerve centre" and the communications team.

The campaign was particularly successful in signing up groups. There are more than 270 groups in the coalition, with a fair degree of diversity. As reflected earlier, however, that diversity remained more limited than the aspirations at the start, with the campaign still being driven by environmental and development groups. In addition, the 15 million figure of those supporting TckTckTck was simply a mathematical exercise of counting all the individual members of constituent organisations, which is a common way of presenting coalitions but with limited real-world meaning.

The Day of Action on September 21, 2009, led by Avaaz, was seen by those involved as particularly successful and the first real action of the campaign. The G8 moment that was supposed to be the first GCCA-focused action went largely unnoticed. According to organisers, this "Global Wake-up Call" took place in 130 countries around the world with more than 2,000 events. While its media impact was limited and its political impact questionable, it certainly gave an internal boost to campaigners as the first widespread action of the campaign. Similarly, the Day of Action on October 24 led by 350.org mobilised thousands of events across the world. But again, the nature of those diffuse events meant they struggled to gain media traction or clear political impact.

The other tactic generally seen as successful was the operation at the summit itself. Those involved felt the nerve centre and the communications group having clearly defined roles and effective ways of functioning worked extremely well.

Scope/Internationalism

In some ways, GCCA was a very successful global campaign. As noted above, the days of action took place in most countries around the world. In addition to the breadth of engagement, there was a strategic list of 13 countries where groups could ask for money from the campaign and where work was undertaken to build the capacity.

However, despite the breadth of engagement, there is a broad acceptance within the campaign that only in a few countries did the campaigns really carry significant weight. Day of action events were, in many cases, extremely small.

In addition, many of those involved feel that despite their best efforts at building a truly global campaign, it remained very northern focused and, more particularly, European focused. GCCA struggled to build effective campaigns in major developing countries partly because of a lack of capacity and time, but also because it didn't recognise the strategic importance of these countries and didn't have the confidence to criticise their positions. There is a clear consensus that more time, energy and resources should have been put into BRICS countries. In addition, campaigners single out the German campaign as one other area where more resources could have been decisive.

Resources

Funding was an important issue for the campaign, especially as the big organisations were unwilling to invest enough of their own resources initially and the financial crises reduced internal flexibility. Within the core team that initiated GCCA, there is a sense that the big U.S. foundations that were key to funding climate campaigns came to the table very late due to their focus on the U.S. climate debate raging at that time. Even when they did come on board early in 2009, they had quite different views about what the coalition was for, i.e., whether to create a truly mass coalition or just invest in bringing the two or three key players together.

In addition to the external resources, organisations put in their own staff and money. However, particularly among the big organisations, this was not as significant as many felt was necessary, and there was a common perception that the secretariat was understaffed, especially in terms of senior staff.

CASE STUDY: MAKE TRADE FAIR/OUR WORLD IS NOT FOR SALE

Overview

The trade movement was comprised of two very different campaigns. The first was the loose network that worked together under the Our World Is Not For Sale (OWINFS) banner—partly made up of other loose networks such as Seattle to Brussels. These organisations were broadly against a new trade round and believed the most important thing was for poor countries to be able to protect their markets and resist liberalisation.

The other main trade campaign at this time was Oxfam's Make Trade Fair (MTF) campaign, which emphasised the possibilities of trade in addressing poverty, but only if "rigged" trade rules were changed. It focused on various "wedge" campaigns, such as those for coffee, sugar and access to medicines.

The campaigns overlapped in their timing and areas of analysis—especially around the rights of poor countries to protect their own markets—but beyond this they were very different and often antagonistic towards each other.

The Doha Round, the latest round of trade negotiations among the WTO membership, has failed to conclude, although there are occasional efforts to revitalise it. It is a failure welcomed by OWINFS but condemned as a missed opportunity for progress in fighting poverty by MTF.

Objective and Messaging

The objectives of OWINFS were to:

- Stop trade liberalisation
- Reform (or in some cases abolish) the WTO
- Allow poor countries to protect their markets and subsidise their industries

Many of those involved in OWINFS and associated groups accept that their positive agenda was limited and the common message was much more of a negative one—stopping a deal at the WTO. This lack of a consistent positive agenda reduced its political appeal beyond the traditional oppositional groups and those most directly affected, but among them it was extremely attractive. It also appealed much more in the south than it did in the north.

The objectives of MTF were to:

- Change trade rules so that they benefit poor countries
- Reduce northern domestic subsidies
- Cut the cost of drugs by reforming patent rules and intellectual property
- Pay coffee and sugar farmers a fair price
- Secure high labour standards

This positioning, which emphasised the opportunities of trade and not just the risks, was highly controversial within Oxfam and in the broader sector. It was seen as more effective with northern audiences than traditional southern allies. Oxfam found it difficult to bridge these internal differences.

MTF's messaging evolved as the campaign continued—partly due to changes in external political circumstances, partly due to internal political and staffing shifts. As the E.U. and United States hardened their positions, MTF focused more on the right to protect and less on abolishing northern subsidies. Some within MTF feel this was a strategic error that enabled the campaign to become caricatured as anti-trade and, therefore, sidelined in the debate. Others feel it was a legitimate shift given a fundamental change in WTO politics.

Strategy

OWINFS focused on building anger against the WTO, putting pressure on rich countries to reduce their demands on poor countries and supporting poor countries in becoming more demanding. By doing this, it hoped to increase the prospects of the talks breaking down and thus a crisis of confidence in the WTO. The strategy was based on building popular anger in the north and especially the south through traditional mobilisation activities such as rallies and marches.

MTF's starting point was that the trade debate had been unhelpfully polarised into globophobes and globophiles. MTF tried to adopt a distinct position of being supportive of trade as a tool against poverty, but only if trade rules were changed. By engaging in the process and adopting some of the language of governments, MTF hoped to increase its influence over outcomes. MTF used the framing of the WTO Doha Round to try and make progress on a number of specific trade issues, as well as the round overall. It focused on issues that it felt conveyed a strong human story, such as access to medicines, coffee prices, labour standards and sugar.

This segmented approach worked well and enabled the public and media to engage in discussions about trade that, in their undeconstructed form, tended to be too complex to grasp. It also brought an effective political focus on key issues at key times, forcing political change in a way that more generic campaigns struggled to do given the wide set of issues and the ability to hide in the detail. The downside of the segmented approach was that Oxfam was seen as moving too quickly from one issue to the next. While there is some truth to this in terms of grassroots campaigning, where more effective transition strategies were needed, the shifts in focus were better integrated with the political dynamics and attention spans they were targeting.

Impact

OWINFS felt it had been critical to strengthening the position of developing countries and ultimately in stopping the DDA from progressing. The former is true for a limited set of countries, particularly those where popular mobilisation of small farmers became a political concern for their governments. However, the inability of OWINFS to articulate a more positive agenda, along with its distance from the political mainstream, even in developing countries governed by the left, meant it was more of a restraining influence than a transformative one.

The claim that OWINFS derailed the WTO round is not credible. Decision-makers involved in the round feel that the critical factor was the macro politics, specifically regarding the U.S. position, and the outcome had little to do with any campaigning impact.

MTF does not make such bold claims about its impact, but it does have a credible claim to specific policy areas in which it won concessions, such as:

- Elimination of E.U. export subsidies
- Some reform of TRIPS (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights) legislation to make it easier for developing countries to manufacture and import generic drugs
- Supporting the successful Brazil case against the United States on cotton
- Splitting the E.U. from the U.S. position

More broadly, MTF claims it changed the terms of the trade debate in the north toward being a developmental issue and not simply an economic one.

Although MTF was seldom the sole player in the changes above, it has a solid foundation on which to claim an important role in each of them. In some other areas, such as coffee and labour rights, the campaign failed to achieve substantive breakthroughs.

Structure

MTF was an internal Oxfam campaign run mainly through Oxfam International's affiliates and programs. In addition, it worked with ad hoc coalitions around individual campaign wedges. For example, it allied with MSF and TAC around access to medicines, coffee farmers' organisations during the coffee campaign and labour unions during the labour phase. The overarching campaign structure remained within Oxfam International.

OWINFS had a sign-on statement but not much more structure than that. The statement was signed by 1,500 organisations. In Delhi in 2004, there was an attempt to realise a global movement, but while this meeting was seen as galvanising it did not lead to any strong structural outcomes. Individuals took on coordination roles, but these tended to be logistical rather than anything else. Subgroups worked via telephone and Skype conferences to try and find agreement on positions by consensus. Information was shared between the groups involved and the grouping would meet during WTO negotiations.

Tactics

MTF was predominately an elite-level campaign. Its impact mainly came from lobbying and the quality of the research and policy analysis the organisation produced. It engaged in the global policy debate around the DDA and became a significant player in it; its analysis was respected even by those who disagreed with it.

Nevertheless, there was also a popular edge to some of this work. For example, MTF worked with celebrities such as Chris Martin from Coldplay, who agreed to be photographed having commodities dumped on them, and Oxfam's "Big Noise" petition for fair trade rules was designed to show a popular demand for reform.

This mix of tactics was particularly impactful in the north, but southern governments also worked closely with Oxfam to benefit from its analysis and policy support in negotiations.

OWINFS had less impact at the elite level and focused more on mobilisation, especially in the south. Some of the organisations allied to it were extremely effective at building a popular movement among small-scale farmers whose interests they felt were threatened, for example in Brazil. This grassroots mobilisation certainly impacted the political calculations of politicians in southern countries about their room to maneuver.

Scope/Internationalism

OWINFS signatories came from around the world, but the political impact was highest in a small number of southern countries.

MTF had more impact on northern targets via Oxfam's international network.

Neither campaign had a significant presence or impact in the United States, a key problem for substantive progress.

Resources

OWINFS was funded by NGO donations and based on the contributions individual members made to the collective work. Oxfam Novib remained an important funder, despite OWINFS being at loggerheads with MTF for large parts of the campaign.

Oxfam's campaign was carried out with its own international budget. Collaboration with allies on specific policy areas engaged its broader resources. Oxfam also funded southern NGOs to engage in its campaign via its program work and via direct grants from head offices.

Identifying Themes

Having briefly outlined the key characteristics of the campaigns, this study will now focus on the core elements that make campaigns succeed or fail and areas of contention around them, namely:

- Collective Action
- Structure
- Campaign Objective
- Leadership
- Political Strategy
- Branding
- Celebrities
- Internationalism
- Funding

COLLECTIVE ACTION

The most obvious connection between the case studies examined is that they are all coalitions. The partial exceptions to this are TAC and Oxfam's MTF, which were primarily based on one organisation but depended on coalitions for large elements of their success.

This was not a requirement of selection, but in asking decision-makers, journalists and campaigners to name impactful campaigns, they almost exclusively listed coalition campaigns. Furthermore, these campaigns tended to be big coalitions. For example, Make Poverty History was a coalition of more than 500 groups in the United Kingdom alone, Save Darfur consisted of more than 100 groups in the United States, ICBL had more than 1,000 groups, OWINFS more than 1,500, and GCCA more than 270.²

In some ways, this is obvious. It makes sense that the biggest campaigns, particularly the biggest international campaigns, could only be waged effectively by coalitions. After all, there are few, if any, individual organisations that have the resources, range of approaches and reach that are required to operate solo at this level.

While this seems logically obvious—and is supported by the identification of successful campaigns by campaigners themselves—it does beg the question of why it is that organisations consistently go back to running their own individual campaigns.

There were primarily four reasons for this:

The first is the perceived and real transaction costs of working in coalition. This is something widely identified. Even the successful coalitions were in several cases seen to have unacceptable transaction costs. For example, the transaction costs involved in Make Poverty History were such that many organisations have been unwilling to work together effectively since—despite the reach and impact of the campaign.

The second is that organisations are increasingly keen to demonstrate clear attribution of impact. This is for funding, accountability and brand building reasons. The concern among many is that by working in a coalition, especially a large international one, it becomes impossible to attribute impact to one's own organisation.

Given the increasing emphasis put on accountability (among NGOs themselves, funders and the public) this creates a set of powerful incentives that push organisations towards working on smaller niche areas with fewer partners. The thinking behind this is that if no one else is working on an issue and the campaign is successful, there can be no doubting that organisation's role. It ignores the fact that if no one else is working on an issue and it is easy for one group to make an impact, it may be because it is not the most important issue.

Third is a broader desire within the sector to differentiate one's own organisation from other NGOs among the public. This is not a new motivation, but as funding pressure compounds and the number of players keeps increasing—sadly there are too few mergers, let alone takeovers, in the NGO sector—this makes it harder for groups to collaborate.

The fourth reason is that, increasingly, the big international NGOs are actually coalitions themselves. In many cases, getting a federation or confederation of 20 plus national sections/members to agree on a priority campaign is time consuming and difficult enough, without then having to go to other groups and get them on board. Having negotiated an internal position, those international NGOs are often not in a position to show the flexibility needed to form effective coalitions. As more INGOs go through the process of integrating their campaigning functions internationally, this becomes more of an obstacle.

There is some anecdotal evidence that these pressures are increasingly leading to groups withdrawing from collective approaches or pursuing their own campaigns. Not only is it harder to identify contemporary high-impact coalitions, it seems apparent that INGOs are reducing their engagement in collective approaches such as GCAP and increasingly launching their own campaigns.

Of course, it is also true that some coalition campaigns started out as one organisation working on an issue then over time forming an alliance. That is certainly the case with the Publish What You Pay Coalition, debt relief and landmines, all of which started with an individual organisation that was later brought into a coalition. However, in many cases, the

² One proviso to this is that successful campaigns often attract members by virtue of being successful. However, in most of the cases studies, the breadth of the coalition preceded the success rather than reflected it.

new “integrated” campaigns being launched by organisations have an equal emphasis on promoting their own brand or fundraising as they do on the policy change they are trying to promote. In such circumstances, it is difficult to see how such campaigns can coalesce into more effective and impactful joint working.

The forces making coalition work harder—desire for attribution, funding pressures, creation of integrated and increasingly complex international organisations—will not go away so need to be addressed if coalition working is to be remoulded.

Who's In?

As important as the fact of coalition is the nature of it. Campaigns take widely differentiated approaches to coalition building. In some cases, campaigns have focused on bringing together a core group of organisations in order to keep the focus and strategic alignment high. For example, the Control Arms Campaign, which worked for an arms trade treaty, had just Amnesty International, IANSA and Oxfam at its core. At the other end of the spectrum, MPH and GCCA built mass coalitions that included almost any group that would join, with the exception of political organisations. In the middle were groups like PWYP and ICBL, which built large coalitions but had a core group of key players at its centre.

Most of the campaigns point to a number of factors in building an effective coalition:

- **Strong core:** Assuming groups are broadly strategically aligned, campaigns should ensure all of the key groups most engaged in the issue are at the coalition's core; better to have internal disagreements than external ones.
- **Build out:** For a mass mobilisation campaign, the bigger and more diverse the better. ICBL believes the strength of its coalition rested in the fact that it overlapped so many sectors, bringing together humanitarians, human rights and disarmament groups.
- **Strategic recruitment (and exclusion):** Campaigns should focus on bringing in key constituencies that will add impact to the strategy. For example, SDC targeted evangelical Christians early on due to their influence over the Bush administration. The Treatment Action Campaign recruited ANC supporters from townships. PWYP engaged aid agencies, making a complicated issue about transparency a more emotive one about poverty. The opposite is also true: the engagement of some groups can actively dissuade political targets from engaging with the campaign. For this reason, MPH refused to allow the Stop the War Coalition or the Socialist Workers Party to join the group, and ICBL ensured that the traditional disarmament groups were not front and centre of the campaign.
- **Get noticed:** Counterintuitive campaign alliances get noticed. For example, PYWP worked closely with some oil companies to support the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative. The support of Shell was much more valuable than the addition of any NGO would have been. Similarly, ICBL recruitment of former generals gave its arguments a level of credibility it would otherwise have struggled to project.
- **Have faith:** Many of the campaigns, especially those focused on mass mobilisation, single out faith groups as central to their impact. MPH, Jubilee 2000 and SDC all relied on faith groups for a large part of their mobilisation. There is a strong sense that faith groups are particularly effective in mobilising action, and by engaging them, a campaign can reach out to a more mainstream—less traditionally left of centre—public.

The more contentious area is how to balance breadth of coalition with unity of purpose. Having a very broad coalition support the objectives of a campaign as centrally defined, as per ICBL or PWYP, is relatively straightforward. However, having a broad coalition with different strategic outlooks at the core of a coalition, as per MPH, creates a significant set of tensions.

Finally, having the right group at the core of a coalition is in many ways the most important thing, as it creates the frame through which the campaign is perceived, as well as dictating the strategy that drives it. One of the concerns about GCCA from many of those involved most closely in it is that having the main organisations coming from the environmental and development sectors has significant downsides. Their worry is that basing the coalition on these groups alienates a large proportion of the public for whom environmental or development concerns are peripheral. While campaigning by niche interest groups may be fine for more marginal areas of public policy, to change the global economy in the way that is needed to address climate change requires a more mainstream movement.

However, it is much more difficult to build a coalition in the political mainstream when many of those groups—such as labour unions, the private sector, faith groups and consumer groups—may only be marginally interested in climate change. It does suggest that an initial stage of campaign planning needs to be outreach to other potential campaign allies

to get them to engage seriously and be ready to invest the time and resources that leadership of a coalition requires. It also suggests a willingness among traditional campaigning groups not to necessarily push one's own organisation to the front of a campaign where the involvement of others would add more value.

An Important Caveat

While collective action is—in almost all cases—a necessary characteristic for large-scale impact, it is clearly not the only one.

There are numerous coalitions that have been so insufficiently focused and badly structured that they spend more time debating the 1 percent of policy on which they differ than organising to have an impact on the 99 percent on which they agree. Others have had such high transaction costs or unrealistic political agendas that they are condemned to being ineffectual from the start.

In recent years, some of the biggest coalitions have also struggled. Groups like GCAP or GCCA, despite being very broad and having committed staff at the top of the organisation, have struggled to have the impact they desire.

STRUCTURES

While all of the campaigns studied were coalitions, the type of collective action varied enormously. The structures underpinning the campaigns examined can be split into three main types: secretariat led, collaborative and flotilla.

It should be noted that some campaigns exhibited characteristics of more than one of these structures and others moved over time from one type to another. For example, the Save Darfur Campaign varied from being secretariat led to collaborative at different stages in its history.

1. Secretariat led

The prime examples of this in the campaigns studied were Jubilee 2000 and the Save Darfur Coalition. Enabled by their structure, these campaigns were characterised by the creation of strong brands, a well resourced secretariat and centralised leadership.

The advantages of this structure and approach are considerable. Such centralised campaigns provide:

- Clear lines of communication with the public, with the opportunity of a single brand to understand, buy into and support
- The opportunity for (if not always the reality of) strong leadership
- Rapid decision-making
- A willingness to take risks

The key disadvantages are the tensions created by such a strong centre. Specifically:

- Potentially limited partner engagement due to lack of ownership and worries over competition
- Tensions between the leadership of the coalition and the leadership of supporting NGOs, and more broadly between the secretariat and the coalition's constituent organisations
- The lack of checks and balances, which makes the secretariat more prone to policy or campaigning missteps and makes getting the right leadership critical

Jubilee 2000 and SDC, which shared a similar structure, were two of the best campaigns at mobilising the public. The Save Darfur Coalition recruited more than 1 million supporters in less than six months and organised a march in Washington of up to 100,000 people in April 2006. Jubilee 2000 got more than 20 million people to sign its global petition, and tens of thousands circled the G8 meetings in 1998 and 1999.

While their successes were not only structural, the leadership of both campaigns stressed the importance of their ability to move quickly and freely, communicate directly with the public without mediation from other organisations, and build a campaign-focused brand.

However, both Jubilee 2000 and SDC also ran into difficulties associated with such centralised coalitions. In both cases, significant tensions developed between the leadership of the secretariat and the members of the coalition. In the case of Jubilee 2000, this was offset by the significant progress being made on the issues. But as the campaign went on, some coalition members started to withdraw or reduce their support as Jubilee 2000 started looking more like a competitor than a collaboration. Christian Aid for example, which had housed Jubilee 2000 and been at the core of the campaign, became increasingly worried that Jubilee 2000 was taking its campaigners away and overshadowing its work. These tensions were contained fairly well at the time, but they ultimately led to many of the organisations involved being unwilling to work together in such a centralised way in the future.

In the case of SDC, similar tensions over ownership and success grew as the campaign expanded. Having been founded informally as a group to facilitate campaigning on a region no one had heard of, the campaign (and the secretariat at the centre of it) grew into the premier international advocacy campaign in the United States. This sudden expansion meant many of the traditional groups who had helped found the coalition felt increasingly threatened by the campaign as it outgrew them. Suddenly, an organisation they had founded had more members, better funding, a bigger profile and more political access than their own organisations. Rather than a sense of shared success, the lack of common ownership associated with the centralised model meant coalition members felt threatened by it.

While Jubilee 2000 managed to offset some of these tensions through its policy impact, SDC compounded them with two controversial policy decisions. The first was the trip the coalition organised with New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson, in which the coalition was seen to be negotiating with President Bashir. The second was an advertisement placed by the coalition that seemed to suggest aid agencies were supportive of military action against Sudan. These policy controversies, magnified by the fact that they had been made with limited consultation and therefore no joint ownership, increased the underlying tensions that already existed and provided ammunition to those who wanted to rein the coalition back in. The tensions came to a head in 2007, when the board removed the then Chief Executive David Rubenstein. This was followed by a reassertion of more control by the member organisations.

Despite these tensions, it is clear that when political change strategies require mass mobilisation campaigns, centralised coalitions with a strong campaign brand and a well-resourced secretariat are well placed to deliver them. What they rely on is diplomatic leadership, sound policy judgment and, crucially, very high levels of buy-in by constituent members. Ultimately, coalition members need to be willing to build up a brand that will have limited association with their own organisations and, in many cases, be seen as a competitor for funding, media and policy space. They have to accept that this campaign may end up securing more funding, recruiting more supporters and ultimately having more impact than their own organisations.

If the professed intentions from civil society leaders about being focused on the issue, not “egos and logos,” is taken at face value, then this should be possible. However, the evidence suggests that, in practice, this will be a rarity, especially for the large organisations for whom brand considerations are most important.

2. Collaborative campaign

The second type of structure identified was the collaborative campaign. These are campaigns with a shared strategy that may be supported by a small secretariat or run by wholly collective structures. In both cases, they rely on coalition member engagement and leadership in order to have impact.

Good examples of this approach are the MPH and PWYP campaigns. The PWYP campaign set up a small secretariat fairly early in its emergence. This was initially staffed by only one person and was designed to support and coordinate the coalition’s work, not lead it. The secretariat focused on communication, outreach and support for member groups rather than building up its own capacity or communicating directly with the public.

The MPH collaboration was founded without a secretariat in order to avoid the tensions that campaigners experienced with Jubilee 2000. Instead, the main organisations formed a coordination team then set up working groups on key areas such as media, policy and mobilisation, which were open to all members who wanted to engage.

The advantages of a collaborative approach were:

- A strong sense of joint ownership, responsibility and control among coalition members
- Widespread acceptance that ongoing engagement is needed to make the campaign work, since there was no central capacity to delegate to
- Successes (and to an extent failures) are shared

The disadvantages of this structure are:

- Lack of clear leadership, bringing the risk of slow decision-making, increased tensions and a lack of clarity on who is the external voice
- The potential for ongoing competition between coalition members over the direction of the campaign
- Constant member engagement and a high degree of consensus are needed to have impact since there is such limited capacity

Without a doubt, the major drawback of a collaborative structure vis-à-vis a more centralised approach is the lack of clear leadership. This was identified by PWYP coalition members in their comments about the lack of transparency in decision-making and the lack of clarity of strategic direction. However, PWYP had a very high degree of internal coherence and trust, which meant these difficulties never became overbearing—at least among the core team that managed the international secretariat—and the collaborative work it supported enabled different organisations to play to their strengths and commit to different degrees.

In many ways, the structure of Make Poverty History was a direct reaction to the tensions emanating from the centralised leadership of Jubilee 2000. The collaborative model was designed specifically to avoid the risks of competition and centralisation that for many had characterised their experience of Jubilee 2000. In retrospect, most agree that the structures of MPH represented too dramatic a course correction, especially the lack of a secretariat.

The lack of central leadership within MPH was compounded by the fact that, unlike PWYP, the remit was very broad and the policy space was highly contested. Therefore, rather than reducing tensions, the structure simply shifted the dynamic from being one about organisational competition to being one about policy and branding competition.

Due to this structure, members found it impossible to resolve these tensions, and the slow decision-making and lack of clear leadership at times exacerbated it. However, it is also true that while the structure could not effectively resolve tensions, it did manage them by ensuring collective decision-making and joint control, whereas a more centralised model may have caused an explosion blowing the coalition apart. Essentially, MPH brought together an incredibly broad coalition within a very weak structure with no central capacity. It then subjected this structure to a level of exposure that no international development campaign has achieved before or since. Given this it is incredible—and at least in part testament to the structure—that the tensions within it did not destroy it.

While the structure may have been the least bad solution for ameliorating the different positions, it also made the campaign less effective externally. This was apparent in its lack of agility in responding to political opportunities or in the lack of an external voice representing MPH's analysis. The latter problem led to the farce at Gleneagles where MPH failed to organise its press release responding to the summit until the following day. The media focused on other voices such as Bob Geldof as a result.

While both PWYP and MPH suffered (though to different extents) from a structural lack of clear leadership, they also benefitted from the advantages of the collaborative approach, and not just in containing internal tension. Perhaps most impressively, both MPH and PWYP were effective at getting ongoing engagement from their members. Indeed, MPH was entirely dependent on members for resources and activity.

MPH also managed to build a near universally recognised brand in the United Kingdom within six months of the campaign launching, something that was only possible because of the breadth of the coalition and the variety of opportunities members collectively bought to the coalition. It was a mobilisation made possible by a sense of common ownership.

3. Flotilla

This structure was personified by GCCA and the associated TckTckTck campaign, though OWINFS had a similar approach. The idea of the model was that it would provide organisations with increased impact through coordination, without the increased transaction costs of having to agree about every detail of strategy. The campaign would agree on the broad direction of the movement and moments of common activity but essentially work towards the shared objective individually. To extend the flotilla metaphor: all were sailing as part of the same fleet with the same destination, but with each group having their own flag, their own captain and their own tactics.

Those interviewed cited the origins of this approach in two areas:

1. A reaction to the tensions and compromises of Make Poverty History and other coalition campaigns
2. A lack of willingness to subsume brand considerations, in part due to the financial crisis

The benefits of this structure were:

- Low barriers to entry
- Low transaction costs
- A diversity of approaches
- Unimpeded ability to work as individual organisations

The downsides were:

- Lack of substantive engagement by member organisations with little vested in the central campaign
- Difficulty in harnessing the disparate activities of the flotilla or to make it more than the sum of its parts

- Hard to register the scale of activity with targets
- Difficult to build and sustain a brand with such limited buy-in

For GCCA and TckTckTck, the campaign's late formation less than a year ahead of the campaign's key moment was compounded by a structure that left organisations with little central buy-in or commitment. Several people interviewed suspected that there were even those who actively wanted GCCA to fail in order to avoid competition with their own organisations. A Catch-22 developed where groups would only engage once GCCA became successful—thus inhibiting its chance of success.

Even once groups did start to engage more consistently in September 2009, the ability of such a disparate movement to harness the varied actions taking place was very limited. Decision-makers and journalists targeted by the campaign speak of being underwhelmed by it, and those in supportive countries were disappointed in its ability to have significant impact.

Some of these difficulties came from the lack of buy-in, but also important was the failure to build a unifying brand that could have harnessed a sense of momentum. GCCA was specifically set up without any public brand, and the campaign arm of TckTckTck that was meant to be publicly facing lacked sufficient investment and never established itself with the public or decision-makers.

While there were different views over the reasons, there was a near unanimous view—both inside and outside of the coalition—that GCCA and TckTckTck had struggled to become more than the sum of its parts.

OWINFS found itself facing a similar problem. Its enormous network of more than 1,500 organisations failed to throw its full weight behind the campaign, partly due to its political strategy but also because, outside of WTO ministerial meetings, the campaign was simply too diffuse to be noticed as a coordinated movement.

The Landmine Campaign

The International Campaign to Ban Landmines is an interesting example of a campaign that managed to combine elements of different structures. The formal structure was most closely related to a collaborative one, in which a very small secretariat serviced a large membership and members sat on a board responsible for the key decisions.

However, it also exhibited some characteristics of a more centralised campaign, specifically a strong central leadership. In addition, although the coordination committee existed and was the ultimate decision-maker, it was small and did not seek to be broadly representative—at least at first. Members of the committee operated closely, and although there were bruising, mainly personality-based disagreements, they succeeded in providing a level of inclusion without opening decision-making to everyone involved. This combination worked extremely effectively for ICBL.

Constructing such a model relied on having a small, similarly minded board as well as an effective leadership. Also important was the fact that for many of the bigger organisations, which tend to be most sensitive to worries over brand and leadership competition, the issue of landmines was not at the core of their mandate. They were thus willing to delegate and trust others more than they might otherwise have been willing to do.

So while it is clear that this hybrid model would not be feasible in all cases, this example should be closely looked at by those who want to build a collaborative structure while also supporting effective leadership. In this case, it was achieved by combining a small board filled with individuals who shared a similar strategic approach with a well-led but small secretariat.

Horses for Courses

Clearly, there is no such thing as an ideal structure for campaigns that should be applied as a blueprint in each and every case; the form has to respond to the strategy. However, this is not the same thing as saying structure is unimportant. The case studies show that the structure of a campaign is one of the key determinants for how campaigns evolve and the tensions they produce. It is also clear that the strengths and weaknesses of certain structures make them more suited to certain types of campaign.

For example, a campaign that seeks to mobilise the public in a mass way, reaching new audiences and demonstrating momentum, would benefit most from a centralised or collaborative structure. Whereas a flotilla campaign approach may be more functional for an elite-level campaign where branding and buy-in are less important.

Of course, we do not have the luxury of designing campaigns in a vacuum. The coalition structures we are left with are often a result of the participants, their commitment and their preferences, rather than being intentionally designed to be most effective in terms of the campaign's objectives. For example, a centralised secretariat model may offer the most benefits to a mass mobilisation campaign in theory, but the lack of control it comes with may mean key members are unwilling to engage.

What becomes apparent in looking at the evolution of campaigns in recent years is the extent to which new campaigns have structured themselves specifically in reaction to the campaign that preceded them. So MPH was set up as a collaboration to avoid the tensions of centralisation associated with Jubilee 2000, and, to an extent, GCCA was structured as a flotilla to avoid the disagreements of MPH's collaboration.

The desire to avoid the tensions, compromises and transaction costs associated with coalitions has increasingly resulted in lowest-common-denominator collaborations, where the added benefits of working together are reduced by a desire to avoid tension and the pooling of brands. These are collaborations where organisations are working together in name only.

There must be a willingness to adapt structure to participants, but not at the cost of impact. Organisations need to take a fresh look at their collaborations—both current and future—and accept that no collaboration worth having will come without the need to make trade-offs.

Trust

One additional thing mentioned by almost all of those who felt they participated in a successful campaign was the importance of high levels of trust. This often comes from individuals who have worked closely with each other for many years. The importance of having a close-knit group at the centre of a campaign cannot be overestimated. Campaigns like ICBL (at least early on), the Treatment Action Campaign and PYWP had it in droves. MPH and SDC never really had such a united group at its centre.

Interestingly, GCCA was initiated by a close knit-group of people who were used to working together. High levels of trust existed between them at the outset. However, as the issue of climate change became more of a corporate priority for big organisations, new staff without a track record on the issue or of working together became the main interface with the campaign, and the high levels of trust that had been built up broke down. In addition, the long incubation period between campaign initiation and launch meant many of the key players had changed organisational affiliation by the time of the launch. The format in which that original core team worked most closely together became the nerve centre, which is the policy and political part of the campaign that most cite as being the most functional.

CAMPAIGN OBJECTIVES

In addition to having different structures, campaigns also have very different types of objectives. The objective type has significant implications for how the campaign is run, the tensions it produces and the political strategy it adopts. Below is an attempt to map the most significant types of objectives and their attributes, though it should be noted that these are not exclusive categories.

Classic Policy Change

Attempting to change government policy or corporate behaviour in a specific area is perhaps the most common type of campaign objective. Most of the campaigns in this study were primarily focused on this objective. Such campaigns require strong power analysis of what will be needed to move the target to a new policy position. These campaigns can be long or short term, but in general tend to be more immediately focused. Beyond this, the tactics depend on the power analysis and could include anything from policy research to mass mobilisation, direct action to insider influencing.

Hearts and Minds

As the name suggests this is a type of campaign less aimed at policy change and more at public attitudes. Changing public attitudes may either be the final objective or a tactic to influence others (e.g., changing public attitudes in order to change government policy). While many of the campaigns studied did this work, few had it as a focus. TAC's attempts to change the way in which HIV was seen was probably the campaign with the biggest focus in this area. Another example is campaigns against gender-based violence. Both Amnesty and Oxfam have run high-profile campaigns in this area, and they have focused primarily on changing attitudes rather than policies. In launching such campaigns, effective targeting and monitoring is critical to determine strategy and impact. These campaigns also require the ability to reach the target audience effectively and consistently over time, often via the media. These campaigns tend to be long term.

Moment

Many campaigns structure themselves around a moment-based objective. Of the campaigns studied, the best examples of this were Jubilee 2000, GCCA and Make Poverty History. The theory behind moment-based campaigns is that rather than there being a consistent opportunity for change, political breakthroughs come in peaks. In addition, it reflects a belief that campaigns are most effective at mobilising people around a specific moment of drama and possibility, rather than trying to keep a constituency going in perpetuity. Even those campaigns that were not focused around a moment, such as PWYP, TAC, SDC and ICBL, worked hard to establish such moments and made them core to their campaign planning.

There is no doubt that moment-based campaigns are successful for the focus they provide. In addition to creating a crunch moment, they respond to the shifting areas of interest of the media, public and politicians, and they are more likely than an ongoing campaign to get groups to work together. But there are also real drawbacks, the most obvious of which is losing momentum when the campaign winds down. In the case of Jubilee 2000 and Make Poverty History, the decision to wind down the campaigns was incredibly controversial. In both cases, the objectives they were striving for had been partially met but far from fulfilled. Those arguing for continuation of these campaigns insisted the following:

- The campaign has created a massive momentum that would be lost if it stops.
- The constituency behind the campaign would be fractured if the campaign winds down.
- The public has only just started engaging in the issue.
- Small organisations have been energised by the campaign.

Those arguing against their continuation also did so for a mixture of strategic and organisational reasons:

- The political opportunity has passed, and while future progress may be possible, we've extracted all we can from the targets at this stage.
- The media, public and politicians are getting (or will soon get) bored of the issue.
- Big organisations cannot subsume their brands or work on one issue forever.

Both sides have merit in their positions, which begs the question of whether a middle ground can be found. (This is discussed further below.)

Movement

A movement-based objective can also be structured around moments but tends to emphasise investing in a constituency and a longer-term strategy of change. It is the creation and sustenance of the movement that is as important as any policy change. This often has a large element of "hearts and minds" campaigning, targeted to a constituency that is likely to be motivated by the issue. Many see several of the campaigns studied as part of the same movement, i.e., the international development movement that has come together around Jubilee 2000, Make Poverty History, trade and now climate change. Others would say this is too diffuse to be a movement and would point to the women's movement as the classic movement-based campaign.

Mission Focused

A hybrid of moment- and movement-focused campaigns are those that exist until their mission is achieved or until they give up. These include TAC, PWYP, ICBL and SDC. It is hard to describe any of these as movements, since they are more focused than that, but they do emphasise ongoing engagement in an issue and a consistency of engagement over time in order to have impact.

These campaigns often rely on early successes in order to generate and harness momentum, with ICBL being a prime example. The celebrating of such successes generates momentum and helps activists see a path to future success. In cases where the campaign is less successful, however, these campaigns can struggle to maintain momentum and keep governments and partners engaged.

LEADERSHIP

“It is amazing what can be accomplished when nobody cares about who gets the credit.”

—Robert Yates

The conundrum of leadership in coalitions flummoxes many campaigns.

The tension is obvious: good leadership requires significant empowerment of an individual to set direction, make judgments and take considered risks. Traditional coalitions, on the other hand, are generally defined by joint work, diffuse decisions and compromise.

This dilemma is further compounded by a desire by all group members to get a share of the credit for the campaign’s work, for reasons of funding as well as more egotistical motives. In some cases, it is further increased by a general disdain for hierarchical structures.

It’s important to get right both types of leadership: internal and external.

Two of the campaigns with the strongest leadership models—both internal and external—were Jubilee 2000 (Ann Pettifor) and the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (Jodie Williams). Both of these women would admit—perhaps even relish—the fact that their leadership style could veer towards the dictatorial end of the spectrum. Both felt that there was a right and a wrong way to achieve impact and compromising in order to assuage coalition members’ sensibilities was not something they were willing to do. Even members of organisations who felt railroaded or overshadowed by these figures still respected the impact of their work. These two women were effective—at times controversial—internal and external leaders because they were supported by the structures in which they worked, achieved continuous policy progress for their campaigns and possessed substantial personal abilities. The main problem with their style was it sometimes alienated coalition partners.

At the other extreme of the leadership spectrum is Make Poverty History, which was deliberately structured to have neither internal nor external leadership. This structure had all of the downsides touched on previously, such as slow decision-making and ongoing and time-consuming contestation over direction, but it did make the coalition less threatening to its consistent members and perhaps made them more willing to commit to the campaign. This suggests that sacrificing clear internal leadership in favour of weaker shared leadership but higher levels of engagement, while far from ideal, is not necessarily fatal to a campaign’s ability to have impact.

One big problem for MPH—and something that could have been avoided more easily—was the coalition’s refusal to identify an external leader. The experience of the campaign demonstrated vividly that if a campaign is unwilling to identify a leader for itself, then the media, politicians and the public will identify one for it. In the case of MPH, this led to a sense among the public, media and politicians that Bob Geldof and Bono were the leaders of the campaign, and according to campaign polling, many in the public even thought it was being led by the British government.

While MPH may not have been able to find a solution to internal leadership—accepting that leadership by committee was the only way of securing engagement—it should have been able to find one to external leadership by separating the two functions. For example, it certainly would have been possible to forgo an internal leader and come to decisions by committee but still have an external leader who could provide a clear voice for the coalition and articulate those decisions to the public. The decision not to do this stemmed from the same fears of losing control and creating competitors but was clearly an over-correction from Jubilee 2000.

The case of ICBL also shows the possibility of creating effective collaborative leadership models internally. The key difference between the somewhat tortured collaborative leadership of MPH and the more effective and efficient leadership of ICBL (at least until the Nobel Prize controversy) was that MPH set out to make the coordination committee as broad and representative as possible, thereby including individuals and organisations with very different views and political strategies. Whereas in the case of ICBL, the board structure was both smaller and much more strategically like-minded, so while there were major battles between personalities, the political direction was more consistent.

The same is true of PWYP, which based its structure closely on ICBL. In this case, the management committee provided the leadership function and maintained a clear strategic direction for the campaign. The lack of a high-profile coordinator reduced the sense of personal leadership (and some of the tensions this can produce) but still gave the campaign and external contacts a clear identifiable point person for the campaign.

POLITICAL STRATEGY

Campaigns may be brilliantly structured, well resourced and widely supported, but unless they have a clear and well thought-out political strategy they will be ineffective, or, in certain cases, even prove counter-productive to the end they are trying to achieve.

Political strategy can be divided into two main component parts. The first is the definition of the ask, which may be different from the campaign objective. The second element is defining the tactics necessary to achieve it. This is based on a thorough power analysis, the likely size and scale of the campaign, the current position of decision-makers, the likely opponents, and the levers at the campaign's disposal. Bringing these two elements together—and ensuring a feedback loop between them—provides the political strategy.

All good campaigns do this as a matter of course. But it is surprising how many campaigns only focus on the ask. They take positions regardless of the scope and scale of the campaign and adopt asks that they have no analysis of how to implement. In some cases, those behind such campaigns believe adopting the "right position" is the only thing that matters, regardless of the impact the campaign ultimately has.

Take, for example, the activists at the 2010 U.N. MDG summit, who lamented the inadequacy of the MDGs and demanded a more radical approach but were unable to mount any kind of effective campaign that year, despite the fact that 2010 was a key year for securing progress on poverty. Another example is the Climate Justice Movement's futile push for a target of 1.5 degrees at Copenhagen.

At the other end of the spectrum are those campaigns and organisations that start from the position of analyzing what is likely to happen or what is easily possible and then base their asks around that.

In the campaigns studied, the political strategy tended to be the most hotly contested area for debate—both at the time and in retrospect. Two of the most controversial areas were whether the ask settled upon was the right one and whether the relationship with governments or corporate targets was too close or too oppositional.

Concerns Over Co-option

In the case of MPH, the political frictions were over the dangers of "co-option" by government, a tension that stemmed from the breadth of groups involved. The campaign included groups like the World Development Movement and War on Want, whose organisational identity is rooted in being oppositional towards the United Kingdom and most other northern governments. At the other extreme was Comic Relief, which is primarily a fundraising group and seldom engages in campaigning. Even between these two extremes there was a real difference between groups like Oxfam, which saw the U.K. government as a potentially progressive force on development and therefore one worth working closely with, and Christian Aid, which was skeptical of close engagement at that time.

The issue of co-option around MPH is an important one to address, as it crystallises the issue most clearly of all of the campaigns. Two things are clear from the evidence. The first is that the campaign was conceived independently from any government engagement. Indeed, in the early interaction between the nascent campaign and the government in late 2003, it became clear that the government was planning to focus on development for its G8, but in a very limited way. The second observation is that many parts of the government, especially Number 10 and Number 11, welcomed the idea of a campaign and actively encouraged its development. The clearest example of this in action is when then Chancellor Gordon Brown convened a meeting in February 2004 with campaigners, faith groups and Bob Geldof and urged them to work together.

The reasons for the government's enthusiasm for this campaign were the source of much speculation. The more leftist groups, whose campaigning experience was almost uniquely based on opposing northern governments, were distinctly uncomfortable about being seen to work alongside the government. They saw this as an attempt by the British government to win back liberal voters put off by the Iraq war by associating themselves with a popular progressive campaign. However, the evidence is clear that the more mundane reality was that for both Tony Blair and Gordon Brown, development was an issue at the core of their political identity. Since before 1997, they had both sought leadership roles on development and had positioned the Labour Party in a progressive position. For example, the party established a new Department for International Development, which would untie aid, the support for debt relief and the support for a ban on landmines. In much the same way as the campaigners, the senior leadership of the government saw

2005 as a real opportunity to make progress on development. They saw a public campaign as an important element in creating international pressure and building public support for the spending decisions needed.

Of course, that is not to say the politicians involved were unaware or disinterested in the political impact of the campaign. Particularly as the campaign took off and became hugely popular, there was a desire to associate closely with it. Labour politicians felt it would favour them and their relative leadership on these issues compared to their Conservative opposition. It is also true that the Labour Party did some work during the 2005 election campaign to promote its leadership on international development to a handful of constituencies with demographics thought to be supportive. However, the idea that this was a central part of the Labour Party's strategy or that this was the motivation behind its support of the campaign was wholly wrong. Sadly for the movement, the strategy of using international development as a core way to win elections is yet to attract many supporters within political parties.

Overall, there was a strong symbiotic relationship between MPH and the U.K. government. The unspoken pact was that government would share information with NGOs about other governments' positions to inform their lobbying and would spend political capital with core targets and build expectations around the summit in order to help the campaign in its objectives. On the other side, the campaign would push other countries domestically and create a constituency within the public that engaged in the political process and would welcome progress if it came.

There were also differences within ICBL over how closely to work with government, although they were far less dramatic than those highlighted above. The leadership of the campaign—many of whom were schooled in campaigns opposing the U.S. government—was initially wary of working so closely with supportive governments. Indeed, until 1996, ICBL had assumed a largely outsider approach, regularly criticising governments for their timidity and lack of progress. This changed in 1996 with the collapse of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. At this stage, it became clear that engagement was critical to impact and that the Canadians' willingness to show the leadership required presented an opportunity. From then on, a core team from the campaign worked hand in glove with the Canadians, in particular, as well as with a broader group of like-minded countries, coordinating on everything from language in the treaty to target countries. This close working was critical to the success of the campaign and essential to obtaining a treaty. In fact, some of the campaigners admit they were surprised to find some of the diplomats were even more committed to a ban than their own supporters. Without this close working a treaty would have been unobtainable.

The core worry associated with co-option is that campaigns will become too sympathetic to government's constraints and too willing to compromise as a result. The fear is that by working so closely with government, the campaign will be unable to strongly criticise their partners or speak out in public against their positions. ICBL shows this does not have to be the case. Following months of very close working at professional and personal levels, ICBL publicly turned on Canada during the final treaty negotiations, strongly criticising it when it appeared it was going to give in to U.S. demands for modifications to the treaty. Canada decided not to weaken the treaty and, as a result, joint working resumed.

PWYP is another example of a campaign that adopted a strong insider approach from almost the start. The United Kingdom's support for the EITI enabled the campaign to work closely with the government and co-strategise with it, but in doing so PWYP was also forced to focus less on its ultimate objective of a regulatory approach. This was a controversial decision at the time. It was based on a sense that the campaign was not yet strong enough to be effective without a sympathetic government and, therefore, the compromise was one worth making. The upside of such engagement became clear in 2004, when the EITI looked like it was being sidelined and PWYP could use its insider influence and authority by threatening to disown the initiative at an embarrassing time for the government. Doing so helped the campaign secure a significant tightening of the initiative. PWYP has also shown the ability to maintain its long-term objective of a regulatory approach even when working with governments on compromise solutions in the interim.

The Treatment Action campaign was in no danger of co-option by the Mbeki administration. The president and his health minister's HIV/AIDS "denialism" meant the campaign was vigorously opposed to them throughout their administration. Nevertheless, where other campaigns may have adopted an entirely outsider approach, TAC took a pragmatic stance of working with more sympathetic parts of government and the ANC. In so doing, it helped force through some progress, despite the resistance of the president.

As some of the examples above show, many campaigns worry about co-option. This is understandable. It is vital for the credibility of civil society to be independent and willing to speak truth to power. However, it is equally true that the credibility of civil society is just as damaged if it is seen as being oppositionist for its own sake, regardless of the position a government adopts.

In most of the international campaigns looked at, there was a balance between insider and outsider strategies and a willingness for the political circumstances to determine the balance between them. Nevertheless, there remain some groups whose response to government is conditioned by their organisational identity rather than their strategic objectives. This works in both directions. Some groups refuse to work closely with government even when it supports the same objectives and where joint strategising would have the most impact. Others will work closely with governments and deploy purely insider strategies irrespective of the government's position and the effectiveness of these strategies.

Battles Over Policy Positioning

Within coalition campaigns, finding consensus on a policy agenda is often one of the most time-consuming and fraught exercises. This is magnified when organisations working together not only differ over policy but also have different strategies, constituencies and outlooks.

In the case of trade, the different branches of the movement, which were not part of the same campaign, had fundamentally different policy asks and strategies for achieving them. While Oxfam's Make Trade Fair campaign emphasised the possibilities of trade for poor countries, the need to open up northern markets and the need to end northern subsidies, the anti-globalisation movement led by groups like OWINFS argued that trade and the WTO were primarily threats, not opportunities, and that the interests of poor people would be best served by a collapse of the Doha Round. In retrospect, it seems that both of these strategies were partially vindicated. Oxfam's MTF, together with the work of groups like MSF and TAC, was able to point to moderate policy wins on TRIPS and E.U. export subsidies that they argue were only possible because of the credibility they won from engaging in a broader trade dialogue. On the other hand, OWINFS can point to the failure to conclude the Doha Round and a consensus from most development actors and poor states as proof that there was not enough of a pro-poor package in the round. However, both strategies also got things wrong. Many of those involved in Oxfam's MTF campaign feel they overemphasised the possibilities of getting progress through a Doha Round. While it may have been strategically astute to engage in Doha to leverage change outside the formal process, MTF ended up investing too many resources in a process that was not likely to succeed. Meanwhile, the anti-globalisation movement had no effective positive offer to put forward once the Doha Round collapsed and instead had to fight another rearguard action against bilateral agreements.

In the case of MPH, the divergence was over what elements of the manifesto got the most focus, together with a more general question about whether the asks were demanding enough. The criticism from many groups involved was that the campaign overemphasised aid and debt, relative to trade. On this, the critics were right. Those within government at the time recognised their similar lack of emphasis on trade. The government's view was that debt and aid were issues on which the G8 could make progress and secure agreements. On trade, however, not only were the politics more difficult, but it was felt that the WTO was the proper forum in which to secure progress, not the G8. Many in the campaign recognised this and focused on Gleneagles to achieve the aid and debt objectives. It is doubtful that more could have been secured via the G8, even if the U.K. government had focused more on it.

The problem was less that the focus of the campaign at the G8 was wrong, than that the campaign never managed to get back into the same high gear or achieve the same level of awareness or impact in the run up to the WTO ministerial and what was supposed to be the second half of the Make Poverty History campaign.

More important still was the failure of MPH to become a real international campaign, which would have been critical to having any chance of impacting trade negotiations.

The broader critique was that the campaign did not criticise the U.K. government enough and was not sufficiently demanding. But people within governments outside the United Kingdom say they have no doubt that the British government felt pushed by the campaign and ended up with a more ambitious position that they actually stuck to as a result of the campaign. The government's decisions to adopt a 0.7 percent timetable and to broaden its agenda beyond a single specific policy area as originally planned reflect this. The best measure of this pressure was the extent to which the United Kingdom was willing to expend political capital. According to both U.K. and other G8 government insiders, this was resolutely the case. For example, Prime Minister Blair leaned heavily on his personal relationship with President Bush to shift the U.S. position, and, ultimately, Bush instructed his team to deliver Blair a successful summit. The United States ended up agreeing to a more generous aid position while on the plane to Gleneagles as a direct result. More broadly, the U.K. Sherpa responsible for the summit was consistently isolated within the G8, with other Sherpas refusing to move as far as the United Kingdom wanted them to, especially on aid levels. To the anger of other G8 countries, U.K. Sherpa's

consistent response to this was to suggest further meetings rather than step back from the objective. Senior politicians and officials from outside the United Kingdom still recollect a clear irritation with the U.K.'s inflexibility and intransigence.

Those outside the United Kingdom put the inflexibility of the British government down to it being hemmed in by MPH, while those inside the U.K. system say MPH helped the government hold its nerve, especially knowing the Live 8 concerts were still to come. Those involved in the government decision-making feel that a more hostile campaign would have reduced the incentive to engage with it and thus its influence. The attraction of the campaign for government was its ability to have impact on other governments and, more parochially, its ability to show public support for the government's leadership. Both those in the United Kingdom and others in the G8 felt that the U.K. government was at the outer limits of ambition and that pushing beyond this would have led to it being less effective. There was also a strong sense that while positive endorsement by the campaign was something to be coveted, negative attacks would have limited impact. Had the United Kingdom wanted to lower expectations of the summit by blaming other governments, for example, it could certainly have done so.

These disagreements over policy reached their zenith in the aftermath of the Gleneagles summit, where groups competed to outdo each other in angry rhetoric. For example, "the people roared the G8 whispered" (GCAP), "G8 Turn Their Backs on the World's Poor" (War on Want), "a disaster for the poor" (World Development Movement) and "a sad day for poor people in Africa and all over the world" (Christian Aid).

The fact that six years later many of those same groups continue to refer to the Gleneagles commitments as the benchmark that they want leaders to live up to speaks volumes about just how badly wrong they got this judgment. Looking back on the Gleneagles summit almost six years later, many are more sanguine and accept that a focus on getting the agreements implemented and adhered to would probably have been smarter than decrying them for their inadequacy.

ICBL and Jubilee 2000 had the significant advantage of clear and relatively simple asks. This meant divergence was limited, but, even in these cases, battles over policy were real and took strong leadership to resolve.

The definitional question within ICBL was particularly thorny, with some of the more disarmament-minded groups keen to have a broad definition of landmines in order to include anti-tank mines and cluster munitions. The core group decided not to go down this route and instead agreed early on to focus on anti-personnel mines in order to maintain focus and avoid blurring the arguments. Nevertheless, disagreements over this more narrow definition continued to surface right up to and into the treaty negotiations. In retrospect, it seems clear that the tightly focused campaign had much more impact than it would have had it been more diffuse and more easily portrayed as a disarmament campaign. ICBL also shows the ability of campaigns to win in one area and carry the momentum over into another, in this case from landmines to cluster munitions.

Jubilee 2000 similarly had a disagreement with the more extreme groups that set up Jubilee South. While Jubilee 2000 initially focused on poor countries' bilateral debt, Jubilee South called for the cancellation of all debts, as well as reparations, the "transformation of the global capitalist economic system and the building of a new world economic order," among other things. As the campaign unfolded and grew in strength, Jubilee 2000 strengthened its demands—such as focusing on a broader list of countries and including multilateral debt—but kept its distance from Jubilee South. Jubilee 2000 is still seen as one of the most successful campaigns on development. It would not have been had it followed the strategy of Jubilee South.

Unlike most campaigns, which tend to emphasise policy over strategy, SDC tended to do the opposite, at least in the early days. It had developed a relatively elaborate and highly successful political strategy on how to gain influence and have impact, but exactly what it was asking for was less clear. In the early days of the campaign, there was little time invested in policy analysis. The sense internally was simple: that this was a genocide that needed to be stopped. The coalition's job was to tell the administration to stop it and put pressure on it to do so; the administration's job was to figure out how to do that.

The problem with this was that the sizable pressure produced by the campaign was often too amorphous and led to the government being able to duck the pressure too easily. Most damagingly, it led to the government ramping up its rhetoric (the easiest policy response to pressure), rather than investing time, resources and political capital in finding a solution to the crisis. As the campaign pressure grew, so did the U.S. government's rhetoric. The Sudanese president was personally vilified, accused of genocide, and threatened with no-fly zones and even hints of air strikes. The lack of follow-up action and the growing gulf between rhetoric and action reduced the effectiveness of the United States and,

more broadly, the international community in dealing with the crisis. As the campaign became more sophisticated, having recruited a group of senior policy analysts, its impact increased significantly.

In the climate campaign, there was again a major policy split, less so within GCCA but more between GCCA and the Climate Justice Movement. Whereas GCCA focused on a broadly defined FAB deal (fair, ambitious and binding), the Climate Justice Movement emphasised climate reparations and a 1.5-degree target. In this case, there is little doubt that the more radical asks had impact. Several small states took on these asks as their own, and negotiations became increasingly polarised. Supporters of the Climate Justice Movement argue their position helped block a bad deal. Opponents argue that they set back the chances for progress in the forlorn hope of a perfect deal in the future.

Interestingly, decision-makers suggest that both camps were significantly out of kilter with their view of what was achievable at Copenhagen. They suggest that demands for a 2- or 1.5-degree position were simply unrealistic by the time of the summit and that getting a legally binding deal was also impossible at this stage. They argue that even the more moderate demands of GCCA were so removed from the political realities of the time that the pressure it was attempting to exert was too easily dismissed. In essence, decision-makers argue that by positioning itself so far outside of the political realities and so far ahead of the deal that was possible, GCCA became less relevant to the debate.

Those within the campaigns often accept that such asks were indeed significantly more ambitious than the politics of Copenhagen allowed. They justified their asks in two ways: First, on the basis of science—that their asks were dictated by the consensus of international climate scientists. Second, on the basis of tactics—that keeping the bar high would encourage governments to aim higher, even if it was not going to reach the ideal level. Those tactical considerations are not unique to climate campaigning. As seen above, more often than not campaigns have those who favour either insider or outsider approaches. However, the policy ask being dictated by climate science rather than political science is peculiar to climate campaigning. In the case of debt, landmines or conflict, the issues are moral questions, but the answers are subjective policies, so the asks that come from them can be fashioned by balancing the ultimate objective of the campaign with what is achievable and would have most political salience. In the case of climate change, most groups feel they do not have this flexibility because they see sticking to the science as critical to their credibility. As a result, the usually more moderate campaigners feel forced into more hardline positions. Campaigners feel that in many ways this is a strength; it gives their policy asks a basis in fact. However, several campaigners also accepted that it could also act as a constraint, making the movement unable to show flexibility or welcome incremental progress. Several of the decision-makers interviewed felt that the lack of a more pragmatic voice reduced pressure on decision-makers, and building pressure for an "all or nothing" deal made the nothing equation more likely. They point to the recent deal at Cancun, where the campaign's pressure had dissipated and more progress had been secured as evidence of this. Even some of those who accepted the urgency of a sub-two-degree deal felt that this could only be achieved by initial steps that built the momentum. They note that the campaigners got themselves into a position where they felt unable to welcome interim steps and were thus unable to build momentum. There is, of course, a more fundamental question here about the strength of the movement and whether it was ever even close to being powerful enough to effectively push for the seismic changes they were asking for.

In PWYP, there was a tension right from the start about the decision to embrace EITI and put so many of its collective energies into that rather than a regulatory approach. Groups in the United States were particularly critical and saw this as a diversion. The judgment was based on the nature of the campaign: that it was elite based and that the most powerful progressive government on this issue at the time—the United Kingdom—was not ready to endorse a stronger approach. To ignore the EITI would have been to risk condemning the campaign to obscurity. The campaign sensed it had to go with the momentum and in time use this platform to push for further progress. This stance was strengthened by the process of engaging in EITI, which strengthened the intellectual case for transparency; the practical case, as developing countries saw their borrowing rates drop when they signed up; the power base, as more NGOs sprung up and were able to engage with governments; and the governments' comfort with the concept. Engaging with EITI had left PWYP in a much stronger position to push for the next stage of regulatory reform, which it is now doing.

Even TAC, which was working on one of the most emotionally charged issues in which policy was directly leading to the deaths of individuals, was careful to think through its positioning to ensure it had the most impact. By starting with mother-to-child transmission, the campaign won more allies and supporters. Ultimately, though, Mbeki was so resolutely opposed to TAC's demands that a more basic oppositional strategy was the only option left. However, TAC's legal action, civil disobedience and mass marches were not rhetorical devices. The campaign had invested enough in its

grassroots and legal research to know it could have impact via this approach. That impact finally came when Zuma—worried by the threats of civil disobedience—helped push through a treatment program to placate TAC.

As the above examples show, good campaigns effectively judge their own abilities and shape their strategies and political asks accordingly. They are able to assess the power they have and the extent to which they can deliver on their promises or threats. Bad campaigns decide their ask irrespective of strategy or ability to motivate a constituency. There is nothing wrong with radical demands if the campaign has built—or has a credible strategy to build—a constituency that is powerful enough to give its targets enough cause for concern or is attractive enough to make the ask enticing. However, setting radical policy asks without the ability to mobilise supporters, pressure decision-makers or win media coverage (to name just a few options) makes little sense. Those campaigns that struggled most with impact did so, in many cases, because of a mismatch between the size of the ask and the scale of the campaign. In the case of climate change, for example, even the more moderate campaigners' asks were enormous (i.e., requiring a major global economic restructuring). But while the asks were seismic, the campaign started late, key groups engaged halfheartedly and little funding materialized to support it. Accusing governments of an inability to get their own act in gear at Copenhagen looks a little hypocritical in that light.

In Defence of Incrementalism

In a recent book on civil society, Kumi Naidoo, who has chaired many recent coalitions such as GCAP and GCCA, suggested that incrementalism is never an effective strategy in campaigns. However, if you look at the evidence—not only of recent campaigns, but of most great campaigns—incrementalism has been key. Take the campaign against the slave trade. As the name suggests, it started as a campaign against the slave trade, not slavery itself. The strategy of the campaign was to first outlaw the trade, as that is an easier target, and then move onto slavery itself. Similarly, Jubilee 2000 did not call for the abolition of all debt and reparations. Rather, it focused on debt cancellation for specific countries following an internationally agreed upon process. Even a more clear-cut campaign like ICBL decided to go for a more targeted definition of landmines, coming back to cluster munitions in a separately focused campaign. PYWP started with a voluntary process rather than a compulsory one. All of these campaigns were criticised at the time by those against an incremental approach and in favour of a more radical one. But all of them were vindicated by the impact they achieved. The evidence strongly suggests that campaigns willing to balance ideal policy objectives with political strategy are the most successful.

The Role of Radicals

The success of incremental or progressive positions does not mean radical groups do not have a role to play and do not have positive impact. There are three main arguments for the radical fringe.

The first is that radical positions, while not achieving the objectives they set for themselves, act as a useful way of shifting the centre of gravity within the political space and help make the demands of centrist groups sound more reasonable.

Some of those interviewed noted a sense of complementarity within the different wings of the trade movement. While Oxfam's MTF campaign played an insider strategy targeting northern subsidies and access to their markets, the OWINFS grouping pushed for developing countries' right to protect. Although the different groups could be highly antagonistic toward each other, some sensed that there was a different focus but the same objective. The public opposition of OWINFS to the WTO and the anger it helped ferment meant those involved in the trade process were keen to be seen to be engaging with the more moderate civil society groups, something that might not have happened otherwise. Others, especially those targeted by the campaign, are more critical and believe the lack of unity significantly undermined the potential impact of the campaign.

Another example is the different wings of the climate movement. Some of those in the Climate Justice Movement believe that, while accepting that the demands of the movement were unobtainable, they succeeded in getting developing countries to toughen their positions and demand a more balanced agreement. They further argue that by helping to stop a weak deal being done at Copenhagen, one that would have locked in a lowest-common-denominator approach, they enabled developing countries to secure more progress through the subsequent negotiations. The more prevalent view among decision-makers and targets of the campaign was that the extreme positions of the Climate Justice Movement and their adoption by elements of the G77 helped make a deal impossible and simply postponed the decisions to Cancun that should have been made in Copenhagen.

In these and other cases, there seems to be an in principle acceptance of the role a more radical movement can have in shifting the political space, but strong disagreements in individual cases about whether this has in fact happened or instead been counterproductive. Decision-makers in particular—perhaps as one would expect—are more skeptical about the added value of more radical movements.

The second argument for the radical fringe is that they are working with a different timeline. While incremental campaigns are focused on short- to medium-term policy change, the radical groups are pioneers working on more controversial areas where others fear to tread. By engaging in these areas and taking the risks associated with this early adoption, they make it easier for others to fill the policy space in a more moderate way later on. In this way, we can see radical movements as complementary to the incremental approach—groups with similar objectives but working on different timelines. The evidence of this is quite strong. For example, work on women’s rights, debt relief and trade justice all started with radical groups before being embraced by more mainstream campaigns. This suggests that we could make more of this complementarity if radical groups spent more of their time opening up more frontiers and making them safe for others rather than engaging in shorter-term processes where the incremental approach is more effective. Of course, it is rare that issues are divided so neatly between current and future in a way that would make this easy.

The third argument made by radical groups for the adoption of their positions is more simple: They are right and that is all that matters. This presents "rightness," or perhaps morality, as a unidimensional concept expressed exclusively through the policy positions a campaign takes. It suggests that adopting the “right” or moral position is the only thing on which a campaign should be judged. But while such positioning may give a strong sense of moral rectitude to those involved, it also relegates considerations of impact and influence to obscurity and is doubtful as a strategy for change.

There is one other justification for some groups of radicals. That is that the nominal campaign objectives are not in fact the real objective of the group. In extreme cases, these groups actively covet high-profile failure as a way of drawing attention to the inability of the current system to deliver and to build anger for a more revolutionary type of change in the future. A more nuanced example of this is that some of those involved in the climate negotiations believe that the positions adopted by the climate justice movement were less about securing a climate agreement (however ambitious) and more about challenging capitalism more broadly. Of course, this does not mean the approach is invalid, merely that it is less likely to have impact on the objective at hand.

As we have seen, by shifting the political centre of gravity and investing in controversial policy areas, radicalism can play a complementary role to incrementalism, and vice versa. However, it is equally clear that the split between radicals and incrementalists can be damaging and counterproductive by creating acrimonious and time-consuming splits within movements (e.g., the small radical fringe of Jubilee South), creating an irrelevant policy agenda, or subverting the campaign for other motivations.

The opportunity for complementarity could be increased by several things. Firstly, an acceptance by moderate and radical campaigners alike of their respective roles and strengths, rather than the mutual contempt that too often characterises the relationships between them. Secondly, on the basis of this acceptance, increasing dialogue between the different approaches would support mutually reinforcing strategies and avoid undermining each other’s work. Thirdly, where possible, more radical groups should focus on longer-term policy objectives that they want to bring into the mainstream, rather than short-term campaigns where their radicalism can be wasted.

While efforts to work together are important, there is no doubt that this will not be possible in some circumstances, especially when radical groups have other agendas or are unwilling to engage in conversations about strategy. In such cases, it is critical that those who favour a more incremental approach—where most of the campaign successes have been achieved—become more self-confident about the positions they adopt. There is strong evidence to suggest that in the cases of Jubilee 2000, Make Poverty History and ICBL, had a more radical agenda been adopted it would have resulted in significantly less impact both in the short term and the long term. Therefore, it is critical that the mainstream campaign avoids being captured by the radical fringe.

Focus vs. Inclusivity – The Importance of Systemic Policies

One of the recent trends in campaign coalitions, best exemplified by GCAP, is to focus on the interconnections between issues and build a holistic approach. There is a powerful logic to this. It recognises the interconnections between, for example, democratic rights and women’s rights, women’s rights and women’s health, women’s health and child health, child health and nutrition, nutrition and agriculture, agriculture and climate change. The interconnectedness of our planet and these issues is undeniable.

It is also true on a practical level that by working in silos, we risk an advance in one area at the expense of another. For example, a victory for malaria campaigners may come at the expense of those focusing on HIV. This zero-sum-game approach is particularly apparent in a financial crisis, when political attention and financial commitment are severely curtailed. However, while such interconnectedness makes for good policy and a logical analysis, it generally makes for bad campaigning.

Campaigning on everything at the same time is a poor change strategy. It enables governments to prioritise the least costly responses instead of the most important. More importantly, it stops campaigns from gaining momentum and having impact in the first place. Without a sharp focus, the effort is dissipated across a spectrum, messages become confused, targets become too numerous and opportunities are too general.

In the campaigns studied, most maintained a strong focus on a specific set of policies. Those that had a specific focus, such as ICBL, TAC, PWYP and Jubilee 2000, found it easier to maintain than groups like Make Poverty History and the trade justice campaign, which both found themselves very thinly spread. These campaigns maintained the broad umbrella of the issue but actually focused their campaigning on specific subsets of issues. In the case of MTF, this included a number of "wedges," such as coffee, sugar and labour.

This demonstrates that there is a viable middle ground between micro-focused campaigns and trying to do everything at once. The most obvious way to square this circle is to prioritise different issues at different times, for example, to target progress on aid one year, trade the next. This does not deny the importance of other issues—indeed it can be firmly rooted in a holistic analysis—but it does enable a focus to build and create an opportunity for impact.

The other way of balancing focus with coherence is to identify and target systemic policies. The truly great campaigns—and there are few of them—have managed this. They have built tightly targeted campaigns around policies that if they win progress on, can set off a chain reaction (or at least create a more favourable atmosphere) of future change. The campaign for women's right to vote is a prime example. It is rooted in a holistic analysis of women's rights, but focused on a specific policy that, when changed, forever tilted the playing field in the direction of the movement. Similarly, the campaign against the slave trade began with a focus on the trade and not slavery itself, ending up taking people on a journey, changing the dynamics and winning the much bigger policy goal.

BRANDING

Whether or not to brand a campaign is a question many coalition campaigns wrestle with. A campaign's brand includes a name and perhaps a visual identity that the campaign uses to communicate with its target audiences. It is distinct from the brands of the organisations supporting the campaign. Over time, this brand will often build up a set of other attributes beyond name and visual identity—everything from tone to political positioning.

The reason campaigns are interested in brands is their ability to communicate simply with the public. The advocates of joint branding argue:

- Creating a campaign brand enables campaigns to build a new relationship with targets and allies, without the baggage that may come with organisational brands.
- In coalition campaigns, there are often too many message carriers, leaving the public unclear about the message.
- A joint brand helps ensure disparate activities by diverse groups stack up to more than the sum of their parts.
- A new brand creates more interest and a sense of expectation than the use of existing brands.

Those less enamored with joint brands argue:

- Building collective brands detracts from individual organisations' brands and thus their future capacity to have impact individually.
- Building a brand takes resources and effort, which would be better spent on campaign activities.
- Coalition members often have well established and trusted brands; not to use them is a waste.
- It takes a long time to build a brand, too long for most focused campaigns to do so effectively within the time constraints of a campaign.

While these are all valid considerations, it is clear that in the case of mass mobilisation campaigns in particular, the creation of a unified campaign brand adds real value to the ability of the campaign to have impact. Make Poverty History, ICBL and Jubilee 2000 are all examples of a unifying brand working extremely effectively. Those involved in these campaigns feel that had they tried to communicate just as individual organisations, they would have struggled to cut through in the same way with the public.

GCCA was set up specifically not to have a brand, due to concerns over competition. The campaign later adopted TckTckTck, which was previously developed by Kofi Annan's humanitarian consortium, but little was invested in it so it tended to be a tag line adopted by organisations doing their own activities rather than a true campaign brand that led the communications with the public. Many of those involved in GCCA feel the lack of investment in a jointly branded campaign reduced the visibility of what could have been a much more powerful movement.

The overriding reason for deciding not to build a joint brand is competition between existing brands. This may be competition over funding, influence or visibility, but in all cases it leads to strong incentives to promote one's own organisational or campaign brand rather than an alternative collective one. This motivation is far from strategic, but it is one that cannot be ignored given the need for individual organisations to build themselves.

Among those interviewed for this report, the consensus was that the bigger, more established organisations tend to be the most "brand precious." Smaller groups are seen to be keener to associate themselves with bigger brands rather than vice versa. They also have a higher degree of flexibility in signing up to things than complex international NGOs. Those jointly branded campaigns that have been successful have relied on big brands being willing to take the lead and subsume their own brand for the sake of the issue. This takes commitment at the outset of the campaign, as well as ongoing investment in building the collective brand. Oxfam's decision to brand its event with Nelson Mandela in Trafalgar Square as MPH is one of the most cited examples.

It seems clear that it will take renewed leadership from the major players in the movement if joint campaign brands are to be built. In an era when those big organisations are facing budget pressures due to the financial crisis and campaigning competition from smaller, more agile Internet campaign groups that tend to be equally, if not more, brand precious, it seems less likely that this will be forthcoming without significant changes in the sector.

CELEBRITIES

Of all of the tactics used by campaigns, perhaps the most fraught with difficulty and controversy is working with celebrities. While no one doubts the benefits of research, advocacy, mobilisation and media work, there are a lot of NGO campaigners who remain very uneasy about working with celebrities.

Those concerned with the close relationship between campaigns and celebrities cite:

- Principled objections to supporting/promoting a celebrity-obsessed culture, where people are disproportionately rewarded for the way they look and sound, etc.
- Concerns over superficial engagement by people more interested in promoting their own careers than the issues
- Confused messages delivered by people with a limited understanding of the policies
- The danger of overshadowing the voices of poor people themselves
- Lack of control and the danger of being co-opted by celebrities with other agendas
- A risk that by working with celebrities, the public will view the issue through this "frame," i.e., they will engage via a consumerist viewpoint not an activist's one
- A perception that celebrities are generally unwilling to be controversial and take on political issues

Those in favour of celebrity engagement have a similarly broad range of arguments:

- Celebrity culture is a reality and tapping into it is an effective way of promoting your issue with the public, media and politicians
- Celebrities bring an outsider's perspective to the issues and, therefore, often communicate more effectively with the public than NGOs
- Celebrity engagement is a good proxy for public engagement
- The public often feels a connection between themselves and celebrities, so while they may be unable to relate to a poor person living in a hut in rural Africa who speaks a different language, they may find it easier to relate to the reaction of someone who they feel they know—empathy by proxy
- Celebrities reach a mainstream audience in a way that campaign groups often struggle to do

The arguments over the utility of working with celebrities tend to come down to individual celebrities and campaigns, rather than the generic arguments put above. Few campaigns would object to Nelson Mandela or Desmond Tutu being a campaign figurehead, whereas you might find less appetite for Mike Tyson.

Of course, not all campaigns have tried or succeeded in engaging celebrity supporters. More radical groups and campaigns, in particular, either do not want celebrity engagement in principle or, when they do, struggle to find celebrities willing to support their more controversial and political messaging. Thus, while Oxfam's MTF was heavily supported by Chris Martin and Coldplay, the OWINFS movement did not have any substantial celebrity support.

Some campaigns have struggled to engage high-profile celebrity supporters because of the nature of the issue. PWYP, for example, has worked closely with George Soros but feels that the set of issues is too complex and technical to engage mainstream celebrities. Given PWYP's elite-level strategy, this is probably not too much of a strategic dilemma for them, though it should be noted that Bono wrote an open letter to President Sarkozy on the issue recently.

Interestingly, climate change groups have also struggled to get celebrities engaged and not through want of trying. Various explanations for this have been put forward. One is that their personal behaviour makes them vulnerable to charges of hypocrisy (e.g., high-carbon life styles, film tours, fast cars, numerous houses, etc). A second is the perception that climate change is too complicated an issue, although, as the debt campaigners often say, that's what everyone said about debt. A third explanation is that, particularly in the United States, a key media market for many celebrities, climate change is a highly partisan issue, so celebrities are dissuaded from engaging. Whatever the reason, many campaigners involved feel this has been to the detriment of the campaign's ability to reach out to the public as effectively as they would have liked.

ICBL is perhaps the most well known of the campaigns for its relationship with celebrities, or more specifically, celebrity in the form of Princess Diana. However, this was more by luck than design and was not part of the campaign's planning

or strategy. Indeed, prior to her engagement, the view was that the issue was too controversial to attract big name celebrities. Princess Diana became involved via the British Red Cross. There is no doubt her two landmine-related trips and her subsequent death did a great deal to legitimise and popularise the issue, as well as put increased pressure on the U.K. government to move quickly. Following Princess Diana's involvement, Angelina Jolie and Paul and Heather McCartney became the highest-profile supporters. While Angelina Jolie was seen as an effective advocate willing to engage in the difficult U.S. politics around the issue, Heather McCartney's engagement highlighted a risk associated with celebrity engagement. While associating herself with the campaign, McCartney started adopting very different messages. For example, she backed the U.S. position on technological solutions rather than taking the campaign's position opposing this. This caused the campaign some difficulty.

In a similar way to ICBL, Jubilee 2000 and SDC worked with celebrities as envoys and as advocates. Jubilee 2000 worked closely with Bono, who helped raise the profile of the campaign but also had a major impact on the U.S. position. George Clooney approached the SDC campaign and spoke at its major Washington rally in 2006. He too advocated with the U.S. administration and even gave evidence to the U.N. Security Council.

In each of the above cases, the campaigns went beyond working with celebrities as tools for raising awareness and engaged them in the policy area so that they became credible spokespeople and advocates. In some cases, this was a conscious decision on behalf of the campaign, in others it was simply a well-informed celebrity. Going beyond a photo call and engaging the celebrity in policy advocacy brought a lot of strengths to the campaigns, but it also increased the risk of the message getting confused or the celebrity deciding to take their own route, not accepting the campaign's position at face value (à la Heather McCartney).

Among the campaigns studied, MPH had the most tumultuous relationship with celebrities. In particular, the scale of engagement of Bob Geldof and Bono took celebrity campaigning to new levels of both impact and controversy. Neither Geldof nor Bono were traditional celebrity campaigners. They were not engaged by NGOs and told what to say. They had become established as independent voices on the issues and their long track record and knowledge of the issues meant they could not be controlled by the campaign. They were independent actors who had their own views on policy and strategy.

This led to a more complicated relationship between Geldof, Bono and the campaigners than that found in other campaigns. In fact, the celebrities were never really part of the campaign, and Geldof was actually part of the U.K. government-convened Africa Commission. This meant agendas diverged and the levels of coordination were far from adequate to make up for it. Geldof, in particular, was more focused on Africa and the commission's recommendations than the campaigners who had broader asks. This came to a head most strongly at the time of the G8 summit in Gleneagles, when Geldof's 10 out of 10 (for the G8 decision on aid) contrasted strongly with the GCAP positions ("the G8 whispered"). In addition, the decision of Geldof and Bono to press ahead with the Live 8 concerts on the same day as the Edinburgh march dismayed many within the campaign who rightly felt that the march would be overshadowed.

However, the campaign's targets, including the public, media and governments, see Bono and Geldof as part of MPH and one of the most impactful elements to it. They also identify them as one of the most impactful elements to it. This is even more true outside the United Kingdom, where even non-Anglophone governments said they felt the most pressure from these celebrities. Live 8, in particular, is seen by most targets as MPH's high point, while many of those involved in the campaign see it as a separate initiative that distracted from the Edinburgh rally. It is hard to justify this latter position. Both the United Kingdom and other G8 governments felt Live 8 was the mass public engaging in the political process (however superficially) and providing their support to the campaign's objectives. The idea that a medium-sized rally in Edinburgh would have as much international profile and impact is a difficult one to take seriously.

What is clear from these campaigns is that celebrities can motivate the media, decisions-makers and the public in a way that civil society cannot always do as effectively. They provide reach, a brand and political influence that civil society groups might not have. They can also help broaden the coalition beyond the usual suspects and reach into younger demographics in particular. Engaging celebrities can be particularly valuable in short-term campaigns that want to simulate mass public support but do not have the time to build it in key countries.

Critical to moving from celebrity photo calls to real campaigning influence is engaging credible voices who the public, politicians and the media take seriously on the issue. This comes with risks. A credible individual will necessarily be thoughtful, independent minded and committed. All of these things will strengthen their ability to have impact, but also make them harder to control; they cannot simply be expected to parrot policy lines developed by others.

These risks need to be weighed before the campaign, and if celebrity engagement is still seen as offering potential benefits, a strategy to handle the risks should be developed. That means working with a celebrity with similar policy views and strategic thinking and thoroughly immersing them in the issue. No matter how distasteful campaigners may find it, these celebrities will then need to be taken seriously as members of the campaign. If campaigns feel that a celebrity has fundamentally different views from them or they cannot agree on policy, they should end that relationship rather than continue and risk those differences being exposed.

HOW GLOBAL IS GLOBAL?

We tend to talk about global campaigns rather glibly, but few if any campaigns have been truly global. While many campaigns, especially Internet-based ones, claim a presence in many if not all countries, few actually reach the bar of being a concerted campaign in more than a dozen countries. Of course, most campaigns do not need to be global in order to achieve their aims. Aside from the campaigns aimed at changing individual behavior on globally relevant issues (e.g., violence against women), few need reach in all countries in order to achieve their campaign's objectives. Even in these cases, it makes sense to prioritise and decide which countries offer the greatest potential impact.

For most campaigns, it is strategic to target a much smaller subset of countries. Not all countries are equal in the resources they have, the leadership they provide or the population they hold. Most campaigns studied did have a strategic approach to international targeting, though some tended towards the more the better.

Of those campaigns studied, all of them achieved some international reach but in very different ways.

Save Darfur was conceived of as a one-country campaign targeting the U.S. government. But it became apparent to SDC fairly quickly that a solely U.S.-based campaign would have little chance of sustained impact. In addition, it risked setting up an unhelpful dynamic of the United States against the Muslim world, which was particularly important given this was immediately after the Iraq war. For these reasons, in 2006 the campaign invested significantly in both staff resources and providing grants to other organisations to try and build an international movement.

This investment of time and resources helped lead to the Globe for Darfur network of organisations, which worked closely around key moments and helped mobilise action in more than 50 countries on “days for Darfur.” Many of the groups involved would have been working on Darfur regardless of SDC, but the support of SDC helped network these organisations (via Crisis Action and the Darfur Consortium), build their capacity and thus strengthen the movement. In addition, SDC invested in catalysing activity in key Arab and African countries seen as strategic by the campaign. While both strategies succeeded in reducing the extent to which the Darfur movement was seen as solely a U.S. campaign, the campaigns outside of the United States were nowhere near the scale of the U.S. movement. This was due to several reasons: SDC's international push came relatively late, at a time when the main violence in Darfur had already happened; there was suspicion among many in civil society about having such a powerful U.S.-based movement; and there were policy differences between groups in the United States, which called it a genocide, and those in most other countries, which tended to use more moderate language. Nevertheless, there were significant campaigns in countries such as the United Kingdom and France, all of which were strengthened by SDC's support. Where SDC had less impact was in catalysing campaigns from scratch. Particularly in African and Arab countries, the groups that agreed to work on the issues tended to have limited impact on their target governments.

In the case of the Darfur movement, there was international coordination via Crisis Action but no formal structures. Those involved saw themselves as part of a network, not one campaign. Policy lines were broadly agreed upon around key moments, but there was never a sense of one group leading internationally or a central decision-making function.

In a similar way to Save Darfur, the Treatment Action Campaign was also initiated to focus on one country, this time South Africa. TAC maintained this focus but worked closely with international partners to have impact on the South African government together with the drug companies that were also targets. In this case, the joint work was much more ad hoc. TAC engaged with groups like Oxfam and MSF, which were leading the global effort together with other parts of the AIDS movement. These external groups helped build international pressure and did so particularly effectively during the court cases the drug companies brought against Nelson Mandela's government (not the best public relations idea in retrospect). Drug companies whose brand identities were critical to their success were extremely sensitive to northern-based campaigning. While TAC and international groups worked well together, the relationship remained ad hoc.

On trade, the OWINFS grouping was more of a network than an organised global campaign. It succeeded in recruiting many groups that loosely signed up to its objectives, but it is hard to measure in exactly how many countries it achieved any sense of scale, let alone any impact.

Oxfam's MTF campaign operated in different countries depending on the campaign wedge, i.e., coffee focused on Latin America and sugar focused on West Africa. Only in a few of these countries did the campaign reach scale. While most campaigns rely on the successes of their national groups for their international profile, MTF Oxfam managed to create a strong international campaign almost independent of its national-level work thanks to its close engagement in the DDA

process, its elite media work, and its research and policy work. With the exception of ad hoc coordination with various campaign partners that Oxfam worked with during the different issue-specific wedges, the main coordination structures needed for this were within Oxfam itself.

Jubilee 2000 had a tighter network, but it was still just a network campaign. While many groups even shared the Jubilee name, they had very different approaches and emphases. There was also no global structure to hold the movement together and coordinate it centrally. This gap was partially filled by the U.K.-based campaign, which had initiated the new push on debt and was best resourced to play an informal international leadership role—sharing intelligence, resources and thinking with the broader movement. Jubilee 2000 did best in the United Kingdom and Germany. In addition to civil society capacity in both countries, the two other crucial factors were the large-scale engagement and mobilisation of the churches and the fact that both countries had major political moments in the shape of G8 summits in order to provide a focus.

ICBL and PWYP were perhaps the two best-structured global campaigns. Both had an international identity separate from the national groups and relatively strict rules (not always adhered to in practice) about when to use each brand. Thus PWYP and ICBL were international campaigns with national coalition members that called themselves various things. In both cases, there was a central coordination committee that provided the international leadership.

Within this structure there was a high degree of autonomy to use different tactics and approaches. The national coalitions signed up to the objective, but how they went about achieving those objectives was largely left to them. ICBL supplemented the international coordination committees with regular meetings of the national campaigns, where the strategic plan was outlined and groups were given an opportunity to challenge the direction of the campaign.

Make Poverty History tried a similar approach in creating an international structure. Those behind MPH in the United Kingdom wanted to support a broader campaign with as much of an international basis as possible. The major problem with this was that GCAP—the body set up to coordinate this international campaign—was not really the centre of the campaign. The resources and impetus for it came originally from the United Kingdom, and the campaign there proceeded with little regard to any global structure. As a result, the international network always struggled to be a focal point. Despite the ineffectiveness of the global structure, in countries such as Australia, Canada, Japan and the United States, the campaigns became the most significant anti-poverty movements in those countries' histories, though not on the scale of the U.K. campaign.

These successes came in part from the sense of opportunity that 2005 created and the resources the U.K. campaign provided (e.g., the white band, the celebrity engagement), but it also became a reinforcing movement. As GCAP/MPH coalitions picked up momentum in individual countries, this reinforced campaigns in other countries. This suggests that had it been possible to build a more integrated global campaign with an effective coordinating centre, the added value could have been significant. Instead, when the U.K. movement fell apart at the end of 2005, GCAP lost a lot of capacity that the INGOs had provided.

On one level, GCCA was the most successful campaign at getting widespread international engagement. The action days loosely coordinated under the GCCA banner mobilised people in most countries around the world. However, the lack of structure and the lack of a joint brand, as already discussed, meant that the ability for the centre to harness this network or to make it resonate was extremely limited.

It is clear from these examples that ICBL and PWYP established the most effective international structures. These structures were based on a clear delineation of responsibility, with national coalitions joining an overarching central campaign that was responsible for the overall direction, in consultation with member organisations, but devolving national implementation and strategy to national coalitions. This structure is predicated on a willingness to have a strong centre and to plan the international structure before rolling out national campaigns. The evidence suggests that campaigns that start national and try to go international struggle to achieve the sense of ownership and clarity of structure needed to make international work effective.

FUNDING AND THE ROLES OF FUNDERS

All campaigns require resources to succeed, and big campaigns need even more resources than small ones. In addition, certain types of campaign require larger sums of money than others. For example, a mass mobilisation campaign needs more money than an elite-level advocacy campaign.

The campaigns studied operated on vastly different budgets. At one extreme is Save Darfur, which started with almost no budget at all but ended up spending more than \$50 million in one year. At the other extreme is ICBL, which until the treaty was signed had no real central funds at all.

In addition to the amount spent, the way in which campaigns received and spent their funds also varied greatly. This is partly a result of structure; more centralised campaigns like SDC tended to have more centralised—and thus bigger—budgets. Those with collaborative structures tended to rely on their partner organisations for in-kind resources. Make Poverty History raised very little money centrally, with the exception of a grant from Scottish entrepreneur Tom Hunter. The vast majority of its resources came from coalition members and pro-bono assistance, such as advertising space donated to the campaign.

Those campaigns where external funders played the most strategic role were PWYP and SDC. The personal philanthropy of George Soros enabled PWYP to step up its work significantly, including the seeding of many national campaigns, especially in the developing world. Without this strategic partnership—which extended beyond funding advocacy—it is likely that the impact of the campaign would have been significantly less.

In the case of SDC, funders were quick to get behind the nascent organisation. At what turned out to be the founding meeting of SDC, a funder offered to cover the start-up costs. Later, some major U.S. foundations invested heavily in SDC, and an anonymous individual donor gave almost \$50 million for advertising. These funders were critical to SDC's ability to operate at scale and internationally. However, even in the cases of PWYP and SDC, the campaigns were initiated by campaigning groups not funding organisations.

In the other campaigns (Trade, MPH, Jubilee 2000, TAC and ICBL), the role of funders was less important. Trade, MPH and Jubilee 2000 primarily drew on the resources of the organisations involved, not external funders. In the case of ICBL, which had less backing from big organisations, ad hoc funding was found from supportive governments. George Soros again engaged in strategic funding, and a few key trusts and foundations contributed relatively small amounts. Following the Nobel Prize and the treaty, donors were much keener on the campaign. But donors mainly funded conferences and travel, not the core functions of the campaign, which tended to be within organisations' own capacities and resources.

None of the campaigns studied was initiated by an individual funder or group of funders. Many of those interviewed argue that this is critical to campaigns being seen as legitimate and ensuring there is a group of committed people at the core of the campaign, rather than groups primarily interested in funding opportunities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The main lessons of the campaigns studied have been identified in the relevant chapters and will not be repeated here. Below are five additional recommendations that offer opportunities, if addressed, to nurture future effective campaigns:

- **Renewed commitment:** Commitment to real collaborative working appears to be decreasing in the sector at present, partly because of the perceived (and often exaggerated) difficulties of previous joint working. There are fewer joint campaigns, and those that do exist tend to be extremely loose collaborations with limited added value as a result. This trend is coupled with and linked to the increasing internationalisation of individual NGOs, which are thus more inward looking, focusing on internal coalitions rather than external ones. Of course, over time it is hoped that these integrated INGOs will be better placed to lead global coalitions. However, basing coalitions around single organisations that tend to be very asymmetrical in their geographical strength is unlikely to prove as effective as striking up coalitions that bring together the existing powerful players in different contexts. NGOs and INGOs, in particular, should use the current opportunity to review their collaborations and the added value they provide. There should be a more explicit recognition of the importance of close partnerships, rather than arms length relationships. Organisations should be willing to withdraw from collaborations that are not creating any added value. But more importantly, they should focus on forming new coalitions that work. To do this effectively will require strong leadership from within the INGOs, in particular, which have the most resources and convening power and, crucially, a willingness to accept the trade-offs involved. Lowest-common-denominator coalition arrangements should be challenged and rejected.
- **Evaluations:** As noted in the introduction, the quality of current evaluations within the sector is extremely variable. The lack of a common standard or quality control means the evaluations are not comparable, and the insight they provide varies enormously. Even when the evaluator is high quality, the fact that the customer is the one being evaluated can lead to evaluators pulling their punches in order to keep their client (or to attract future ones). In coalition evaluations, there are also often restrictive parameters set by the coalition on which elements of the campaign are evaluated. There is a clear opportunity for funding bodies or NGOs themselves to set up a commonly recognised body responsible for high-quality evaluations—a model similar to the role that PWC or KPMG currently play on corporate accounting. These gold-standard evaluations would help improve future campaigns but would also give funders and supporters benchmarked evidence that an organisation's investment in a campaign was worth it—thus making future engagement more likely.
- **Incentive structure:** Beyond effective evaluations, the broader balance of incentives needs to change to encourage effective collaboration. Funders have a key role in this. Forcing organisations to work together can often be counterproductive, but changing funding guidelines so that applications based on effective multi-organisational collaborations are viewed more favourably would help significantly. Furthermore, funders could consider spending part of their money on an annual grant to organisations, not on the basis of a proposal for future work, but in recognition of their past work. This would incentivise high-impact work and a focus on results rather than process or simply responding to donor demands.
- **Strategic discussion:** One of the problems within the sector is that there are far too few opportunities for joint strategic conversations, at least at the international level. CEOs of the most effective and high-impact organisations rarely meet for collective conversations. The Berlin Civil Society Centre has done some effective work at bringing together chairs of boards, but this needs to be replicated at the CEO level with a small but international group of leaders from the sector—a G20 or Davos equivalent for civil society. This would need to be supported by a high-profile individual or organisation to ensure the right level of people attended, and it could become an annual event.
- **New types of collaboration:** The tension between an organisation's need for profile, supporters, brand recognition and funding on one hand, and the clear evidence that significant impact comes when organisations pool resources, strategy and brand through coalitions on the other, is one of the most fundamental tensions obstructing the creation of effective campaigns. These tensions have grown in recent years, particularly due to the financial crisis, which has reduced the opportunity for progress and increased emphasis on protecting one's own organisation. But they are not new tensions. While we may all wish to think that organisations in the sector are mission focused to the extent of prioritising impact above their own organisation, there are real reasons why this does not happen. Many of these have been touched on, such as funding, boards, budget maximisation, etc. Reducing these distorting incentives and creating other more impact-orientated ones is essential, but such tensions will never dissipate entirely. The sector has recently

tried to navigate these tensions by creating looser and looser structures, whereby individual organisations have to make fewer compromises about branding, profile, etc. While effective at protecting individual organisations' interests, these structures have failed to deliver the impact they aimed for. Another alternative that should be considered is whether organisations can agree to a standing structure that brings them together on a regular basis around key opportunities, in between which organisations would be free to do their own thing. Similar to the way that teams only come together in the Olympics or the World Cup every four years, civil society could try to agree to a structure and ways of working that enable it to collaborate effectively under a common brand and leadership at mutually agreed moments. The advantages of this are that it would provide a forum to discuss campaigning opportunities, and by having the structures in place, it would reduce the lag time and transaction costs involved. To work effectively, it would require a relatively coherent and strategically aligned coordination team at its centre—not a free-for-all assembly. Though far from straightforward, this approach could offer some real opportunities for the future.

Campaigning for International Justice

Part Two: Where Next? (2011-2015)

Introduction

The international development sector has a long track record of successful campaigns that have transformed the lives of millions of people.

However, in the past five years it has become harder to point to breakthrough campaigns at the international level. This is due to a variety of factors, including:

- The financial crisis reducing fiscal and political spaces
- A desire for southern leadership (both LIC and MIC) that has not yet materialised
- BRIC countries' rejection of traditional donor roles and policy initiatives
- Reduced leadership within the traditional NGO sector
- A failure to learn some of the basic lessons of previous campaign successes and failures
- A crisis of confidence in the face of an attack on aid
- Taking on bigger challenges (such as climate change) without building new capacity
- Global processes becoming less effective at delivering change (WTO, Copenhagen, G8)

This brief study aims to highlight opportunities for future campaigns in international development based on an analysis of the current context, future trends and lessons from recent campaigns.

Identifying campaign opportunities is far from a science. It is based on a mixture of reading the direction of public policy, identifying key external trends, hypothesising over the impact of those, spotting potential leaders, and identifying issues that make some policy areas more "campaignable" than others, for example:

- A clear and credible solution
- An identifiable villain
- Strong emotional content
- The potential for insider champions
- Key decision-making moments

In addition to all of these variables, and perhaps most importantly, great campaign opportunities are self-defined. When a critical mass of influential and credible individuals and organisations make a collective decision to work together and focus on an issue, opportunities can open up that were not previously predictable or identifiable. Indeed, they may only exist as a result of the decision to engage in an issue collectively. Equally, an opportunity for systemic change may be clearly apparent but squandered if groups decide not to take advantage of it.

In this context, the modest aim of this report is to identify a group of issues that fit some of the core criteria of viable potential campaigns. It does not seek to be prescriptive, rather it seeks to identify a range of options to provide a basis for structured conversations between key actors interested in global change.

Reports like this cannot create effective international campaigns. Only a process of dialogue among competent and committed organisations and individuals can do that. This report is, therefore, designed to be a building block in that process and a catalyst to help make it happen.

This report is split into three sections: an analysis of what has changed for campaigns in the last five years, a chapter setting out six themes with significant campaigning potential and a brief set of conclusions.

Methodology

This brief report is based on more than 300 interviews with politicians, civil society campaigners, civil servants, academics, celebrities, trade unionists and private sector leaders from around the world. Most of those interviewed are listed in an appendix, although some asked to remain anonymous. Interviews took place in person or by telephone between October 2010 and April 2011. The author spent time in China, the United States, Brazil, South Africa, Kenya, Brussels, Germany, the United Kingdom and France in researching this paper.

This report is designed to be read in conjunction with *Learning Lessons: Campaigning for International Justice 1991-2011*.

Definition

This study uses the word “campaign” to describe a planned and concerted attempt to achieve a set objective by mobilising a variety of tactics.

The emphasis on a variety of tactics distinguishes a campaign from a unidimensional lobbying, programming or PR activity.

The emphasis on planned and concerted campaigns suggests a stronger strategic objective than a simple reaction to events or one-off engagement in an issue.

Nevertheless, this definition still encompasses a wide variety of potential campaigns ranging from long to short term, policy orientated to hearts and minds, radical to incremental, elite level to mass mobilisation.

Acknowledgements

This work has benefitted hugely from the access provided by people at the highest political levels, leaders of civil society, and those involved in the day-to-day running of the campaigns. Thank you to everyone who took the time, especially those who may disagree with the conclusions.

Thanks to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for supporting this work, to Save the Children UK for providing hosting services, and for those who reviewed the first draft.

About the Author

Brendan Cox has worked in international development for the last 10 years, including periods working for Oxfam, as executive director of Crisis Action, and, most recently, as special advisor for international development to the British Prime Minister Gordon Brown.

What's New?

In looking for opportunities to make further progress on international development, it is critical to understand the context. Outlined below are the most significant changes to political and cultural contexts that have occurred in the last five to 10 years (insofar as they impact on campaigns), many of which are continuing to evolve. In each area, the main implications for campaigns are highlighted, together with suggested responses.

Before that, a note of caution. Change is often overemphasised relative to continuity. It is more interesting, more contemporary and more controversial. Put simply, the new tends to overshadow the old. We should, therefore, be wary about fixating overly on change and remember that many of the institutions, systems and strategies are best characterised by continuity.

THE FISCAL CLIMATE

Even the most introspective NGO has probably realised there is a financial crisis underway. In addition to the most obvious effects of the crisis—decreased growth, higher unemployment, the dramatic reduction in fiscal space in those countries affected—it has also led to a change in domestic politics in many northern countries. The nature of the effect differs by location, but it seems apparent that the political right has been strengthened by events, with increased support for parties advocating anti-immigrant sentiment, fiscal conservatism and national isolation. More parochially, the support base for aid has been eroded as members of the public are asked to identify where they would cut spending.

Perhaps most fundamentally, the crisis has also undermined elite confidence in globalisation, without which the most ambitious objectives of the sector feel much less achievable. As one top political advisor put it, “We are not just seeing a shrinking of budgets, we are seeing a shrinking of imagination.”

Nor should we ignore the direct impact of the crisis on civil society. While private giving has stood up remarkably well in most cases, those dependent on government funding have tended to see budgets frozen or cut. Although no figures are available across the sector, anecdotal evidence suggests campaigning capacity has been hit particularly strongly by this. The second, less direct impact is that civil society has, according to many of those interviewed, become more competitive over the small pool of resources, keener to show its individual contribution and thus less willing to work in effective alliances. Thirdly, the financial stress means organisations are less willing to take risks, in particular by upsetting the governments or corporate donors that still fund their work. Fourthly, the financial crisis and the climate change debate have emboldened the anti-growth advocates within civil society, who risk pushing the sector down a cul-de-sac of political obscurity.

However, there are also opportunities in the wake of the crisis. The “Washington consensus,” as commonly understood, has been replaced by a broader acceptance of the need for an active regulatory state, though the coming to power of the right in many countries is reducing the extent to which this is capitalised upon. The financial sector is under more scrutiny and pressure than previously. The need for counter cyclical spending—even in poor countries—is now widely accepted, and those states with strong social protection mechanisms are seen to have weathered the crisis more effectively than those without. The response of the international community, the coordinated measures via the G20 and the trillions mobilised, have also provided an example of what is possible when there is political will to act.

This impact of the crisis is thus a mixed one for civil society. Opportunities to make progress on total levels of official development assistance (ODA) look severely limited, but opportunities for progress on issues such as regulation, social protection and broad economic models have opened up. Parts of civil society have been quick to respond to this; they have moved to a defensive position on ODA and focused instead on issues such as the Robin Hood Tax/Financial Transaction Tax and a renewed push by the Publish What You Pay Coalition on transparency. These issues have received

a more receptive response partly because of the financial crisis. Debates about social protection and the types of market intervention required have also opened up, but so far with less input from the sector.

The fall-out from the financial crisis is probably the most important factor shaping the 2011-2015 period, but even this should not be overstated. While the crisis was certainly international, it was not truly global. Low-income countries may be hit by falling aid levels and reduced FDI but, overall, their economies weathered the crisis much more effectively than expected. Emerging economies were also much less seriously affected. This means that the openings and closings forced by the crisis are not necessarily the same in all countries.

This asymmetrical effect has also built the confidence of developing countries, and weakened it in the developed world, a theme explored below.

Implications and Responses

The impact of the financial crisis in the north, especially in those countries worst hit, will last throughout the period examined. Therefore, in the next five years making the case for increased aid spending and especially advocating for new targets will be relatively unproductive. There are, however, two qualifications to that.

The first is that as growth returns to economies—as it is already doing in many—the feeling of economic malaise will at least partially lift—depending on the rate of growth—reducing tensions over aid spending and reopening limited opportunities.

The second caveat is that attack is often the best form of defence and, similarly, that stopping a billion-dollar cut is as important as securing a billion-dollar increase—though admittedly less satisfying. Senior officials from the biggest donors were clear in interviews that they felt parts of the development sector had accepted cuts in the aid budget as inevitable and, therefore, were vacating the field, granting those advocating making disproportionate savings in the aid budget an open door. Sitting back and hoping for a low profile will not be a productive strategy. Groups should maintain campaigns focusing on countries increasing their aid levels, routed in previous commitments, while accepting that in the near term success may look like stopping aid budgets from decreasing rather than securing real increases.

Of course, aid is only a small part of the development policy prism. Perhaps more important are the other opportunities opened up by the crisis. The biggest moment of opportunity—the moment of flux when states and publics were still reeling from the crisis—has passed. Nevertheless, there remain significant openings. The Robin Hood Tax/Financial Transaction Tax and the Publish What You Pay coalitions, as mentioned above, are the best examples of civil society campaigns that have seized the opportunity of increasing space, and they have had 10 years of impact in one year as a result. These coalitions deserve to be more broadly and actively supported. Beyond these two specific opportunities, the aftermath of the financial crisis opens up at least two further opportunities that should be exploited. The first is to mainstream the debate about inequality—an issue raised into stark relief by the crisis, universally felt and badly articulated at present. The second is the debate around social protection. Here there is some interest from the French and a commission led by Michelle Bachelet, but there is limited civil society engagement and little popular awareness. (Both of these are discussed later.)

SHIFTING POWER DYNAMICS

With the exception of the financial crisis, shifting power dynamics is perhaps the most obvious and most examined trend of recent years. This is not the place to examine it in depth. Suffice to note a near unanimous view that the days of the United States being the only superpower are numbered (if not already over), and American (and probably European) relative decline is already well in progress.

What will replace U.S. hegemony is much less clear. Views range from a bipolar world—a new G2 with China and the United States dominating—to a multi-polar world—with growing roles played by various combinations of Russia, Brazil, China, South Africa and India. A new group of secondary powers is also growing, including Poland, Turkey, Nigeria, Indonesia and others—depending on which foreign policy think tank you think has the best guess.

Once again, this trend should not be overemphasised. Certainly in the period 2011-2015, the United States will remain the world's dominant power. The speculation of which other countries will emerge as competitors is far from a science. The assumption of Chinese ascendancy contains significant unknowns of how inequality, human rights and inflation

will play out. Even where countries do challenge U.S. economic dominance, experience has shown us that they will not necessarily become global policy leaders. For example, Japan—until recently the second biggest economy in the world—had limited global ambitions and a cautious approach to policy leadership. China too currently has limited international leadership aspirations beyond securing its own core economic and territorial interests. Nevertheless, the fact of a shift is unmistakable.

Implications and Responses

There are two presumed impacts of this shift in power dynamics. The first is a reduced willingness and capacity (politically and fiscally) among traditional G8 powers to lead on development issues, certainly in the way that they used to. The second is the opportunity of new leadership from emerging economies. This opportunity has excited many within civil society, who welcome a "southern" leadership that they see as more legitimate and more able to provide effective leadership on a pro-poor agenda.

However, the reality is that for both generic and specific reasons, none of those emerging economies (e.g., India, Brazil, China and South Africa) are well placed to lead on securing policy space at the international level for development. The three reasons that cut across all of them are:

1. They are emerging, not emerged. Therefore, they are all focused primarily on their continued development and the obstacles and difficulties with this. All of them face significant internal difficulties that will keep their governments nationally focused for some time to come, chiefly, unequal development and resultant inequality, coupled with concerns over its impact, insecurity, protests, threats to social stability, etc.
2. Each of them to different degrees is still some way short of having the confidence—and in some cases the civil service capacity—to take on leadership roles via traditional diplomatic routes.
3. All of them are stuck between wanting the good bits of being a developed country, such as a seat at the top table, the recognition and the wealth, and not wanting to lose the perks—if you can call them that—of being a developing country, including lower expectations for political leadership, lower contributions to institutions, continued development assistance and opt outs.

Some reasons for the lack of new sources of development leadership are more specific. Brazil, for example, is very focused on securing a seat on the UNSC. In addition, some countries fear that any leadership mantle will risk making enemies in the region and beyond. China's political system means an official would have to be very brave to be willing to risk advocating taking a leadership role on anything without a guarantee of success. India's shocking infant death toll, rocketing inequality and Naxalite rebellion call into question its credibility as a leader on development. South Africa's governmental capacity is perhaps the least of the four. Its recent attempt to lead an education push as part of its World Cup hosting combined incompetence with insufficient interest.

With the introspection of emerging economies and the paralysis of G7 countries, there is a danger of drift at the multilateral level. As a partial antidote, the following is recommended:

1. Build on what we can with emerging economies. Specifically, South-South cooperation is increasingly important for all of them and will become more so. This will be different than traditional development assistance, and often—even more self interested—cue a return to tied aid, bad loans, etc. Donors are already working on trilateral cooperation; civil society should look at ways to do so as well. Expectations of impact should be low, but the aim should be to influence (and make more developmental) their practices, increase confidence within the ministries responsible and raise ambition so they are willing to take on bigger challenges moving forward. Lifting expectations of recipient governments and civil society should be a core part of this.
2. Target the best bet. The best chance of nontraditional leadership in development is Brazil. The new leadership with Patriotta and Dilma are less ideologically opposed to leadership than some within their system. While capacity within the civil service is limited, the foreign ministry is relatively well resourced and effective. The Brazilian government has a stellar record on both reducing poverty and, to an extent, inequality. Civil society should be increasing advocacy resources in Brazil rather than withdrawing them, as many are doing. This should be coupled with high-level courting by traditional development leaders and southern voices in particular, creating a sense of expectation and a supportive environment.

3. Look for convergent self interest. The exception to emerging economies' relative shyness on the global stage is where their interests are affected. As seen in the collapse of the Doha Round or the Copenhagen Summit, while emerging economies may not be ready to lead, they are very willing to block agreements and protect their interests robustly. The difficulty is that their interests are not at all analogous with those of low-income countries. Some sectors of civil society have been slow to recognize this, but differentiating between them is critical to understanding how and whether it is possible to use convergent interests to leverage change. Civil society should actively identify opportunities and issues that bring together emerging and LIC interests and then work with emerging economies to further their agenda and in doing so create political capital for LIC's priorities.
4. Don't give up on the old guys. While the G7 is unfashionable, in the near term they (or more specifically Germany, the United States, France and the United Kingdom) remain the best bets for opening up international policy space on development.

CHANGED GLOBAL INFRASTRUCTURE

The change in the balance of global power has also necessitated a change in the institutional arrangements through which these powers collaborate and compete. The G8, which until 2008 was still the forum in which key powers met, was clearly not fit for purpose when the financial crisis hit and sped up reforms that otherwise would have been much more incremental.

The G20 was welcomed, not only by the countries newly admitted into the exclusive club, but also by those who felt its coverage of a significant majority of people and global GDP gave it increased relevance, reach and potential impact. The first two G20 Heads of State summits in 2008 and 2009 (Washington and London, respectively) were seen as significant successes in creating a common response to the crisis. Although some of the achievements were overstated at the time, the appearance of G20 action and efficiency helped stabilise both the markets and the institution itself. As a result, the G20 has replaced the G8 as the premier forum for international economic decision-making.

While not yet the death knell for the G8, it may ultimately prove to be so. The future of the G8 beyond 2011 is very unclear. While some countries within it are strongly supportive, the U.S. administration is reluctant to commit to the president attending more than one such G-summit a year. Also, the added value of the grouping, at least on economic affairs, seems limited. The G8 or G7 may have more utility as a forum for discussing foreign policy, an area where it has a more like-minded grouping.

So it seems clear that the G8 is dying and the G20 is replacing it, but what is the future of the G20? Certainly for 2011, there are high expectations through the ambitious French presidency. Driven by French elections, President Nicolas Sarkozy is looking for high-profile wins, or failing that, at least high-profile fights. But beyond that, the future is much less clear. Those most involved in the G20 feel that since 2009, the agenda has become more diffuse and the willingness to compromise or force progress has reduced. Following the French, we are likely to have weaker presidencies from Mexico (with a lame duck president), Russia and probably Turkey.

Meanwhile, most of the other global governance institutions have remained unchanged or on similar change trajectories to those in place before the crisis. Thus Bretton Woods institutions are reforming, but far from quickly. The U.N. Security Council remains entirely unchanged.

Implications and Responses

While squeezing the last vestige of political capital out of the G8, development advocates are right to shift focus and resources onto G20 influencing, bearing in mind that most of the most proactive states in the G20 will be the same as the G8, so the amount of shifting might not need to be that great. Development advocates should nevertheless strongly critique the G20—not for its make-up but for its failure to address poverty and the fate of the lowest-income states. Civil Society should seek to establish a narrative where how the G20 delivers on development (for poor people and poor countries) is a key measure of its legitimacy and efficacy. Several of the emerging economies in the G20 are eager to portray themselves as advocates for poor countries at the G20, which gives significant leverage to the sector.

Analyses looking at the impact of G20 initiatives and comparing them with G8 initiatives could be effective at increasing that leverage. As could national-level media and advocacy in those countries most susceptible to the argument.

WHERE POOR PEOPLE LIVE

It seems odd, but until a paper was published last year by Andrew Sumner from IDS, we had been—at least partly—barking up the wrong tree in our attempts to address poverty. The generally unchallenged assumption until then was that poor people still lived in poor countries, often conflict-affected poor countries, as per Collier's bottom billion. Twenty years ago, 93 percent of poor people lived in poor countries. However, Sumner's paper, based on existing data, made it clear that this changed quite a while ago, and, in fact, the vast majority of poor people (those living below the \$1.25 poverty line) live in middle-income states—and stable ones at that. The news hit the sector like a wave and has prompted much rethinking of strategies, or at least the scrambling for new justifications of old ones.

Implications and Responses

There are three main possible responses to this shift in understanding. The first is—on the basis of the numbers—to prioritise middle-income states more. The second is to decide to keep a focus on low-income countries on the basis that middle-income countries may contain more poor people now, but their trajectory means this will change and their national governments are capable enough to fight their own corner. The third is to stay spread across both.

The second option appears the least advisable for several reasons. Firstly, it assumes automatic economic trickle-down from elites to poor people. Secondly—and closely linked—it assumes homogenous poverty, ignoring the nature of poverty in middle-income countries, the inequality underpinning it and the type of people who remain poor. Thirdly, it assumes benevolent developmental governments. None of these are safe assumptions.

So whether groups choose to focus specifically on middle-income states or just to include them in their analysis and work, middle-income countries become relatively more important, which has a number of important implications. Most fundamentally, this change in understanding means that internal politics are far more important than previously acknowledged. The relatively capable, effective and competent middle-income governments need a different approach to low-income, aid-dependent ones. Traditional project-based ODA becomes less important, political change and strengthening entitlements at a national level become much more so. International campaigns—though far from unimportant as will be explained—become relatively less so.

Of course, this is not as clear cut as we might like. While poor people may live in either middle-income or low-income states, that does not mean their interests are the same. In addition, we cannot always assume that the interests of poor people are the same as the interests of their governments, whether middle or low income. Though this complexity is nothing new, it has been heightened by the growing group of middle-income countries and the size of their populations. These tensions materialised to an extent during the Doha Round but perhaps crystallised most clearly at Copenhagen. Civil society found itself conflicted. There is no easy answer to balancing one group of poor people's interests with another (mediated inefficiently or malevolently by their governments), but investment is needed in taking these judgments matched with a willingness to follow through on it with hard hitting advocacy.

DIGITAL WORLD

Another much (perhaps over) commented upon shift has been towards the increasing digitalisation of society, and within that, our campaigns and advocacy. Commentators have been falling over themselves to describe how revolutionary the latest app will be. There is barely a revolution that goes by that is not attributed solely to Twitter. In all this hyperbole, it is sometimes difficult to spot what has fundamentally changed and the impact of this.

Firstly—and most obviously—access to information has exploded. People in the most remote places are able to access information that was previously unobtainable to them. Where information is power—and it often is—this can be revolutionary. Local governments' budgets that used to be read by a handful of people can now become public documents, and inconvenient information can generally escape the censors.

Secondly, the Internet provides the ability for ordinary people to communicate almost instantly with millions of others, perhaps hundreds of millions, at a negligible cost, making the creation of movements much easier and more dynamic.

Thirdly, the Internet makes it easier for individuals to give their input into decision-making and strategy formation.

Implications and Responses

These changes, which are far from the totality of the changes heralded, are as revolutionary as the creation of the printing press. As more and more people get online, online tools become more sophisticated and platforms enabling access become more diverse, these impacts will continue to grow.

But there are also caveats. Yes, more information is available, but in the tsunami of available information it becomes more and more difficult to filter and evaluate. It is certainly easier to engage in movements via the Internet, but there are strong questions about whether the lower barriers to access make that engagement as significant as the face-to-face interactions that they have in some cases replaced. (See Malcolm Gladwell.) And while the Internet makes engagement easier, it may correspondingly raise the bar for impact. According to many of those interviewed, the preponderance of web-based petitions has decreased the impact of petitions as a whole. It could also lead to a cynicism among activists engaged in campaigns whose connection between ask and impact is increasingly tenuous.

The Internet is an incredibly efficient and increasingly ubiquitous tool, but like any tool, it can be used effectively or ineffectively. What the savvy organisations and individuals focused on Internet campaigns realise is that using the Internet is a tactic rather than a strategy. Indeed, many groups are focused on transitioning their supporters back from online to offline actions as a result of the decreasing returns of “clicktivism.”

The one main area where there is a strategic rather than a tactical consideration is in the ability and desire of activists to get more involved in decision-making and shaping strategy, rather than simply being campaigning pawns on behalf of organisations. The response to this trend has varied, with some organisations devolving decision-making to online forums made up of self-selecting activists, and others carrying on as before while providing activists with better opportunities for feedback. The response chosen obviously rests on the type of organisation, but the growing voices advocating citizen takeovers should be balanced with the corresponding desire for authoritative voices and organisations able to separate the wheat from the chaff.

CHANGES IN CIVIL SOCIETY

As mentioned above, civil society within the development sector is also changing. Some of the most important shifts include:

- The financial crisis has reduced available resources (especially for campaigning) and increased competition for those resources.
- The war on terror has been used to reduce space for civil society activity in many contexts and taken up significant political space.
- Internet-based campaigns are the new kids on the block, with more development-focused versions currently being incubated.
- Many of the big INGOs are going through difficult and lengthy change processes within their organisations aimed at reducing northern bias and creating more functional structures.
- There has been a growing desire to promote “holistic” analyses and campaigns that draw together as many of the key issues as possible.
- The types of funding received by NGOs for campaigning is increasingly instrumental and requiring of clear attribution.
- NGOs are seen by many of those interviewed as less innovative and less able to capture the public’s imagination than they used to be. As such, they risk having their traditional role usurped by others.

Implications and Responses

While some of these trends, such as INGO restructuring and the evolution of new players, offer medium-term increases in impact, their short-term impact is often to make organisations more internally focused and, in some cases, more brand than impact focused.

Other trends, such as changes in funding levels and types, have reduced leadership within the sector and reduced incentives for effective collaboration.

As a result, while civil society is, in some cases, becoming more ambitious—taking on a holistic analysis of interlinked problems—it is becoming less capable of delivering strategies to secure these objectives. This is also leading to a counter trend of organisations focusing on smaller objectives in order to demonstrate their unique contribution and impact.

Being clearer about the added value of the sector and, on this basis, rebuilding effective coalitions, is the best way of addressing these difficulties. But to be effective, these need to be real coalitions necessitating trade-offs and compromises rather than simply agreeing to work loosely together, as recent examples demonstrate.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The cataclysmic potential of climate change and the risk of development gains being undermined has been a game changer for much of the movement's thinking. Resources have been reallocated and agendas changed—in some cases beyond recognition. While awareness of climate change is not a new phenomenon, the focus on its developmental impact and the adoption of this agenda by the development sector has taken place largely in the last five years. Although it should be noted that following Copenhagen, many of the groups most engaged are already reducing their involvement in the issue.

Implications and Responses

At a time when the sector's capacity for impact is probably reducing, it has taken on an issue that requires seismic global economic realignment. This issue cannot be wished away or ignored, but neither can the development sector take on the issue alone. In fact, in many ways the sector is badly placed to be at the forefront of the movement, especially in the north. By focusing on poverty in developing countries, the movement has helped cast climate change as an issue about poor people far away. While this is certainly an improvement on being seen simply as an environmental/conservation issue, it appeals significantly to only a very small sector of the public. For such a big change objective, the campaign needs to be rooted in a mainstream constituency that speaks to national and personal interest rather than hinting at altruism.

However, while development groups should avoid being at the head of the climate change movement, they should continue to contribute to it. (The next chapter looks at some options.)

WHY GLOBAL STILL MATTERS

Having identified some of the key things that have changed in recent years—together with likely future trends—one of the clearest conclusions is that national campaigning, relative to global campaigning, has become more important. This is for a variety of reasons:

- The number of poor people living in middle-income states, which often have large financial reserves, established systems for redistribution and competent administrations, means that the decisions of these national targets have much more impact on poverty than global processes.
- Low-income country governments have also become increasingly competent, therefore, influencing them is increasingly important.
- Increasing and deepening democratisation means national citizens are more able to hold their governments to account and national campaigns have more traction.
- Multilateral processes have been seen to fail (e.g., Copenhagen/UNFCCC; failure to stick to G8 commitments, especially from Gleneagles; and the WTO Doha Round collapse).
- Middle-income countries, in particular, are less susceptible to influence from northern pressure or pressure from multilateral bodies, especially after the financial crisis.

All of this points strongly to the importance of national campaigns. However, it does not mean that international campaigns have become or should be made redundant.

Firstly, international campaigns are not the antithesis of national campaigns. Indeed, they can facilitate and reinforce them. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines was a good example of how an international campaign can give birth to national campaigns, reinforce their messaging, and help to resource and sustain them. In this example, the international work provided a framework, but the international agreement was based on national-level strategies and successes.

Secondly, multilateral institutions are important. The fact that they have failed to deliver in some high-profile instances does not mean we should disregard their importance or their potential. The G20's response to the financial crisis provides a glimmer of hope for future progress via intergovernmental processes.

Thirdly, international trends matter in influencing. South Africa is worried that Brazil is becoming more equal while they are not. China wanted to be part of the A.U./Arab League consensus on Libya. The United Kingdom would only sign up to a financial transaction tax if competitor economies did the same. Whether because of national competition or simply the visibility of issues, an international focus can significantly increase the resonance of national campaigning.

In recent years, many campaigns recognise that they overemphasised the “global” at the expense of the national. Climate campaigners, for example, put many of their hopes in the Copenhagen summit providing a breakthrough moment and a forcing mechanism, rather than simply reflecting national positions where inadequate progress had been made. But this overemphasis on the global must not now be replaced by an atomised national-level response to focus solely on national issues and work on those in a vacuum.

The synthesis of these two extremes is the importance of building campaigns that are rooted firmly in national change strategies, constituencies and mobilisation, but wherever possible to link this national work to international progress as part of an international campaign. International campaigns need to plan their strategies to identify both international and national objectives and international and national targets. They must also be willing to provide significant degrees of autonomy to national-level campaigners within the core objective of the strategy.

Opportunities

This chapter seeks to identify key opportunities for international campaigns on development, focusing on the 2011—2015 time frame. It does not aim to spell out exactly what a campaign would look like, but tries to identify areas of potential and indicate core elements and possible structures as a starting point for further conversations. It identifies some of the obstacles, difficulties and opportunities in each of the potential campaign areas.

INEQUALITY

Throughout the interviews for this study, inequality has been the most referenced policy priority for civil society groups.

This is especially the case in emerging economies, where it is defining not only the debate among civil society but also within government. For example, India is increasingly worried that the Naxalite rebellion is a symptom of inequality, and the governing Congress party is feeling significant pressure to spread the economic gains the country has experienced in recent years to more marginalised groups. China's 12th five-year plan contains a strong focus on inequality driven by its desire for social stability. Brazil has been focused on inequality for much of President Lula's term in office.

There are a variety of reasons why inequality is a stronger focus than poverty in many of these conversations:

- The shifting analysis of where poor people live, i.e., that the vast majority live in middle-income countries, means reducing inequality is as important in reducing poverty as continued growth is, and in some cases more.
- Inequality has stronger associations with civil disturbances, violence and voter discontent, thereby activating government concern more effectively than a simple poverty focus would enable.
- More generally, poverty is often less of a politically salient issue for governments than inequality. In a country where most people are living in poverty, there may be a sense of common struggle. In a society split into the haves and have-nots, common struggle is replaced by feelings of resentment and anger.
- Inequality is also a better way into debates about why people are poor. Poverty can risk treating things such as the lack of resources and lack of access to services as simply a technical distributional problem rather than a political one. In that way, it can obfuscate the real issues. Poor people are not generic citizens. Those left behind, especially in emerging economies, tend to be discriminated against groups such as women, children, ethnic and religious minorities, people from low castes, and other marginalised groups.
- Poverty reduction is much faster and more efficient if inequality is reduced at the same time as an economy grows.
- Addressing inequality also suggests a more active role for the state. While many forces can contribute to growth and poverty reduction, addressing inequality connotes a set of state specific activities.
- There is a growing and vibrant body of thought around the impacts of inequality and related concepts of promoting happiness rather than simply economic growth. These have become increasingly mainstream even in northern politics. (See Sarkozy and Cameron's recent forays into the area.)
- Inequality also presents an opportunity for a common conversation between states. Both rich and poor countries face the problem of inequality, making it much more suited to a G20 conversation.

There are also major problems with focusing on inequality in campaigning terms. The utmost of these is that while the focus provides increased political salience in emerging economies in particular, it is much more overtly political language than a focus on poverty. Discussions about inequality are traditionally seen as part of a leftist agenda and, therefore, difficult to mobilise a broad coalition around. In addition, while inequality enables a common global conversation, this could also be seen as a threat for northern countries that would rather focus international attention

on external issues rather than internal ones. The other major difficulty with taking on inequality as an issue is its sheer breadth. Inequality could encompass everything from promoting the rights of different groups to changing economic models to redistributing resources.

What a Campaign Could Look Like

Inequality is one of the most pressing issues in development today. However, at present, it is more helpful as an analytical framework for campaigns than a campaign in itself, for the reasons set out above. This leaves two main routes to explore. The first is to draw out specific elements of inequality—for example, women's rights—and focus on this as an illustration of inequality. The second is to focus on crosscutting policies that would reduce inequality while not using the mantle of inequality per se, for example, social protection systems. These two options are explored below.

WOMEN'S RIGHTS

The development sector has talked about women's rights for decades. In theory, every major development-focused NGO has mainstreamed women's rights into its analysis, programming and campaigning. However, in reality women's rights are too often relegated to the formulaic addition of phrases like “especially women” to otherwise gender-blind policy reports and strategies. Within NGOs, gender is often ghettoised among gender advisors, who tend to be marginal to decision-making.

The global women's movement is also surprisingly badly organised and led. While there is exceptional work done at national levels in some contexts, the movement overall is weak and disjointed. The international networks that do exist tend to have low levels of capacity and often focus on intellectual debates around feminist themes rather than a focus on campaigning for policy change.

Despite this, or perhaps because of it, the opportunity to make progress is extremely significant.

- Women's rights are an issue that developed and developing countries both struggle to advance. Whether we are talking about women's representation in parliaments, the gender pay gap or violence against women, they are issues no state has effectively and sustainably dealt with. This enables a level playing field for discussion and avoids developing countries feeling patronised or developed countries superior. Rather, it enables a common conversation about shared problems, well suited to G20 dynamics.
- Perhaps most obviously, women represent half of the global population. While we cannot assume all women would support the agenda adopted by the campaign, the relevance of the issue cannot be disputed.
- There is a major opportunity to break out of the ghetto that women's rights has found itself pushed into, or in some cases immersed itself in. By reaching out to mainstream groups and men, there is an opportunity to engage new audiences that have previously felt excluded from the debate or uncomfortable about engaging in it.
- While advancing women's rights is one of the most important interventions in addressing poverty (60 percent of people living in poverty are women according to UNDP), it is also an issue that cuts across classes. Whether it is high-flying female business executives being passed over for promotion or poor women being excluded from local decision-making, the issue has the ability to mobilise all sorts of constituencies.
- The nature and scale of the current violations of women's rights provides a campaign with a plethora of opportunities to ensure emotional engagement and generate outrage. “Half the Sky,” by Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn, was a strong example of this potential.
- The creation of UN Women provides a new structural context that can be exploited and formed by a campaign. Under the leadership of Michelle Bachelet, it also affords an opportunity to forge new leadership on the issue.
- While the domination of male leaders is clearly not a positive thing for the campaign, it can and should be used as leverage to extract leadership on the agenda. The lack of women at the top table makes the argument for the campaign in stark terms and should enable it to shame leaders into addressing the policy areas.
- Campaigning on women's rights should enable the creation of nontraditional alliances between celebrities, progressive corporations, social movements and NGOs. This is an agenda that should be pushed back into the mainstream.
- The movement is badly under-resourced at the national and international levels. Increasing resources would have a significant impact on increasing activity levels and impact.

Of course, many of the opportunities of campaigning on women's rights have been apparent for many years. A common platform was agreed to in 1995 at the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing. However, these broad policy priorities have not effectively focused the movement or been turned into effective campaigning. There are real obstacles that have stopped these opportunities being realised and that would require surmounting (or avoiding) if progress is to be made. They include:

- Lack of capacity in the movement overall and in campaigning in particular; a policy-heavy approach has meant the intellectual grounding of the movement is very thorough, but the translation of this into pressure for policy reform is extremely uneven
- Real policy splits between different parts of the community on issues such as abortion, sex work and the role of men
- A significant misalignment, especially in the north, between what women self-report as wanting and a traditional feminist agenda
- The cultural connotations of engaging in the issue, in particular concerns over a clash of civilizations and the role of women in Islam; many organisations do not want to alienate other religions or be seen as part of a western/northern agenda
- The lack of senior organisational buy in, meaning junior staff tend to be given leadership roles on women's rights without the experience or organisational clout to make this leadership effective
- Some of the core characteristics associated with effective campaigning, including prioritisation, leadership and hierarchical structures, are in some way anti-feminist according to some within the feminist movement
- The breadth of the issue allowing "mission creep" and reducing focus, since almost every public policy issue can be defined in feminist terms

What a Campaign Could Look Like

A revitalised campaign on women's rights offers a major opportunity to surmount some of the obstacles above. It relies on two main things.

Firstly, it needs to prioritise the asks and focus down on a small number of key areas. The Beijing Program of Action is comprehensive but too broad to provide more than a policy framework. The movement needs to be willing to make difficult trade-offs about the most critical issues and the most achievable changes and be willing to focus on them. This does not mean that other issues need to be dropped, simply that focusing down would enable the campaign to achieve progress in one set of policies before moving on to the next, hopefully having built up some momentum. The Beijing Platform may be the right agenda, but it needs to be approached with a view to how change happens, not simply the completeness of the asks.

Secondly, it needs to be built around a strong and diverse coalition. This means setting up joint decision-making structures; creating an overarching campaign brand to get away from the tired brands of most of the organisations most active in this area; and securing a willingness from groups to pool resources, strategy and activity. It also necessitates reaching out to new players who may not agree with every element of feminist discourse but who agree on the priority areas. Within this coalition, the campaign would need to allow national-level adaptation to ensure buy-in and relevance.

As an example, the campaign could agree to three priority areas, such as representation, education and violence. And on the basis of these, it could agree to three priority international policy asks, and ask national coalitions to do the same at a national level. For example:

Priority	International Ask	National Ask
Representation	UNGA/G20 agreement to aim for 33% female ministers by 2015	Removal of national-level blocks to political participation
Education	Reform of global education fund to better incentivize girls' education	Enforcing bans on child marriage
Violence	Global anti-trafficking fund	Hearts and minds campaign targeting violence against women

Alternatively, national coalitions could adopt the one international priority as well as devise two of their own. For example:

Level	Priority Ask
International	UNGA/G20 agreement to aim for 33% female ministers by 2015
National	Reform to inheritance law
National	Hearts and minds campaign on violence against women

An alternative would be to identify one specific policy ask that has both international and national dimensions and would provide the sole focus, such as a quota on government ministers, although quotas themselves are controversial in the movement. In many ways, this would be the most effective approach, but agreeing to a single focus may prove impossible. Leaders within the movement suggest the violence agenda is the area of most commonality between the diverse players.

A further possibility is to build a more integrated global coalition of national groups that simply seeks to share learning, approaches and capacity to increase domestic impact—and perhaps occasionally work around shared priorities. While this would certainly be an improvement on the weak structures currently in place and would be by far the easiest option, it would not provide the added value that a more integrated joint campaign would bring.

It seems clear that the campaign would work best as a coalition at both national and international levels. National coalitions would be the constituent parts of the international campaign. The international campaign would need a strong coordination structure to enable effective decision-making, together with an input mechanism for national-level coalitions.

Recent work in the United Kingdom by the Equals coalition has given a small taste of what is possible when the movement comes together. While unfocussed in what it was asking for, the process of bringing together the key groups produced a level of cut through unseen in recent years. A revitalised campaign on women's rights is one of the clearest areas of potential cut through.

SOCIAL PROTECTION

Perhaps the most important issue in addressing inequality is social protection. The category of social protection encompasses a wide range of mechanisms and policies, such as child grants, work guarantees, pensions, unemployment benefits and direct cash transfers. The definition can also include access to essential services.

This set of policy interventions has crept up the ladder of political priorities in recent years for a variety of reasons:

- The graduation of many countries from low- to middle-income status means more states have the financial capacity to engage more effectively in social protection. In addition, the expectations of citizens are increasing at the same time.
- Growing inequality within states means social protection policies are more important in addressing both inequality itself and the problems associated with it.
- Social protections mechanisms were seen to have performed well during the financial crisis.
- The development of social protection initiatives that have been seen as successes, such as Bolsa Familia in Brazil and similar initiatives in other South American countries, have driven further development and implementation.
- Social protection systems are seen as popular with voters and, therefore, attractive to political parties.

As a result, there has also been an increasing international focus on social protection, including the A.U.'s Social Protection Framework and the U.N.'s Social Protection Floor Initiative. In recent months, this has gained further prominence with the creation of an advisory group under the leadership of Michelle Bachelet, tasked with drawing up a report expected to become an input to the French G20.

The difficulties of addressing social protection at an international level are concerns in LICs about affordability; worries from middle-income countries that international standards could be used for future economic protectionism, reducing their competitiveness; and the need for social protection systems to be socially specific.

What a Campaign Could Look Like

Progress on social protection will primarily be made at the national level, immersed as it is in national politics. The role of any international campaign would be to:

- Draw together the capacity and learning of organisations working in different contexts to share best practices.
- Try and create a sense of competition between states towards more effective protection, partly by raising citizen's knowledge and expectations of what they should expect from their state. Such objectives could be achieved by building a relatively loose network of organisations, perhaps with a small secretariat focused on information dissemination and seeding new national campaigns.

There is also an opportunity to make this network drive further change by providing it a common focus. By drawing out a key policy with relevance in as many of the key markets as possible, the campaign could gain both international and national traction. This could adopt a single focus or it could be a package of policies, along the lines of the four pillars identified by the ILO: child payments, pensions, access to essential health services and minimum income for those out of work.

Some of the options would include:

- Annual child grants to poor families for their children, such as Bolsa Familia
- A guarantee to a minimum number of work days per year, along the lines of the Indian National Rural Employment Guarantee Act
- A global minimum income standard agreed to at the international level
- The abolition of health user fees for a basic set of services or a set group of people

In each case, it is likely that some degree of conditionality would need to be attached, such as school attendance for child grants. Such conditionality, though of dubious impact, helps solidify political support for redistributive policies.

There is also a tension between picking one issue and running with it, which is much easier to campaign around, and keeping a package of measures together, which is much more coherent and effective.

Clearly, there are issues about the affordability of such systems, especially for low-income countries implementing them from scratch. However, the ILO estimate that their four-pillared package would cost around 4 percent of GDP for LICs, and in the last 10 years growth in GDP has often exceeded that on an annual basis.

ABSOLUTE ZERO

As outlined above, trends point to inequality becoming a more important and salient focus for development campaigning than poverty. But there is still significant residual traction to be gained by focusing on poverty. In particular, the campaigning opportunity is that absolute poverty is abolishable and on a relatively tight time frame—perhaps 2025 with some effort.

A campaign targeting absolute poverty would have the following advantages:

- Unlike relative poverty and inequality, absolute poverty is abolishable. There is the attraction of finality and totality to motivate people.
- Absolute poverty is embarrassing to emerging economies. Therefore, increasing the profile of the issue and pushing it onto the international agenda could increase domestic efforts at addressing it.
- Whereas targets to reduce the number living in poverty by a proportion, à la MDGs, means the "near poor" can be targeted while the most marginalised are excluded, a focus on lifting every single person out of absolute poverty in any country gets the campaign into debates about inequality without needing to focus explicitly on it.
- A focus on absolute poverty would be particularly salient among donors and LICs.
- The world has made great progress in lifting hundreds of millions of people from poverty in the last decade. This campaign can build on that momentum and the policy experience behind it. Unlike many campaigns, this one would not have to deal with a perception of previous failure.

The downsides of a focus on absolute poverty are that:

- Absolute poverty, as measured by \$1.25 per day, is only one measure of poverty and excludes a lot of other important indicators, such as education, health, etc. The MDGs were written to include several variables specifically to avoid this unidimensional measure.
- Although the poverty measure is linked to the ability to afford a minimum number of calories, in reality it is a relatively arbitrary measure. Living on \$1.26 a day is pretty much like living on \$1.24 a day.
- A focus on absolute poverty means the campaign would focus exclusively on developing countries, fitting a G8 framework better than a G20 one.

What a Campaign Could Look Like

Absolute zero would aim to abolish absolute poverty forever by the year 2025, for example. Critical to making this campaign work would be a categorisation of the issue as one for which all countries share responsibility. Rich countries would have the responsibility of providing the necessary assistance (ODA and non-ODA), and poorer countries would be responsible for spending their resources effectively in reducing poverty.

While the international target would be simple, the national and international policies needed to achieve it could be much more nuanced and sophisticated. Under the headline of abolishing absolute poverty, a policy platform could be promoted looking at a set of enabling issues and intermediate steps. This could target both international and national processes ranging from national elections to G8 and G20 meetings. Middle-income countries with significant reserves would be pressured to mobilize domestic resources effectively, whereas rich countries would be pressured to increase their assistance to the poorest countries. Those countries that make progress would be lauded at an international level.

The best organisational structure for supporting the campaign would be one in which a central coordination committee carried lead responsibility for the international framing, and national coalitions took responsibility for devising and pushing for the national measures. There would need to be an agreement to limit the spread of these in order to keep the campaign focused and effective. The major difficulty with this focus in the current time frame is that it overlaps with the MDGs without being firmly rooted in them. Indeed, it goes significantly further. A version of this campaign may be more viable in the post-2015 space.

DEMOCRATISATION AND GOVERNANCE

Great campaigns seize the zeitgeist, and the zeitgeist of the hour is undoubtedly the extraordinary revolutions in North Africa and the Middle East. A straight democratisation campaign is outside the purview of this report, since the evidence base for democracies being best for economic development is at best mixed, but governance reform is not and offers great potential.

Competent, accountable governments that have capacity and are developmentally orientated are perhaps the most important variable in development policy. In recent years, more organisations have invested in this policy space and are focusing on a wide range of areas, including rights to information, budget tracking, natural resource payment transparency and anti-corruption legislation. The opportunity is to put several of the core elements of this policy mix into a package of measures and bring together a diverse set of actors, thereby forcing more significant progress.

A focus on different elements of governance has several other strengths:

- Governance reforms are centre stage at present and tap into growing public awareness and concern about the way in which people are governed.
- At a time of reduced fiscal space, structural reforms to government that do not require large-scale finance and may even save money are relatively more attractive and viable.
- Governance reforms have strong relevance in both low- and middle-income countries—and indeed some rich ones. In middle-income countries, in particular, the development of a middle class often creates a constituency worried about the way in which their taxes are administered.

The downsides of a governance focus are equally clear:

- Most problematically, while improved governance and development correlate strongly, making the link between any individual reform and improvements in development can be hard. For example, while there has been progress in securing some increased transparency within the extractive industry, it has proved difficult to identify the clear developmental gains coming from this.
- Reform of governance is extremely and overtly political. Reforms threaten the positions, perks and resources of elites, meaning such reforms are vociferously resisted.
- Many of the reforms proposed will already be in place in developed countries, meaning the agenda can look like a lecturing exercise to be more like northern countries. This is not often a great selling point or a great fit with G20 dynamics.

What a Campaign Could Look Like

Identifying a core package of coherent reforms would be the key element to making this campaign work. This would need to be based on a prioritisation of the numerous governance issues that groups are currently campaigning on. Ideally, this would take the form of a common agenda that the campaign pushed each country to implement, such as the introduction of freedom of information legislation, the creation and funding of an independent corruption investigation team, or budget transparency. A common agenda such as this would provide a common standard to which all governments were being held, making it harder for individual governments to obfuscate. However, given the different base from which each country starts and the different legal and political systems in which they operate, this may prove difficult.

An alternative would be to agree to a number of global principles and objectives for the campaign, such as transparency, accountability and rules based, and from these devise the national level asks. In this version, national campaigns would decide the best asks in the different categories and campaign for them. The international campaign would target international institutions and seek an enabling environment where governance issues became political priorities.

To make the most of this campaign it should be launched quickly, based on the groups already active in this area, and then broadened to encompass new groups. The current opportunity for progress on governance is strongly tied to the political profile it has received in recent weeks. Unless the campaign is framed and launched quickly, the window of opportunity may quickly close.

TRADE

A breakthrough on trade would perhaps be one of the most enabling external policy changes in creating self-sustaining progress in overcoming poverty. However, based on the interviews for this report, it is abundantly clear that near-term progress through the official structures, such as the completion of the Doha Round, is wishful thinking. Nevertheless, this does not mean the entire agenda should be jettisoned.

A focus on trade brings many advantages:

- It chimes with the G20 focus on supporting growth in low-income countries.
- If, as many economists expect, northern economies are plagued by low growth during the rest of this decade, politicians may be more willing to look again at the advantages of renewed trade rounds in stimulating growth.
- As mentioned above, trade provides a more sustainable route out of poverty for poor countries, worth far more than ODA.

However, trade-focused campaigns also face significant blocks to progress:

- The rise of emerging economies and the perception of threats to the position of rich countries mean the incentives for some of the most powerful countries are to block further change, at least in the near term.
- Civil society remains split on trade as an engine for poverty reduction, often for ideological reasons.
- The incentives to middle-income countries of trade reform grow increasingly less appealing as they successfully develop without reform.
- Organised and well-resourced industry lobbies have a vested interest in the status quo.

What a Campaign Could Look Like

Given progress through the most effective routes is currently closed, for the time being there are three main options for development campaigners.

The first is to fashion a LICs-only package of trade reforms, probably under the G20's auspices. The scope here is limited given the exceptions already in place for low-income countries via AGOA (United States) and Everything But Arms (E.U.), but there are still opportunities to deepen these, broaden them beyond the United States and E.U., and make progress on related issues such as rules of origin. The traditional objection to such a segmented approach is that it would reduce incentives for broader progress on the DDA. However, as a growing acceptance takes hold that the DDA is not going to progress in any case, the viability of a low-income focus may increase.

The second opportunity is to target northern subsidies that reduce the competitiveness of goods from low-income countries or that enable the flooding of developing markets with subsidised northern goods. The barriers to this include a concern about taking these steps outside a comprehensive process (i.e., What do rich countries get back?) and, more generally, the fact that vested interests have strong incentives for retaining the subsidies. While subsidies have been attacked in the past, the opportunity of the financial crisis has the potential to harness a growing willingness to make difficult decisions where large sums of money are savable and also to unite unusual coalitions of pro-development advocates and economic liberals. Therefore, the U.S. Farm Bill in 2012 and a new stage of CAP reforms in 2014 are real opportunities for progress. Against this potential is the fact that outside of an international trade round, those who benefit most from current subsidies will not have countervailing pull factors. For example, France, which was the biggest beneficiary of the CAP, had to balance this with the benefits of a potential trade deal. Without that trade deal being on the table, the incentives to change look much less significant.

The third option is to focus outside governmental processes and embrace consumer-led change. Companies have relied on weak governments, limited scrutiny and consumers having limited information to avoid charges of exploitation in the past. Boycotts, which have often been the standard response by civil society groups, have been blunt and ineffective.

The growth in the fair-trade movement gives a glimmer of what is possible in this area but is far from a viable change strategy in itself. The advent of crowd sourcing provides a new opportunity to rebalance the information economy by providing consumers with accurate and up-to-date information on the product that they are buying, whether via a broader hallmark system similar to fair trade or a more diffuse system where consumers search on the issues that concern them and make decisions on this basis (perhaps rating a product against predetermined criteria).

All of these steps—even if partially successful—could help build momentum and confidence that could lead to further progress on bigger trade reforms in the future.

CLIMATE

Of all the future trends, the specter of climate change lurks as the biggest single threat to development. However, it also offers opportunities.

The relatively low utilisation of carbon by low-income countries, combined with the presence of a U.N. process aimed at creating some form of mechanism for sharing carbon output, pose the possibility of low-income countries either being compensated for giving up some of their "natural rights" to a share of the global commons or simply being able to sell some of their allocation. Herein lies the biggest opportunity for a step change in resource flows from rich to poor countries.

There are various ways in which this could come about. They range from poor countries being paid for protecting unused natural resources to the division of rights to emit carbon in equal per capita allowances and allowing poor countries to sell these to the highest bidder.

The growing acceptance of climate change and the inability to stitch together an effective global deal to date means there is good reason to believe that these issues will naturally be pushed up the political agenda. However, getting the issues onto the agenda is only part of the task. Making the outcomes pro-poor will be much more difficult. Certainly, the talk of equitable per capita distribution of resources, where rich countries would have to immediately transfer very large sums of money to poor countries, is very far from the current political reality.

What a Campaign Could Look Like

The role of the development sector here is to shape the medium-term objective towards that goal or ensure a high-level of compensation for poor countries if that goal proves unrealisable, as it probably will be in the near term. The development sector should specialise in this element of the debate. Even if the principle of equal entitlements is not embraced, the compensatory mechanisms likely to be part of any deal provide real impetus for states to investigate innovative sources of finance, ranging from bunker fuels to financial transaction taxes.

A campaign in this area would clearly need to be linked to the broader campaigning taking place for a climate deal. The tension in the campaign is that by encouraging poor countries to hold out for a maximalist deal, the campaign could make an overarching deal less doable. There is no easy answer to this other than a willingness to work on different time lines and ensure a long-term trajectory that endorses the logic of equitable shares.

The other benefit of campaigning on carbon shares in this way is the logic it sets up for other resources. In a world of growing resource scarcity, debates about sharing those will be critical to the future of developing countries. Carbon is the clearest example of an area where poor countries have leverage—no compensation no deal. Whereas in most of the other examples, a zero-sum game is more likely to be pursued. Therefore, winning the debate on carbon becomes critical as a benchmark for future debates on scarcity, where developing countries have much less leverage.

MOMENTS

In addition to these policy areas, there are also identifiable processes and events that offer potential breakthrough moments. Between 2012 and 2015, these include:

- 2012 Cop 18 in Korea or Qatar
- 2012 Rio+20 in Brazil
- The 2012 London Olympics
- MDG Review Summit 2013
- 2015 expiry of the current MDGs
- Ongoing G8/G20/UNGA summits

Of these, it is hard to speculate about the potential of COP 18 until COP 17 has taken place. The Rio+20 agenda is also currently very unshaped, with the Brazilian hosts not yet focused on it. Two of the most unusual opportunities are the process towards a replacement framework for the MDGs and the 2012 Olympics.

Replacing the MDGs

There is a significant and understandable tension between those advocating for the investment of time and effort in identifying the replacement framework for the MDGs and those who believe that with four years to go until their expiry, the focus should be on delivering against the existing targets. Those in the latter camp argue that deadlines and targets have the most impact when the deadlines are looming. To refocus post 2015, when the current framework is at its most effective, would be a missed opportunity. Those advocating a switch to investing energy in the new framework argue that leaving it too late will lead to a lowest-common-denominator revision, probably just changing the timelines and a few of the indicators rather than the seizing the potential of a new framework.

Both arguments are right, but it should be feasible for organisations and institutions to split their functions between a continued focus on delivery in country and an international process to revise and recast the MDGs post 2015. The expert-level analysis needed for the latter does not need large-scale political buy-in until at least 2013.

Civil society should certainly be ahead of this curve and should try to develop a common proposal by as broad a cross-section as possible based on the key groups working towards the MDGs at international and national levels. A working group of policy directors from the main NGOs should be convened and tasked with developing a common process leading to a joint proposal for a new framework post 2015.

Initially, the focus of this work could be strongly policy focused, but as 2015 got closer, it would need to move to a more active political phase.

The 2012 Olympics

The Olympics attracts a massive TV audience: 4.7 billion people or 70 percent of the world's population in 2008. They bring together senior political figures: in 2008, 82 heads of state attended. In 2012, more than 120 heads of state are expected to attend.

While these are all great opportunities for a campaign, the nature of the event is overtly nonpolitical. Trying to shoehorn a political moment into a sporting occasion will be resisted by many, including the International Olympic Committee (IOC), and probably by the BBC, which will be the host broadcaster. Chapter 5 of the Olympic charter states, "No kind of demonstration or political, religious or racial propaganda is permitted in the Olympic areas." In previous Olympics, they have sought to uphold this strongly.

Previous campaigns that have targeted the Olympics emerged with the following lessons:

- Athlete leadership is critical. It needs to be authentic, and athletes need to be ready to push the sporting bodies to deliver. Previous campaigns have struggled to engage athletes who are willing to do much more than sign up or appear in a video.
- The IOC is very difficult to engage with. The full support of the organising authorities is not necessary to an outsider campaign, but if creating formal moments as part of the process is the goal, then internal facilitation and support are key.
- Targeting the host provides the most leverage. Beyond that, campaigns have struggled to gain leverage.
- Media cut through, especially once the games start, is extremely difficult. In the run-up, journalists are looking for interesting angles. By the time of the games, it becomes much more sport focused. This can be overcome if the athletes are more campaign focused.

The U.K. Olympics comes around a year before the expected U.K. G8. David Cameron has talked about downgrading the G8 and perhaps appending it onto another summit, such as the UNGA. Nevertheless, he has also indicated it should continue to play an important role in aid and development, and he may be willing to consider a bigger event if there were a larger campaign. The presence of the U.K. G8 gives an opportunity to elongate the campaign and harness the benefits of the two moments, for example to start something at the Olympics that delivers at the G8 or to deliver something at the Olympics that is then monitored at the G8.

As noted above, the greatest traction is likely to be achieved in the host country. The most obvious U.K. objective is to solidify the 0.7 percent commitment in the United Kingdom's budget that year. But this alone is neither significant enough nor motivating enough to mobilise a campaign around. While this could be an important sub-objective, it should not be at the centre of the strategy. To justify the investment of significant resources and time, the leverage has to extend beyond the United Kingdom. Options include:

- **Hearts and minds:** This would be primarily targeting the public and their attitudes and beliefs rather than governments. Indeed, governments and corporate sponsors could all be allies in this campaign rather than targets. This could focus on a variety of issues, but given the nature of the Olympics and the concept of a level playing field, something around discrimination would probably be most suitable. A 2012 campaign focused on women's rights or disability rights could resonate effectively. In addition to the hearts and minds-focused campaign, it could also pursue substantive policy objectives. For example, the U.K. government could draft—perhaps with the Brazilian president who is hosting the next games—a London 2012 charter where heads of state are asked to sign up to a charter guaranteeing equal rights on key policy areas. This progress will then be reviewed at the time of the next games.
- **Private sector focused:** A second way of avoiding a traditionally government-focused campaign would be to focus on the private sector. This could involve the creation of a charter for people-focused businesses together with the U.K. government. This manifesto would be agreed upon by a broad range of actors, and the CEOs of the 100 biggest global corporations—perhaps starting with the Olympics' corporate sponsors—would then be invited to sign ahead of the closing ceremony. This charter could include transparency, tax accounting and investment in developing countries. The advantage of this is that the bar to getting a commitment would be lower, and public pressure via the Olympics would be highly effective, at least for those companies with brands to protect and promote. The content of the manifesto would be critical.
- **Fitter, healthier, stronger:** A more traditional option would be to fix on a global policy objective but try and keep it as close to sport and the international legacy as possible. For example, the campaign could identify the five diseases

that most inhibit people's ability to participate in sport and life in general (one for each of the Olympic rings) and push for specific policy objectives to be agreed on—each one at a heads of state event at the closing ceremony. That could include things like funding GAVI, investing in malaria vaccines and eradicating polio. This has the advantage of focus and relevance but may struggle to rally enough of a coalition to become a critical mass.

All the options for targeting the Olympics will require the creation of a political moment in order to deliver. The problem with this is both scheduling and leverage. The scheduling problem—getting everyone there at the same moment and ensuring they are willing to devote time to politics rather than sports, bilats or shopping—will be difficult but probably not impossible if the United Kingdom plans early and puts political capital behind it. However, this still leaves the leverage problem, similar to that associated with UNGA side events. The optional nature of this event will mean there is no forcing mechanism—no necessity for states to do a deal. States may agree to attend if they have something good to say, but if they do not they will simply not attend. Unlike the G8, no one expects a communiqué and no one will be expecting full attendance.

Building an active campaign internationally will be critical to dealing with this and providing some external pressure and a sense of expectation. The difficulty is that the Olympics in London is very much a U.K. moment. One way around this may be to pitch it as a 2012-2016 campaign and ensure Brazilian groups are a core part of it. While this is only adding one country to the list, it would significantly change the way the campaign is perceived.

The Olympics is clearly an opportunity for development campaigners. The size and nature of that opportunity depends most on four issues:

1. Ability to define and agree to a clear policy agenda
2. Building a credible U.K. and international coalition around this
3. A realistic expectation of strong U.K. government support
4. The identification of supportive athletes who would help drive the process forward

Conclusions

As set out in the introduction, the aim of this report is to provide a starting point for individuals and organisations to engage in joint conversations about opportunities for effective campaigning on international development.

The core campaigning opportunities it identified were:

- Inequality:
 - › Women’s rights
 - › Social protection
- Absolute poverty
- Democratisation and governance
- Trade:
 - › A pro-LICs package
 - › Northern subsidies
 - › Consumer information
- Climate and resources
- Influencing the new MDGs
- The 2012 Olympics

Each of these areas provides a different type of opportunity for progress. However, with the possible exception of the trade/consumer information campaign, these will each only work as coalition campaigns. Therefore, finding ways of working more effectively in coalition again is a critical precursor to launching successful campaigns.

Of these opportunities, the MDG influencing should be taken forward as a matter of course. It does not need large-scale campaigning resources dedicated to it at the start.

Of the other options identified, the three campaigns that best respond to recent shifts in international dynamics and events are:

- A revitalised campaign on women’s rights
- An integrated campaign on governance
- A focused push on social protection

A campaign that focuses on absolute poverty or the 2012 Olympics would be more traditional, so would take less creativity or adaptation to move forward, but it would also offer fewer opportunities to harness new energy.

Trade and climate campaigns offer real potential but would need to find a way of re-engaging groups in a set of issues that many of them feel they have already tried—and broadly failed on.

There are clearly pros and cons for each of the options put forward. And, of course, there are other options not discussed in detail here that other groups will want to put forward, such as resource scarcity.

The next step in each of them would be for interested parties to convene a series of conversations to discuss potential, scope, focus, and, ultimately, structure and longevity. If a basis of common understanding can be reached among key groups with significant appetite for working together, a core convening coalition should be formed and a series

of national and regional consultations held to further hone focus and define the interface between national and international campaigns. In each of these cases, an international hub would need to be set up to help frame the campaign, recruit national partners and provide strategic leadership. This should be made up of strategically aligned organisations and key national partners.

In addition to each of these specific opportunities, additional recommendations based on current trends include:

- Return to working in true coalition on a more consistent basis
- Supporting current campaigns that have seized the initiative since the financial crisis, e.g., the Robin Hood Tax and Publish What You Pay
- Remaining on the front foot regarding aid volumes as part of a strategy to limit backsliding
- Investing specifically in Brazil as a potential development leader
- Identifying opportunities where there is clear convergent self-interest between MICs and LICs
- Increasing focus on poor people in MICs
- Maintaining a strong emphasis on securing leadership from the United States, United Kingdom, France and Germany
- Focusing on broadening, not dominating, climate change campaigns
- Investing more resources in building effective national campaigns, especially in MICs

Finally, the sector also needs to examine how it collaborates on a more strategic basis. Working in coalition is going to continue to be a core element in future campaign impact, but so too is the desire of individual organisations to differentiate themselves and exist as separate entities. There are two main options to address this tension. The first is to work in looser and looser coalitions so that organisational independence, autonomy and awareness are not compromised. This would lead towards more regular collaboration but provide limited added value. The second option is to find a way for the sector to come together on an occasional basis into integrated coalition campaigns that carry significant added value.

The second of these is clearly the better option, although perhaps mixed with ongoing lower-level collaboration. However, to make this work, the high set costs of reforming coalitions, rebuilding trust and systems, and identifying allies need to be reduced. One way of doing this would be to have a small permanent secretariat that maintains capacity and relationships and is tasked with evaluating opportunities for collaboration and putting these to key groups on a regular basis. The core function of this secretariat would be convening key groups rather than independently deciding on campaigns. Once a coalition campaign was formed, it could either become the secretariat for the campaign or simply support the campaign's establishment. In this way, we might see a more effective venue for strategic discussions about collaboration and a tried and tested method of following through on them. This may only result in the formation of formal coalitions once every four years, a kind of Olympics model, but they would be more effective coalitions. In the meantime, organisations would be free to do their own thing.

Of course, the danger in setting up structures to address the lack of effective coalition working is that future campaigns may not necessarily be based on the key players from the last one. In addition, setting up a bureaucratic set of processes to identify a campaign by committee is likely to result in lowest-common-denominator results. Any secretariat must, therefore, have a focus on convening disparate groups and the competence, agility and autonomy to do so in innovative ways.

Finally, it is worth restating something from the introduction. Identifying campaign opportunities is far from a science. In a very real sense, great campaign opportunities are at least partly self-defined. When a critical mass of influential and credible individuals and organisations make a collective decision to work together and focus on an issue, opportunities can open up that were not previously predictable or identifiable. Indeed, they may only exist as a result of the decision to engage in an issue collectively. If we are to see transformative campaigns emerge from the sector, the first step must be civil society resummoning the confidence and commitment to believe in its own capacity for change and a willingness to work together to achieve it.

Appendix: Interview List

Name	Title	Organisation	Country
Achim Steiner	Executive Director	UNEP	Kenya
Adhemar Mineiro	Senior Economist	REBRIP	Brazil
Adriano Campolina	International Director–America’s Region	Action Aid	Brazil
Akinwumi Adesina	Vice President for Policy and Partnerships	AGRA	Kenya
Alan Beattie	International Economy Editor	Financial Times	UK
Alan Detheridge	Former Vice President	Shell	UK
Alex Evans	Non-resident Fellow, Head of Resource Scarcity, Climate Change and Multilateralism	Centre on International Co-operation, NYU	UK
Alexandre Praca	Communications Manager	ITUC	Brazil
Alison Woodhead	Campaign Director	Oxfam	UK
Alistair Fernie	Head of Kenya & Somalia Offices	DFID	Kenya
Amanda Horton Mastin	Innovation and Creative Director	Comic Relief	UK
Amir Osman	Former Senior Director of Policy and Government Relations	Save Darfur	US
Amitabh Behar	Director	Wada Na Todo	India
Amjad Atallah	Co-Director	New America Foundation Middle East Task Force	US
Anand Kumar Bolimera	Director	Christian Aid	India
Andrew Small	Transatlantic Fellow	The German Marshall Fund of the United States	Brussels
Andy Atkins	Executive Director	Friends of the Earth	UK
Andy Martin	Director	Firetail	UK
Andy Sumner	Research Fellow–Vulnerability and Poverty Reduction Team	Institute of Development Studies	UK
Angela Cropper	Assistant Secretary-General	UNEP	Kenya
Anitek Shah	Staff Associate and Special Assistant to the Director	The Earth Institute	US
Ann Grant	Vice Chairman	Standard Chartered Bank	UK
Anne Jellema	International Policy Director	Action Aid	South Africa
Anthea Webb	Director	WFP	China
Antonio Hill	Senior Climate Change Policy Adviser	Oxfam	Columbia
Anyang’ Nyong’o	General Secretary	ODM	Kenya
Ashok Khosla	Chairman	Development Alternatives	India
Asia Russell	Director, International Policy	Health Gap	US
Avinash Kumar	Essential Services Lead Specialist	Oxfam	India
Barbara Stocking	CEO	Oxfam	UK
Basil Ibrahim		The Imagine Company– Quris Consulting	Kenya

Name	Title	Organisation	Country
Beatrice Karanja	Associate Director	Portland	Kenya
Ben Hewitt	Operations Director	Save the Children	UK
Ben Margolis	Acting Director	10:10	UK
Benedict Phillips	Mobilisation Director	Save the Children	UK
Berndt Nilles	Secretary General	CIDSE	Brussels
Beth Mugo	Minister for Health	Government	Kenya
Bill Wasserman	President	M & R Strategic Services	US
Bin Tu	China Programme Coordinator	Leaders' Quest	China
Bob Orr	Assistant Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Strategic Planning	United Nations	US
Bobby John	Advocacy and Public Affairs	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	India
Bongani Masuku	International Relations Secretary	COSATU	South Africa
Briony Worthington	Founder	Sandbag	UK
Burkhard Gnarig	CEO	Berlin Civil Society Centre	Germany
Candido Gryzowski	Director	Brazilian Institute of Social and Economical Analysis (IBASE)	Brazil
Caroline Baudot	Director	Crisis Action	France
Caroline Kent	Advocacy and Campaigns Manager	Deutsche Stiftung Weltbevölkerung	Germany
Celine Chevalier	Former Head of Make Trade Fair Campaign	Oxfam	Geneva
Celso Fernandes	National Director	World Vision	Brazil
Charles Abugre	Deputy Director for Africa	UN Millennium Campaign	Kenya
Charles Badenoch	Vice President for Advocacy and Justice for Children	World Vision International	UK
Chris Jones	Head of Cabinet, European Commissioner for Development	European Commission	Brussels
Chris Ward	Director	Bluedot	UK
Chris Wood	Minister and Deputy Head of Mission	British Embassy Beijing	China
Claire Hickson	Former Policy and Communications Manager	Africa Commission	UK
Clare Melamed	Head of Growth and Equity	ODI	UK
Corinne Woods	Director	UN Millennium Campaign	US
Daleep Mukarji	Former Director	Christian Aid	UK
David Beckmann	President	Bread for the World	US
David Hillman	Director	Stamp Out Poverty	UK
David Lane	Assistant to the President and Counselor to the White House Chief of Staff	White House	US
David Mephram	UK Director	Human Rights Watch	UK
David Nussbaum	CEO	WWF	UK
David Pressman	Director for War Crimes and Atrocities	The White House	US
David Rubenstein	Former Director	Save Darfur Coalition	US
David Turnbull	Director	Climate Action Network International	US
Dietmar Roller	Board of Directors	Kindernothilfe	Germany
Dong Bin	Senior Consultant	Centre for the Study of Group 20	China
Duncan Green	Head of Research	Oxfam	UK
Duncan Okelo	Director	Society for International Development	Kenya

Name	Title	Organisation	Country
Elise Ford	Head of Oxfam EU	Oxfam	Brussels
Elisha London	UK Manager	The Global Poverty Project	UK
Eloise Todd	Brussels Director	One	Brussels
Fabrice Ferrier	Consultant		France
Fabrina Furtado	Executive Secretary	Jubilee South	Brazil
Faryar Shirzad	Former Sherpa to President Bush	Government	US
Felix Fernandez Shaw	Adviser to High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy	European Commission	Brussels
Fiona Napier	International Advocacy Director	OSI	UK
Francesco Menezes	Director	Brazilian Institute of Social and Economical Analysis (IBASE)	Brazil
Francisco Gaetani	Deputy Minister	Ministry of the Environment, Executive Secretariat	Brazil
Frida Ecklund	Climate Change Campaigner	Oxfam	UK
Gabrielle Strautman	Economist	Institute of Alternative Policies for the Southern Cone	UK
Gavin Hayman	Director of Campaigns	Global Witness	UK
Gawain Kripiek	Senior Policy Advisor on International Trade Issues	Oxfam	US
Gene Sperling	Director of the National Economic Council, Assistant to the President for Economic Policy	White House	US
Geoff Adlide	Director, Advocacy and Public Policy	GAVI Alliance	Geneva
Geoff Bowan	First Secretary (Development Cooperation)	Australian Government	China
Geoff Raby	Australian Ambassador	Australian Government	China
George Soros	Founder and Chairman	Open Society Foundation	US
Gerd Leipold	Former Director	Greenpeace	Netherlands
Gerry Barr	President/CEO	Canadian Council for International Co-operation	Canada
Glen Tarman	Advocacy and Representation Manager	Bond	UK
Gordon Brown	Former British Prime Minister	Government	UK
Graca Machel	Co-founder	The Elders	South Africa
Guilherme de Aguiar Patriota	Special Officer	Office of the President, Foreign Policy Unit	Brazil
Guillaume Grosso	Director	One	France
Guillermo Navas	Programme Coordinator	Save the Children	Brazil
Hakima Abbas	Deputy Director	Fahamu	Kenya
Haoming Huang	Executive Director	China Association for NGO Co-operation	China
Heide Marie Wieczorek-Zeul	Former Federal Minister of Economic Cooperation and Development	Government	Germany
Heloisa Oliveira	CEO	Save the Children	Brazil
Henry Parham	Senior Policy Officer	The Elders	UK
Hilary Benn	Former Secretary of State for International Development	Government	UK
Horacio Trujillo	Head of Innovations	iScale	US

Name	Title	Organisation	Country
Hu Yuanqiong	Head of Policy Division	Save the Children	China
Huang Haoming	Vice Chairman and Executive Director	China Association for NGO Cooperation	China
Ingrid Srinath	Secretary General and CEO	Civicus	South Africa
Irungu Houghton	Pan-Africa Policy Adviser	Oxfam	Kenya
James Gondi	Africa Director	Crisis Action	Kenya
James L. MacDonald	Managing Director	Bread for the World	US
Jamie Drummond	CEO	ONE	UK
Jamie Henn	Communications and East Asia Director	350.org	US
Jasmine Whitbread	CEO	Save the Children International	UK
Jean Letitia Saldanha	Policy and Advocacy Officer	CIDSE	Brussels
Jeffrey Sachs	Director	The Earth Institute, Columbia	US
Jennifer Morgan	Climate Change Programme Director	E3G	US
Jeremy Hobbs	Director	Oxfam International	UK
Jerry Fowler	Former Director	Save Darfur Coalition	US
Jo Cox	Director	Maternal Mortality Campaign	UK
Joanna Kerr	CEO	Action Aid International	South Africa
Jodie Williams	Chair and Nobel Laureate	Nobel Women's Initiative	Canada
John Connor	CEO	Climate Institute	Australia
John Giszczak	Programme Division Coordinator	Save the Children	China
John Githongo	CEO	Inuka	Kenya
John McArthur	CEO	Millennium Promise	US
John Samuel	Democratic Governance Advisor of Global Programmes	UNDP	Norway
John Simon	Former Special Assistant to President Bush and Senior Director for Relief, Stabilization, and Development for the National Security Council	Government	US
Jon Cunliffe	Prime Minister's Adviser on Europe and Global Issues	Government	UK
Jorn Kalinski	Head of Campaigns	Oxfam	Germany
Jules Kortenhorst	CEO	European Climate Foundation	Holland
Jürgen Kaiser	Political Co-ordinator	Erlassjahr	Germany
Justin Forsyth	CEO	Save the Children	UK
Karanja Njoroje	Executive Director	Green Belt Movement	Kenya
Karen Allen	Southern Africa Correspondent	BBC	South Africa
Kate Nustedt	Director	Women for Women	UK
Katia Gama	Marketing Officer	Save the Children	Brazil
Katia Maia	Head of International Campaigns and Advocacy	Oxfam International	Geneva
Kel Currah	Executive Director	Sherpanet / What World?	Canada
Kelly Rigg	Director	GCCA	South Africa
Ken Rutherford	Co-founder	Survivor Corps	US
Kevin Cahill	CEO	Comic Relief	UK

Name	Title	Organisation	Country
Kevin May	Manager Public Education, Policy and Communications	Oxfam	China
Kevin Watkins	Director, EFA Global Monitoring Report	UNESCO	France
Kim Hamilton	Deputy Director, Global Development Policy and Advocacy	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	US
Kirsty McNeil	Former Coordination Committee Member	Make Poverty History	UK
Kirti Singh	Women's Rights Lawyer		India
Kizito Wangalwa	National Coordinator	National Taxpayers Association	Kenya
Kjeld Jacobsen	International Secretary	CUT Union	Brazil
Klaus Roland	Country Director	World Bank	China
Kumi Naidoo	Executive Director	Greenpeace	Netherlands
Larry Elliot	Economics Editor	Guardian	UK
Larry Rossin	Former Senior International Coordinator	Save Darfur	US
Laurie Lee	Deputy Director of External Affairs	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	UK
Li Shaojun	Chief Cooperation Division	International Poverty Reduction Centre in China	China
Lisa Karanja	Private Sector and Civil Society Director	Trademark East Africa	Kenya
Liz Bernstein	Founding Director	Nobel Women's Initiative	Canada
Luc Lampriere	Director	Oxfam	France
Lysa John	Global Campaign Coordinator	GCAP	India
Lyvia Rodrigues	Technical Adviser for the Area of Child Labour	Trade Union Confederation of the Americas	Brazil
Mabel van Oranje	CEO	The Elders	UK
Marcello Furtado	Executive Director	Greenpeace	Brazil
Marcello Neri	Director	Fundacao Getulio Vargas	Brazil
Marcio Ruiz Shiavo	Communications Director	Comunicarte Agência de Responsabilidade Social	Brazil
Marco Aurelio Garcia	Special Adviser to the President	Office of the President	Brazil
Marie-Pierre Poirier	Representative to Brazil	Unicef	Brazil
Mario Sander von Torklus	Advisor for Development Policy and North-South Questions	German Chancellery	Germany
Mark Heywood	Executive Director	Section 27	South Africa
Mark Malloch-Brown	Chairman	FTI Consulting	UK
Martin Drury	Former Head of Campaigns	Christian Aid	UK
Martin Hillier	Communications Manager	WWF	Geneva
Martin Kirk	UK Campaigns Director	Oxfam	UK
Mary Wareham	Senior Adviser	Human Rights Watch	US
Matt Phillips	Senior Associate	European Climate Foundation	UK
Max Lawson	Head of Development, Finance and Public Services	Oxfam	UK
Meagen Baldwin	Policy Manager	Concord	Brussels
Michael Bailey	Senior Policy Advisor	Oxfam	UK
Michael Cichon	Director of Social Security Department	ILO	Geneva
Michael Ellis	First Secretary, Global Issues	British Embassy	Brazil

Name	Title	Organisation	Country
Michael Green	Economist and Author		UK
Michael Jacobs	Former Special Adviser to Gordon Brown	Government	UK
Mihir Shah	Member	Planning Commission India	India
Miles Wickstead	Former Head of Secretariat	Africa Commission	UK
Mohammad Elmi	Minister of State for Development	Government	Kenya
Mohammad Qazilbash	CEO	Save the Children	China
Montek Singh Ahluwalia	Deputy Chairman	Planning Commission	India
Moutushi Sengupta	Director–Programme and Advocacy	Oxfam	India
Neville Gabriel	Founding Executive Director	Southern African Trust	South Africa
Nic Dawes	Editor	Mail and Guardian	South Africa
Nick Dyer	Director of Policy	DFID	UK
Nick Mabey	CEO	E3G	UK
Nick Stern	IG Patel Chair and Director of LSE Asia Research	London School of Economics	UK
Nikhil Dey	Co-founder and Director	MKSS	India
Nisha Agrawal	CEO	Oxfam	India
Nitin Lata Waman	Executive Director	Initiatives	India
Nuria Molina-Gallart	Director	European Network on Debt and Development	Brussels
Oliver Buston	Former Europe Director	ONE	UK
Olivia Bueno	Associate Director	International Refugees Rights Initiative	US
Olivier Colom	Adviser to President Sarkozy	Government	France
Olivier Consolo	Director of Secretariat	Concord	Brussels
Owain James	Global Coordinator	Global Campaigns Education	UK
Owen Bardour	Senior Program Associate	Center for Global Development	US
Owen Tudor	Head of European Union and International Relations	TUC	UK
Paloma Caballero	Delegate	Spain's International News Agency	China
Parvinder Singh	Communications Manager	Action Aid	India
Patricia Maria Antunes	Executive Secretary	Save the Children	Brazil
Patrick Watt	Director of Policy and Research	Save the Children	UK
Paul Brannen	Head of Advocacy and Influence	Christian Aid	UK
Paul Collier	Professor of Economics	St Antony's College	UK
Paul Diwakar	General Secretary	NCDHR	India
Paul Hilder	Campaigns Director	Oxfam	UK
Paul Zeitz	Executive Director	Global Aids Alliance	US
Penny Fowler	Head Private Sector Advocacy Team	Oxfam	UK
Peter Kirby	Acting Head	DFID	South Africa
Peter Mandelson	Former EU Trade Commissioner and UK Business Secretary	Government	UK
Phil Bloomer	Director of Campaigns & Policy	Oxfam	UK
Phil Twyford	Member of Parliament	Government	New Zealand

Name	Title	Organisation	Country
Rae McGrath	Co-founder	International Campaign to Ban Landmines	UK
Rajesh Latchman	Coordinator	GCAP	South Africa
Rajiv Tandon	Senior Advisor, Maternal, New Born, Child Health & Nutrition	Save the Children	India
Rakesh Rajani	Founder and Director	Twaweza	Tanzania
Ram Kishan	Programme Manager	Christian Aid	India
Ramesh Chandra	Campaign Co-ordinator	Ekta Parashad	India
Rebecca Munro	Communications and Advocacy Director	World Association of Girl Guides	UK
Richard Bennet	Former General Secretary	BOND	UK
Richard Calland	Programme Manager	Institute for Democracy in South Africa	South Africa
Richard Curtis	Film Director		UK
Richard Lloyd	Former Coordinator	UK Working Party on Landmines	UK
Richard Manning	Former Chairman, Development Assistance Committee	OECD DAC	UK
Richard Moyes	Policy and Research Manager	Land Mine Action Campaign	UK
Ricken Patel	Executive Director	Avaaz	US
Ruth Messinger	CEO	American Jewish World Service	US
S. Parasuraman	Professor	TISS	India
Salil Shetty	General Secretary	Amnesty International	UK
Sam Gurney	Policy Officer, European and International Relations Department	TUC	UK
Sam Worthington	President & CEO	Interaction	US
Sandeep Chadra	Director	Action Aid	India
Sarah Kline	Director	Malaria No More	UK
Sarah Mulley	Associate Director for Migration, Trade and Development	IPPR	UK
Sharan Burrow	General Secretary	ITUC	Brussels
Shaujrn Li	Chief of Co-operation Division	IPRCC	China
Sheila Nix	Executive Director	One	US
Shireen Vakil Miller	Director–Advocacy	Save the Children	India
Shriti Vadeera	Former Adviser to Gordon Brown	Government	UK
Simon Maxwell	Executive Chair	Climate and Development Knowledge Network	UK
Sindiso Ngwenya	Secretary General	Comesa	South Africa
Sipho Pityana	Director	Izingwe	South Africa
Sisonke Msimang	Executive Director	OSISA	South Africa
Sophia Tickell	Founder and Director	Meteos	UK
Srikanta Misra	Manager–Institutional Fundraising	Oxfam	India
Stephanie Klein-Albrant	China and North East Asia Project Director	International Crisis Group	China
Stephen Hale	Deputy Advocacy and Campaigns Director	Oxfam International	Geneva
Steve Goose	Director of Arms Division	Human Rights Watch	US
Steve Tibbet	Former Policy and Campaigns Director	Action Aid	UK

Name	Title	Organisation	Country
Stuart McWilliam	Campaign Manager	ONE	UK
Suman Dasgupta	Programme Co-ordinator	Wada Na Todo	India
Susanne Bauman	Director	Crisis Action	Germany
Sylvie Brigot	Executive Director	International Campaign to Ban Landmines	Geneva
Takumo Yamada	Advocacy Manager	Oxfam	Japan
Tao Ran	Professor and Director	Renmin University of China	China
Thomas Chandy	CEO	Save the Children	India
Tobias Kahler	Director	One	Germany
Ulrich Schlenker	Project Coordinator	Venro	Germany
Ulrika Soneson	Director	Save the Children	South Africa
Virginia Bourassa	HIV/Aids Adviser	USAID Asia	China
Vusi Gumede	Former Adviser to President Mbeki	Government	South Africa
Vuyiseka Dubula	Director	Treatment Action Campaign	South Africa
Wael Hmaidan	Executive Director	IndyAct	Lebanon
Walden Bello	Executive Director	Focus on the Global South	Philippines
Warren Krafchik	Director	International Budget Project	US
Willy Mutunga	Director	Ford Foundation	Kenya
Xiaolin Wang	Director of Research Division	IPRCC	China
Xinmin Jiang	Deputy Director	National Development and Reform Commission	China
Yu Hua	Beijing Project Manager	UNDP	China
Yvo de Boer	Former Secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change	UN	UK
Zainol Rahim Zainuddin	High Commissioner of Malaysia to Kenya	Malaysian Government	Kenya
Zhao Changhui	Chief Country Risk Analyst	China Eximbank	China