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SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (KAS), a German political foundation, opened its office in South Africa in 1982. Political foundations assist in strengthening democracy and the promotion of good governance through funding democracy promotion activities in developing countries. The relationship between donors and recipients of funding is a complex one. Recipients depend on donors for funding and thus in most instances it seems that they take orders from donors and that they may compromise their own ideas/projects and implement what the donor prefers.

Donors are also frequently blamed for tying aid to conditionality, thus putting recipients in the difficult position of trying to please the donor even though they have a better knowledge of what their countries or people need. Despite also experiencing some of the abovementioned issues, the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung refers to the relationship with its recipients as a partnership.

KAS refers to the recipients of funding as partners because KAS works together with its partners to ensure that the projects succeed. In very exceptional cases, where KAS head office has partnership contracts with recipients, funds for such organizations are disbursed at the start of the project, upon receipt of a budget. Even in such cases, KAS still has continuous engagement to see that funds are used as stipulated in the contract and budget. However, with the majority of recipients the funding model operates in two ways: recipients may send invoices to KAS and the latter pays the service providers directly, or the recipients may pay the service providers and submit invoices and proof of payment to KAS for reimbursement when financial reporting is completed at the end of the project. KAS does not dictate terms to recipients. Instead they both work together to ensure that the project succeeds. The research investigated the relationship between KAS and its recipients. The sample in this study comprises selected recipients of KAS funding in South Africa during the period 2006-2011. KAS does not fund all projects of the selected recipients; they have other donors as well. The primary issue with which all of them are dissatisfied is the lack of institutional funding from KAS specifically, but also from donors in general. The issue of funding being made available for projects only is creating difficulties for recipients because they have to source funds for other costs e.g. salaries.
All recipients acknowledge that having funds advanced to them makes their work easier; however, they do not have serious issues with the KAS funding model. They see the funding model as promoting accountability and transparency. Sustainability remains a principal concern for most recipient organizations. The overriding issue among all of them was that if donors discontinue funding, some would be able to sustain themselves with their own cash reserves for a few years while others would have to close immediately, while some recipients have plans to generate other income in the future.

KAS and donors in general need to be more considerate of the challenges faced by recipients of funding and try to put measures in place to assist them where possible. The first measure is to consider providing institutional funding, and there has to be ongoing engagement on this issue. Civil society is the voice of the poor and voiceless and helps to strengthen democratic structures and good governance, but it cannot function without funding. Recipients of funding must also cooperate with donors and submit all the necessary documentation the donor needs to fulfil its accounting obligations.
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CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the background of the study, the motivation, research questions, research aims and objectives, ethical considerations, terminology as well as the structure of the study.

1.2 Background and problem statement

Political foundations and many other foreign organizations, including foreign governments, play a crucial role in the advancement of democracy and the rule of law in Africa.

The Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (KAS), a German political foundation, opened its office in South Africa in 1982. The political foundations were started as “part of a process to support the building of democracy in post-war Germany” (Smille, Helmich, German and Randel 1999:117). The overall aim of KAS is the promotion of freedom and liberty, peace, and justice as well as the consolidation of democracy. KAS collaborates with a variety of recipients to fulfil its mandate. These recipients are think-tanks; non-governmental organizations (NGOs), universities or individuals. KAS also funds political parties specifically for capacity training activities. KAS is prohibited to fund party election campaign activities.

KAS provides funding to its recipients for different activities like conferences, workshops or for research and publications. In some cases organizations apply to KAS for funding and in other cases KAS approaches organizations to cooperate on activities of mutual interest. However, sometimes KAS may approach an individual to conduct research on a topic that KAS is interested in. The recipients are dependent on KAS for funding, but, should KAS decline their proposal, they may approach other donors. However, if none of the donors accept their proposals as a result of lack of own funding, they may have to abandon the project. Unfortunately, if they abandon the project this deprives South Africans of the intervention and contribution that such a project could have achieved. The recipients will also be unable to achieve their own objectives. Dependence on donor
funding on the other hand, may lead to recipients doing what the donor wants and not what the recipients are interested in.

KAS refers to the recipients of its funding as partners. It views the relationship between itself and the recipients as a partnership. This is based on the premise that KAS, unlike most donors, does not initially advance funds to recipients and let them do projects and account for the funds at a specified time. It rather works together with recipients to ensure the success of the project, and the funds are disbursed as costs are incurred. During the life of the project there is constant engagement with the recipient not only to ensure the success of the project, but to also ensure that the recipient only incurs costs that KAS has agreed to fund, and in the case of there being some costs that KAS is not allowed to fund, the recipient is informed timeously. This funding approach has both advantages and disadvantages.

This research project interrogated how recipients of KAS view their relationship with KAS, and how this relationship may be improved.

For the purposes of this project the term ‘recipient’ was used to refer to all recipients of donor funding including those funded by KAS, despite KAS referring to them as ‘partners’.

1.3 Research motivation

The topic was selected to evaluate the relationship between Konrad Adenauer Stiftung and its recipients. It is important for KAS to know how its recipients perceive the relationship in order to improve their relationship. The results of this study can be applied to all donors, especially those who are also working in the democracy promotion field.

1.4 Main research questions

- What is the nature of the relationship between KAS and its recipients; and
- How can this relationship be improved.
1.4.1 Sub research questions

- Do both parties see their relationship as an equal partnership?
- How do they view the KAS funding model?
- Do they have plans to ensure sustainability if KAS funding is discontinued?

1.5 Research aim

To evaluate and recommend strategies to improve the relationship between KAS and its recipients.

1.6 Research objectives

The objectives of this study are:

- To generate information how the recipients perceive their relationship with KAS;
- To sensitise recipients to think of ways of ensuring sustainability should KAS funding discontinue; and
- Generally to improve the relationship between KAS and its recipients.

1.7 Research design and methods

The methodology that was used in this study is qualitative and the study is exploratory. Primary and secondary scholarly and technical documentation was assessed. Qualitative design and method also allows for expression in words. A questionnaire was constructed with open-ended questions and interviews were conducted with the executive director of selected KAS recipients or with a person responsible for a KAS funded project. The format of the interviews is semi-structured. Imas and Rist (2009:292) state that semi-structured interviews are often based on a predetermined set of broad questions, but the order of presenting them may depend on the circumstances. In a semi-structured interview a researcher can probe responses with additional questions developed during the interview. The interviews for the respondents who are based in Johannesburg were conducted face to face, while the interviews for Durban and Cape Town respondents were conducted telephonically.
The sampling strategy used was purposive sampling; its goal is to identify persons with knowledge and experience relevant to and sufficient for the evaluation purpose (Bamberger, Rugh and Mabry 2006:326). KAS works with a variety of recipients, some on a long term basis, others on short term projects and some are once-off engagements. There is a difference in the method of allocation of funds: some recipients’ funds are transferred directly and they produce invoices and proof of payments whereas others are reimbursed on the basis of receipts, or service providers are paid directly. The sample comprised of eight organizations who are recipients of KAS funds, two long-term recipients: the Democracy Development Programme (DDP) and the South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA). These two organizations have been working with KAS for over 10 years and they have partnership contracts with the KAS head office. The other six are the South African Institute for Advanced Constitutional, Public, Human Rights and International Law (SAIFAC), the St Augustine College of South Africa, the Impumelelo Social Innovations Centre, the Law Faculty of North-West University (Potchefstroom Campus), the Institute for democracy in South Africa (Idasa) and Sustainable Energy Africa (SEA); they all have contracts with the local KAS office. The main criterion for selecting the sample was that they must have been funded by KAS for a minimum of three years.

The period 2006-2011 was selected because it was during the term of one resident representative. As a result, there was consistency in the manner in which the activities of KAS and recipients were managed. The funding model and the mandate of KAS remains the same and are determined by the KAS head office, but the resident representative uses own prerogative when selecting recipients and when allocating funds.

The data was collated based on the responses given, and categorized accordingly. In order to ensure validity the interviewees were supplied with their interview transcripts in order to validate the information they had supplied.

1.8 Ethical considerations

The researcher is employed by KAS as a project manager. She, therefore, works directly with some of the respondents, but she was as objective as possible during the conducting of the interviews as well as in writing the final report. KAS was informed about
this research and permission to conduct the research was obtained from all parties concerned. All interviewees provided permission to be interviewed. They were informed about the purpose of the study and they were given access to the interview questions in advance if they required them. The findings of the research are meant to improve the recipients’ relationship with KAS therefore their honesty and objectivity would be beneficial to both parties. The researcher adhered to the University of Johannesburg’s Code of Academic and Research Ethics as well as the African Evaluation Guidelines.

1.9 Terminology

Partnership

Lister (2000:228) defines partnership as “a working relationship that is characterized by a shared sense of purpose, mutual respect and the willingness to negotiate”. Elements necessary for a successful partnership are mutual trust, mutual support, joint decision making, reciprocal accountability, financial transparency, recognition of other partnerships and long-term commitment (Lister 2000:228).

Democratic aid

Democratic aid also embraces democracy related or “good governance” programs, which include elections support, the strengthening of parliaments, judiciaries and political parties, and fostering the growth and power of “civil society organizations,” such as labor unions and women’s and human rights groups (Carothers, 1999:190).

Donor

Lewis (2003: 145) states “donors include governments, multilateral agencies, and private groups, such as foundations and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)”. Individuals commonly referred to as philanthropists also donate funds to worthy causes.

Recipient

According to (Hearn 2000:816), “aid is targeted at a country’s most influential, modern, advocacy-orientated civil society organs which include: women’s organisations, human
Rights groups, national or sectoral NGOs, business associations, private policy institutes, youth and student organisations, and professional media associations”.

1.10 Structure of the study

Chapter 1 - Introduction: Chapter one provides the background to the study including the problem statement, motivation, research questions, aim and objectives, research design and methods and ethical considerations.

Chapter 2 - Literature Review: Chapter two deals with programme evaluation as a management tool and also with the literature on donor funding, partnership and sustainability issues.

Chapter 3 - Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung: International cooperation: Chapter three focuses on the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung and its international cooperation. It gives background information about the foundation, its work worldwide and also summarises its work in South Africa.

Chapter 4 - Findings and Analysis: Chapter four presents the analysis and assessment of the interview data.

Chapter 5 - Conclusions and Recommendations: Chapter five presents the conclusions and recommendations. It also includes a summary of documentary analyses and a summary of interview data, as well as, the benefits of the study.

1.11 Conclusion

This chapter introduced the background to the study and the problem statement. It also introduced the research questions, research aims, motivation, research design and methods and the structure of the study.

Chapter two comprises a core literature review.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

South Africa, like many other countries on the African Continent, has for many years benefitted from donor funding for diverse projects. This chapter focuses on the literature on donor funding, specifically dealing with political foundations as donors as well as with recipients of their funding. Firstly, it deals with programme evaluation as a management tool, the uses of evaluation, challenges of evaluating the effectiveness of aid, democracy assistance: political or developmental, political foundations as interest groups, recipient-donor relations – who lays down the rules, partnership in donor funding, models of partnership, weak or strong, aid accountability and conditionality, ownership in recipient-donor relations, sustainability, donor-exit strategies, the origins of German political foundations, Germany as a member of OECD and the conclusion.

2.2 Programme evaluation as a management tool

Programme evaluation is essential in any organization. Evaluation is a higher-order management function that must not be seen only as an add-on, but rather as a critical element of management. In most organizations budgeting is seen as very important and personnel dealing with finances are part of management. Therefore, an evaluation is necessary because its results have a bearing on the budget. Monitoring and evaluation complement each other. It is impossible to say which is more important because they are simply interdependent. Kusek and Rist (2010:100) state that “a results-based monitoring and evaluation system can help policy-makers answer the fundamental questions of whether promises were kept and outcomes achieved”. In most instances a project is designed and implemented to provide a service to a community in order to fulfil a need, like providing a rural community with tap water. However, the only way in which we can know that the quality of life is improved is by conducting an evaluation. The community members will determine if their quality of life has improved and also if they are satisfied with the service.

Kusek and Rist (2004:114) list three complementarities of monitoring and evaluation: “sequential complementarity” in which “monitoring information can generate questions to be subsequently answered by an evaluation...” Secondly, “information complementarity”,
according to which monitoring and evaluation can use the same information but ask different questions and come up with different conclusions. Thirdly, “interactional complementarity”, monitoring and evaluation are used together in organizations when designing proposals. The following section deals with the uses of evaluation.

2.2.1 Uses of evaluation

Evaluation can assist managers in their budgeting and planning. It helps them to prioritize issues. Kusek and Rist (2004:115-116) list six uses of evaluation:

- evaluation can assist managers in deciding which programmes need more resources;
- through evaluation, managers can look at a problem with a different perspective: evaluation will help them to determine the cause of the problem;
- evaluation can assist managers to identify new problems;
- can assist managers in choosing the best alternative when faced with competing decisions – usually, managers are faced with many problems and sometimes it’s difficult to ascertain which solution is the best; conducting pilot studies can assist with solutions;
- evaluation can be used to provide evidence to citizens that government efforts to deal with problems are working;
- evaluation can help to bring consensus between government and stakeholders on the causes of a problem as well as possible solutions.

Evaluation can achieve good results if the evaluator is impartial and he/she is given the space to do the work without pressure from any stakeholders. An evaluator works well if there is cooperation with stakeholders in the organization. According to Rakodi (1982:136), “evaluation may be located within an implementing agency, either in the form of an evaluation unit or consultants employed by the agency, although the need to be concerned with the sensitivity of management in this situation could significantly reduce the value of information obtained and publicized”. An evaluation of the relationship between a donor and recipients of its funding is necessary. Firstly, it will help to improve the relationship between the two parties. Secondly, it may help the recipients to think about ways of sustaining their organizations should the donor discontinue funding. In
most instances NGOs collapse when donors discontinue funding because the recipients would not have prepared themselves for such a time.

According to the DAC the main issues to be evaluated in development activities are:

- “The relevance of the intervention and the extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor”;  
- “The effectiveness of the intervention in achieving its purpose and the extent to which the achievement of the purpose can be attributed to the intervention”;  
- “The efficiency of the intervention in terms of the inputs used to achieve the outputs”;  
- “The intended and unintended impact of the intervention and any contribution to achieving the overall goal”; and  
- The sustainability of the project once funding is stopped (Better aid-Managing aid: Practices of DAC member countries 2009:86)

2.2.2 Challenges of evaluating the effectiveness of aid

It is necessary, however, to evaluate the effectiveness of aid; Green and Kohl (2007:153-154) list the four issues that pose challenges when evaluating the effectiveness of aid:

- there are a number of actors who may have an interest in the results, among others, the donors and the legislative bodies and taxpayers who are interested in knowing whether they get value for their money and also if the programmes have impact;  
- donors lack both financial and human resources to conduct research. In reality, many donors, as a result of financial constraints, would rather allocate more funds to projects than to evaluation;  
- “donor agencies need to be able to connect policy with practice”; this is as a result of evaluation being conducted by a separate department and the actual programmes being run by another. Lack of institutional memory is also a problem that is brought about by high staff turnover: staff who were present when past evaluations were conducted may have left, and there is no continuity; and  
- using local or foreign researchers has both positives and negatives. On the positive side local researchers have expertise on the country; on the negative side they may not be familiar with the donor’s interests and priorities. Whereas foreign
researchers have no expertise on the country, but they may be more familiar with the donor needs.

According to Nielsen and Nielsion (2008: 6), the effectiveness of democracy aid can be seen through an improvement in the essential features of democracy; among others: free and fair periodic elections; a functioning judicial system that is accessible to all citizens; respect for the rule of law; freedom of speech as well as freedom of association. Easterly (2008:437) states that “donors rarely measure results, so there is little historical systematic information about what works and what does not”.

The next section deals with democracy assistance and it differentiates between political or developmental.

2.3 Democracy assistance: political or developmental

Burnell (2000:36) states that the origins of democracy assistance are linked to the German political foundations which, in the 1990s, had resident representatives in more than 100 countries and had field offices for over 30 years in some countries. Carothers (2009:1) differentiates between the two types of democracy assistance, namely political versus developmental. He states that the political approach proceeds from a relatively narrow conception of democracy it focuses on elections and political freedom. It “directs aid at core political processes and institutions – especially elections, political parties, and politically oriented civil society groups – often at important conjectural moments and with the hope of catalytic effects” (Carothers 2009:1). The developmental approach views democracy in a broader sense, focusing on issues of equality and justice that take place over a period of time and involve socio-economic and political developments. The following section focuses on political foundations as interest groups.

2.4 Political foundations as interest groups

A political foundation is a policy interest group that aims at promoting democracy worldwide through working with recipients in different countries. Wilson (1990:1) defines interest groups as “organizations, separate from though often in close partnership with government, which attempt to influence public policy”. Members of an interest group are people who share common interests or views. In South Africa in many cities there are
Ratepayers Associations whose members come together because of their dissatisfaction with service delivery and who have an interest to make improvements in their communities. In most cases these people belong to different political parties however, as a result of their common interest they belong to the Ratepayers Association. Interest groups have a fluid character; an organization may not be functioning as an interest group this year, but may function as an interest group the following year (Wilson 1990:9).

Heywood (2000:222) defines a “pressure or interest group as an organised association which aims to influence the policies or actions of government”. Bekker (1996:31) states that the involvement of a pressure or interest group is not limited to advancing the interests of a specific group. These groups can be classified on the basis of their relationship to government; others are insider, and some are outsider groups. Insider groups enjoy privileges and usually, institutionalised access to government through routine consultation and representation on government bodies.

Outsider groups, on the other hand, are either not consulted by government or consulted only irregularly. Bryce (2005:66) asserts that “as an agent of public policy a nonprofit may perform one or more of the following functions at the same time: it may be involved in policy investigation and development, policy formulation and advocacy, and/or policy implementation and evaluation”. Interest groups provide an alternative form of participation from political parties and may at times be superior to political parties. They may achieve results quicker, and some of the issues they raise may be too specific to be the concern of political parties. The advantage of being an outsider group is that they are not afraid to raise complex issues that make government uncomfortable, as they focus their attention on achieving own goals.

According to Wilson (1990:4), some of the advantages of interest groups are that they:

- help to educate citizens about democratic values;
- can encourage citizens to participate in electoral politics by helping them to build confidence in a small group;
- teach members about tolerance and respect for people with opposing views; and
- may improve public policy and improve the political system by providing an alternative to a political party or to voting (Wilson 1990:27).
Political parties and interest groups work together; strong political parties need strong interest groups to function well. The difference between political parties and interest groups is that political parties participate in elections and have an interest to win elections and become part of government whereas interest groups in most instances are not interested in participating in elections. Though in some instances, interest groups may at some stage decide to participate in the electoral process if its members see that there is potential for them to win the elections and take over governance in their local municipality.

Easterly (2008:49) asserts that “the donor will typically work with one or more local organizations, be it government departments or NGOs”. Brunt and McCourt (2012:587) state that the success of development activities is determined by the participation of locals in their design and implementation. Locals are the ones who understand their needs and the needs of their communities better than outsiders. They can even come up with solutions for any problems they may be experiencing. It is advisable for donors to engage locals when designing projects, this also helps to empower communities. An added benefit of engaging locals is that they will feel that they have ownership of the project. The following section deals with the complex nature of the relationship between donors and recipients.

2.5 Recipient-donor relations – who lays down the rules?

The relationship between recipients and donors is complex. Sogge (2002:13) states “yet, as many have repeatedly observed, official aid is ultimately just another instrument to project power beyond national borders, a tool of foreign policy”. He furthers asserts that “foreign aid is not about beneficence, but about power” (Sogge 2002:13). The power referred to here, is strengthened by money. Considering that in most instances recipients cannot perform their work without the donors’ funds, already there seems to be an unequal relationship. The donors determine the terms of the relationship because of possession of funds (Parks 2008:217).

Reith (2010:447) interrogates this issue further and states that the NGO-donor relationship is such that “NGOs place value on money, which they see as essential for their ability to work towards their mission and ultimate survival, and donors’ value the
same money for the ability it gives them to influence development in the direction of their own agendas”. Recipients can be studied as agents implementing the conditions desired by donors, who are the principals (Killick, 1996, 1997, in White and Morrisey 1997:497). Fehnel (1995:383) states that the critical issue is whether it’s the donors or recipients who define the problem and chart the way forward. Donors take the initiative because they seem to have the experience and resources needed to answer questions that may arise in the planning stages, or because they already have preferred programmes that fall in line with their funding criteria. At times, recipients don’t have an interest in a specific topic, or they lack expertise, but they will continue with the topic because donors are interested in funding such. Recipients are well-versed with the communities they live in and they know the needs of the communities and the problems they may be facing, but they will still focus on what the donor suggests and not pursue pressing issues that are the real priorities. Bebbington, Hickey and Mitlin (2008: 18) state that “NGOs have helped to raise important issues and lay the foundations for progress”.

Mebrahtu, Pratt and Lonnqvist (2007:28) state: “there are exceptions but a significant proportion of African CSO representatives view INGO as neo-imperialists, disproportionately controlling international aid resources and forever playing the dominant role in response to African humanitarian crises”. They view the INGO as being more accountable to their countries and they do not see them as prioritizing local issues (Mebrahtu et al 2007:28).

Donor strategies and priorities change from time to time and recipients may find themselves in a difficult position when such happens. Sometimes NGOs are forced to change their priorities and activities to match the donors in a desperate attempt to acquire funding (Parks 2008:214). The following section focuses on partnership in donor funding.

2.6 Partnership in donor funding

The relationship between the donor and recipient must be guided by some form of partnership to avoid problems. The Paris Declaration sets out five ‘partnership commitments’:
ownership-partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies and strategies and coordinate development actions;

alignment-donors base their overall support on partner countries’ national development strategies, institutions and procedures;

harmonization-donors’ actions are more harmonised, transparent and collectively effective;

managing for results and improving decision-making for results;

mutual accountability-donors and partners are accountable for development results” (OECD 2005 in Whitfield 2009: 83-84).

Reith (2010: 449) asserts that “donors have a prerogative to find suitable partners to work with and ensure that the funds can be used in the most time and cost efficient manner”, this shows that donors have a choice when allocating funds and in most cases, donors cannot manage without local recipients.

The donor-recipient relationship seems unequal in nature because the donors have funds that the recipient needs, and without which they are unable to do their work. In some instances, some recipients depend on donor funds for their salaries and if they do not have funds, they are unable to provide for their families. In essence, the recipient feels obliged to do only what the donor wants and they may even be afraid to ask questions which may be uncomfortable for the donors. Donors have the upper hand to decide which projects to take on, “while the history of the aid industry has been full of commitments to focus on recipients’ priorities, the motives and structures of donors continue to drive the way aid is given…” (de Haan 2009:9). Whitfield (2009:84) states that “donors still have the final say over whether recipient plans are approved or rejected”. There is inequality in the donor-recipient relationship, with the donor disbursing funds and the recipient accepting them.

Reith (2010:448) asserts that because donors have money they are in a position to control how the NGO work, therefore there is no partnership but rather there is control and sponsorship. Maxwell and Ridell (1998:257) state that “partnership is not only about information-sharing and formal policy dialogue, but also specific commitments on both sides: on the recipient side, to fulfil undertakings and use aid efficiently, and, on the donor side, to meet aid commitments and reward good performance”. It is necessary that
both parties enter into an agreement in terms of their expectations of each other. Brunt and McCourt (2012:587) define partnership as a joint commitment to long-term engagement. Partners must have mutual respect, share equal responsibility and there must be good working relations between donors and the recipients of aid. Partnership must also involve a shared responsibility for failure (Reith 2010:447). Unfortunately, in most instances, recipients are held accountable if projects fail and the donor does not take responsibility as well. A true partnership, therefore, must take equal responsibility for both failure and success.

Pickard (2007:575) states that “partnership denotes a special relationship between equal participants or, yes, partners, who enjoy a distinctive bond of trust, a shared analysis of existing conditions in society, and thus in general a common orientation of what needs to be done to construct a more just, equitable and democratic world”. There must be ongoing engagement between the donor and recipient to take joint decisions on projects of mutual interest as well as ensuring that the projects achieve good results. In this ongoing engagement, both parties will be able to identify areas where there are challenges, and speedily resolve issues before they escalate into bigger problems. At times projects fail because of the lack of engagement from both donors and recipients. Recipients at times submit budgets that are not adequate to cover project expenses fully and they realise when they are halfway through the project that the funds will not be sufficient. When they inform the donor that they need more funding, the donor first becomes suspicious that there may have been misappropriation of funds. Had there been ongoing engagement, a donor would be aware at the start of the project cycle that the funds would not be sufficient to cover all expenses.

Arnold (1979:128) states that “as individual countries and groups of aid recipients struggle to master their problems, they often find that they have to accept the pronouncements of the donors on the ways and means they must adopt for their development: they are, after all, the weaker partners in the relationship”. There is overwhelming evidence which seems to suggest that the recipient toes the line of the donor as a result of lack of own funds. While on paper and in theory it may seem that both parties signed a partnership agreement, the reality is that the recipient is the less important partner. Donors on the other hand, also claim to have their own frustrations if
recipients use funds where they were not intended, thus putting donors in a difficult position to explain to their head office about the misuse of funds.

Money has power in any relationship and the donor-recipient relationship is no different. Wallace, Bornstein and Chapman (2006:4) state that “power is often mentioned but rarely analysed in NGO relationships, yet the funders define the rules and regulations to which NGOs must adhere”. While it is understandable that donors want to define the rules and regulations because they are investing money, it becomes problematic when they do not engage the NGOs when designing programmes/projects. The phrase ‘African solutions for African problems’ is very important here; in most instances the NGOS would know the kind of problems that are experienced by their communities and in some cases they may even suggest some workable solutions. Sogge (2002:167) asserts that “…local people had the impression that aid took no account of their priorities”. This is true of donor-recipient partnerships as well, even though donors bring money and sometimes also bring some expertise, the recipients provide home-grown solutions and they have a better chance of mobilising their communities than donors do. Partners must accommodate each other’s strengths and weaknesses. Partnerships can be weak or strong depending on the parties and the circumstances involved.

In the following section the focus is on the models of partnership.

2.6.1 Models of partnership: weak or strong

Maxwell and Ridell (1998:260) differentiate between “two models of partnership, the weak and the strong one. The components of the weak partnership are information sharing and policy dialogue and the components of a strong partnership are jointly agreed country programmes and multi-annual financial agreements” (Maxwell and Ridell 1998:260). The weak partnership characterises many donor-recipient relationships. It is easy for both donors and recipients to engage in information sharing sessions and also to engage in dialogue on diverse topics. In most instances, donors are not from the communities they fund therefore they rely on recipients to provide them with information about life in the community and to provide them with information about key players in such communities. Recipients are equally interested to have the information sharing
sessions because they always want establish if donors are satisfied with the work they are engaged in, and iron out any issues that are not pleasing to the donors.

The strong partnership model is difficult to achieve in many recipient-donor relationships, especially because it involves money. The multi-annual financial agreement would make many recipient organizations' work easy as they are then in a position to plan ahead and engage in meaningful projects that have impact. Franklin (2009:791) states that if development agencies are serious about partnerships they must not only focus on achieving stated objectives or on building institutional partnerships, they must also ensure that there is fairness and cooperation when working with others. Recipients will benefit from this partnership; it will enhance their confidence and they will be able to engage openly with the donor and criticize where necessary, knowing that they are protected by a partnership contract. In instances where there is no partnership, the donor dictates terms and makes decisions unilaterally. Recipients, therefore, do not have the platform to give inputs or state if they are dissatisfied.

It is necessary for all donor-recipient relationships to have some kind of partnership. Any type of partnership shows both parties that there is an element of mutual interest and respect for the other's views. Most, if not all aid, is given with accountability and some conditionality; the following section focuses on this subject.

2.7 Aid accountability and conditionality

The aid relationship is characterised by some form of accountability and conditionality from donors to recipients. Such accountability and conditionality is aimed at ensuring that recipients deliver on agreed targets and also that donor funds are used for the intended and agreed purposes. Whitfield (2009:87) states that “despite significant change in the planning process, conditionality remains a central technology of contemporary aid architecture, supplemented by the continuing use of funding tranches, deepening surveillance of recipients, increased donor coordination, more extensive participation of donors in the policymaking process…”

It seems, in some cases, donors do not trust recipients to manage own affairs and to do own planning. This is presumably worse when donors are dealing with small rural NGOs
(where there is lack of qualified personnel) as opposed to dealing with big NGOs or think tanks; it is not necessary to hold their hand throughout. In most instances such organizations understand what is expected of them and they have expertise in doing their own planning.

Wallace et al (2006:2) state that “for funding going via NGOs, donors have heightened their control through new conditions, tighter selectivity and growing demands for accountability, these last encoded in specific management procedures and practices”.

Recipients who are working with donors who always want to interfere in their work must be frustrated because of donor expectation, as compared to their own interests. Some of the rural NGOs who have very low levels of education or are illiterate may struggle to understand the terminology used by donors. In most instances NGO staff in the rural areas comprises volunteers or people from the community. The donors equally have their own frustrations; they may feel that if they are not actively involved, recipients may misappropriate funds or use the funds for costs they did not agree to.

Wallace et al (2006:2) further assert that “we believe that the way aid is disbursed affects the implementation of NGO policies on the ground and shapes the way they work, that is, their development practise and this may limit the positive impacts which are supposed to emanate from the work of NGOs”. NGOs may find themselves spending a lot of time working on information needed by the donors, instead of doing the real work. The manner in which some donors disburse funds, for instance, on a cost incurring basis, may also hamper or delay the NGO in doing its work. At times, the donor may delay paying service providers who in turn will not provide a service to the NGO.

Bebbington et al (2008: 21) state that though the NGO may be adequately funded, the conditions tied to the funding may constrain them to come up with own initiatives. Civil society mostly comprises people who seek the common good and social activists who aim at improving the livelihood of the community. Of course, some of the methods they use to achieve their aims may not align with the donor principles or regulations. In some instances, donors specify the kind of activities they can fund, for instance, there are few donors who would fund transport to take people to a protest march. These funding conditions can therefore be frustrating for recipients who are only interested in doing their work.
The following section focuses on ownership in recipient-donor relations.

### 2.8 Ownership in recipient-donor relations

The question is: who has ownership of projects – recipient or donor? The donors have invested their funds but the recipients, it can be assumed, are the ones who initiated the project and therefore can claim ownership. Whitfield (2009: 5) states that "where donors do not wish to allow aid recipients a free hand in deciding what to do with aid, we argue, they should refrain from using the term ownership and admit to, justify, their own attempts at influence". Ownership of a project on its own is motivation enough for recipients to work to ensure they achieve the intended objectives. People are more likely to give freely of their time and labour when they know that the project belongs to them or their community. Unfortunately, in most cases, donors claim ownership of projects because they have invested their money.

Kayizzi-Mugwera (1998:223) states that “there must be a code of conduct for the donor partner. This code includes avoidance of sudden shifts of mood: no new elements should be introduced once an agreement is reached. Partners must commit themselves to conditions for cooperation”. There must be agreement with regard to division of responsibility, and the donor must not take over processes and responsibilities from the recipient unless in the case where there is evidence of misappropriation of funds.

Sustainability is a critical issue, but it is neglected by many recipients. The following section deals with sustainability.

### 2.9 Sustainability

Donor funding is aimed at assisting recipients in the short term, until they can sustain themselves. Fehnel (1995:382) states that “development policies, programmes and projects are launched – almost always with the expectation that they will be sustained by recipient organizations – to improve the lives of citizens”. According to Easterly (2008:259), aid is intended to provide temporary financial aid. Therefore, ideally, recipients must always be prepared and have some capital set aside for the time when
donors discontinue funding. In reality, the majority of recipient organizations do not initiate measures to create sustainability; they become complacent until funding is discontinued and they are forced to close their organizations.

Even though many recipients’ organizations shut down when funding is discontinued, it seems that others do not learn from that experience. Bebbington et al. (2008: 21) state that most NGOs are faced with financial constraints and they spend a lot of their time looking for funding. This is indeed true, however, while NGOs source funding they are also supposed to be thinking of ways of generating own income. For instance, recipients may start with cost-saving measures by charging a small fee for delegates when they attend their seminars or workshops, and they may also stop providing refreshments at events.

There are NGOs who provide training for different sectors with donor funding. They could charge a facilitation fee and use the funds to be self-sufficient, or to partly use donor funding. Cassen (1994:165) asserts that “donors are of course aware of the need for recipient countries to develop self-reliance”. On the one hand, some donors will encourage and be willing to give advice on measures to generate own income and ensure sustainability. On the other, some may not be happy because if recipients become sustainable then they won’t need them anymore.

Easterly (2008:437) criticizes donors who in “some programs do not build in plans for sustainability”. It is true that recipients are expected and even encouraged to create sustainability, but some donors do not like it when recipients charge fees to delegates attending seminars. Herbert (2005:53) criticizes donors that they are not necessarily focused on achieving performance, rather they use aid to boost national prestige and to create an impression that they care for the poor as a result they do not care about helping recipients to be sustainable. There are many examples where NGOs had to shut down after funding was discontinued and they couldn’t source alternative funding. It is critical for recipients to identify and implement ways of making investments for own survival and sustainability.

The following section focuses on exit strategies by donors.
2.10 Donor exit strategies

Development assistance is not intended to be permanent. Donors provide funding for a determined time and it is expected that at some point they will stop funding. However, donors need to be sensitive to the recipients when exiting the recipient countries or organizations. There are lessons that donors can use when exiting partner countries:

- the exit strategy is likely to be accepted if the politicians are informed first;
- the exit strategy will be smooth if stakeholders are involved in its planning and implementation;
- the exit strategy must also include consideration of the sustainability of the project;
- donors must consider honouring ongoing projects until completion;
- it is imperative that the donor assist the recipients to secure alternative funding and where possible, the donor may adjust the budget in order to support the recipients;
- donors may assist the recipients with capacity building to ensure that projects will continue after the exit;
- donors still need to learn how to manage the exit better, and even in instances where the exit is managed well, donors are not rewarded (Better Aid: Managing Aid Practices of DAC Member Countries 2009:54-55).

The following section deals with the origins of German political foundations.

2.11 Origins of German political foundations

Political foundations are semi-governmental actors created to support the advancement of democracy (Scott 1999:148). They depend on their governments for funding but they are not staffed by bureaucratic staff (Scott 1999:48). Mair (2000:129) states that “the foundations were originally established to provide the German people with civic education and to assist the political parties in the fulfilment of their functions”. The German political foundations have different values “the FES is particularly committed to social democratic values, the KAS and HSS to Christian and federal democratic values, the FNS to liberal and the Green foundations to ecological and emancipatory values” (Mair 2000:134).
According to Pinto-Duschinsky (1991:33), the Friedrich Ebert Foundation (Stiftung) was originally founded in 1925 but was banned by the Nazis in 1933, and re-established by the Social Democrats in 1947. The Konrad Adenauer Foundation was formed by the Christian Democrats in 1956, the Friedrich Naumann Foundation was formed by the Free Democrats in 1958, and the Hanns Seidel Foundation was formed in 1967 by the Bavarian Christian Social Union.

The foundations have two mandates, the official one and the informal one. With regard to the official one, they aim at “providing support to partners who have a structurally important contribution to make to the realization of social justice, the promotion of broad political participation and to the strengthening of national political independence in accordance with the aims laid down in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights” (Mair 2000:131).

The role of political foundations in providing civic education to the citizens of Germany has inculcated a democratic culture. Germany therefore wishes to see this democratic culture imported to countries where it is needed (Mair 2000:131). The informal mandate is a foreign policy instrument that is useful to the foundations and to the political parties they work with. Pinto-Duschinsky (1991:33) further asserts that the political foundations are able to take up international political projects because they are funded from public subsidies. The foundations apply for funding from the Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, but they must also be approved by the Foreign Ministry. Mair (2000:129) states that the basis for funding a political foundation is dependent on the condition that the party it is affiliated to gains representation in parliament in at least two successive elections.

According to Mohr (2010:19), “political foundations are actors in democracy assistance and democracy assistance is defined as the policy aimed at helping third world countries build institutions of democratic governance; support pluralism in the shape of multiparty politics; freedom of expression and independent media; promote and protect human rights, and work towards establishing the rule of law”. De Zeeuw (2004: 4) states that democracy assistance consists of the following factors:
Providing support during elections including the organization of elections as well as technical assistance to the electoral commission and assistance with regard to the development of political parties;

Providing support with regard to governance including ensuring that there are reforms in parliament, the judiciary, and in the public sector; and

Providing support to civil society by assisting NGOs with advocacy as well as supporting labour unions and the media.

Nielsen and Nielson (2008:3) state that “the fall of the Soviet Union ushered in a decade of foreign aid aimed squarely at promoting democracy”. Knack (2004:252) states that many foreign governments prioritize the promotion of democracy when allocating funds for aid. Democracy is generally associated with a growing economy, improved socio-economic conditions, better health care, the rule of law, etc. It is indeed true that during elections quite a few African countries receive funding to ensure that the elections are free and fair. Local and international observers come in their numbers to ensure that elections are conducted smoothly; however, this alone won’t sustain a democracy and ensure that it matures. Continuous engagement is necessary to ensure that democratic processes prevail and that all aspects necessary for a democracy to thrive are in place.

The following section focuses on Germany as a member of the OECD.

2.12 Germany as a member of the OECD

Germany is a member of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). It is a unique forum where the governments of 30 democracies work together to address the economic, social and environmental challenges of globalisation. The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD “remains a forum where we as donors can share lessons, work to improve our practices, change the way we work and make our aid more effective” (Better Aid: Managing Aid Practices of DAC Member Countries 2009:3).

The DAC member countries cooperate with CSOs by funding their development related activities or by engaging them to execute activities on behalf of DAC members (Better Aid: Managing Aid Practices of DAC Member Countries 2009:64). The members have
noticed that NGOs have a high profile and sometimes the public is more aware of what the NGOs do than what government development agencies do. Partnerships with local NGOs are, therefore, important as these NGOs are able to reach out to communities more easily than the government development agencies. This is because the staff of NGOs in partner countries is local, and donors can work through the NGOs if they are obliged to suspend operations in any country.

Donors prefer working with or through CSOs for a variety of reasons:

- they have the ability to mobilise grassroots;
- they monitor government performance and suggest policy options;
- they form networks and coalitions among themselves to provide a service to citizens and enhance their impact;
- CSOs in developed and developing countries partner with each other to influence the developed country to provide more resources to developing countries; and
- CSOs assist citizens with a platform to raise their concerns or dissatisfaction with their socio-economic or political conditions.

(Better Aid: Managing Aid Practices of DAC Member Countries 2009: 64).

The OECD/DAC puts evaluation at the centre of donor funding. According to the OECD/DAC, evaluation is a “systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results” (Better Aid: Managing Aid Practices of DAC Member Countries 2009: 3). The aim of an evaluation is to determine the relevance of the project; fulfilment of objectives, whether they achieve impact, and to see if the project is sustainable (Better Aid: Managing Aid Practices of DAC Member Countries 2009: 3). The information that is provided by an evaluation assists both donors and recipients to improve their work, and also promotes accountability.

2.13 Conclusion

Political foundations have contributed to the promotion of democracy through democracy assistance efforts. However, the full extent of their contribution is not known because of an absence of programme evaluation systems. Donors need to be considerate and acknowledge the value of the recipients of funding. Partnership, instead of aid with conditionality, can help both donors and especially recipients of funding, to grow. It
seems, in most instances, that donors dictate to recipients of funding because donors have the money and recipients need the money to do their work.

In Chapter three the focus will be on KAS, a German political foundation.
CHAPTER THREE

THE KONRAD ADENAUER STIFTUNG: INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

3.1 Introduction

The Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (KAS) is one of the six German political foundations that aim at the promotion of democracy in Germany and worldwide. Its office in South Africa was opened in 1982 and it works with diverse recipients to fulfil its mandate. Both donors and recipients need each other. KAS views the relationship with its recipients as a partnership. The partnership is managed through having open engagement with its partners.

The following section focuses on the international cooperation work of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung.

3.2 Konrad Adenauer Stiftung: International Cooperation

KAS is a German political foundation that was established in 1956. It is closely related to the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) but is legally distinct from it, and does not rely on the party for its funds. It is named after Konrad Adenauer who was “the first and founding chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany” (Osterheld 1996:5). KAS is in charge of “over 200 projects in more than 120 countries. The foundation’s headquarters are situated in Sankt Augustin near Bonn, and also in Berlin”. The civic education programmes of KAS aims at “promoting freedom and liberty, peace, and justice” (http://www.kas.de/wf/en/71.3628/).

KAS is one of six German political foundations that were established to promote democracy worldwide through political education. The others are the Friedrich Naumann Stiftung, Hanns Seidel Stiftung, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Heinrich Boell Stiftung and Rosa Luxembourg Stiftung (Mair 2000:129).

According to Smille et al (1999:117), “funding for political foundations is decided by a Parliamentary Budget Committee and comes from three ministries. For development cooperation overseas, it comes from the BMZ, for political education in Germany it
comes from the Ministry of Interior and for Central and Eastern Europe and for scholarship programmes it comes from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and BMZ”.

The political foundations are free to use own prerogative when selecting recipients and projects, once the budget is approved by BMZ (*Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung*). Thesing (1999:11) asserts that the foundations are privileged to be able to choose own partners without interference from their funder. Youngs (2003: 136) states that “the Stiftungen themselves profess a growing adherence to bottom-up approaches, focused on what they perceive as the ‘softer’ projects covering cultural co-operation, social and economic rights and civil society training programmes”.

The thematic priorities of the BMZ’s priority area of “democracy, civil society, public administration” are:

- “Human rights (general, women’s and children’s)”;
- “Promoting democracy and political participation”;  
- “Promoting the rule of law”;
- “Promoting decentralisation, local governance, urban and municipal development”;
- “Promoting good financial governance, anti-corruption and transparency”.


Thesing (1999:6) asserts that international cooperation is one of the most important priorities of the foundation, which uses approximately half of its budget to finance international cooperation activities. Germany values its relationship with Africa. Boesl (2010:3) states that Africa is a strategically important continent that should not be reduced to a charitable case. KAS has nine field offices in Africa: in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Kenya, Tanzania, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda and Zimbabwe. It also has three regional programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: the Media Programme Sub-Saharan Africa, the Promotion of Democracy in West Africa programme, and the Rule of Law Programme ([http://www.kas.de/wf/en/71.4783/](http://www.kas.de/wf/en/71.4783/)).

Boesl (2010:3) further asserts that German policy on Africa must be not be characterized by contributing more funds, but rather by using funds in a more effective and purposeful manner. This is the reason KAS does not just advance funds to recipients, but rather the
staff of KAS works together with recipients to ensure that KAS funds are used for the agreed costs as stated in the partnership agreement, and also to guarantee that the funds are used in an efficient manner. KAS views the recipients of its funding as partners because of their continuous engagement with the recipients on projects, and also allows recipients to decide on projects in which they are interested, thus not being dictated to by KAS. Boesl (2010:4) contends that Germany must aim for “a partnership with Africa that is not characterised by the conventional donor-recipient logic, but by a symmetrical and equal relationship, requires that African states and players take explicit responsibility for their actions”. Germany would like to assist Africa but at the same time would also like to see that Africans hold their governments to account and that civil society and other important players in society play a meaningful role of ensuring that democratic processes prevail. Africans have the power and expertise to demand accountability from their leaders.

According to Hearn (2000:820), “the aim of the German Konrad Adenauer Foundation is to strengthen democracy in people’s minds”. It achieves this objective by hosting conferences/seminars and workshops on diverse topics that encourage debate among various stakeholders. KAS also funds research on topical issues, which is aimed at improving people’s lives and contributing to dialogue. The KAS offers a variety of scholarships which aim to promote qualified young people and grant them opportunities for postgraduate study in diverse disciplines including politics, international relations, journalism, law and economics. The KAS alumni is the pride of the Foundation; after completion of their studies, these young people work for governments in their home countries, some work for missions abroad, others work in the private sector. They become important people in society, contributing to society in meaningful ways.

The following section deals with KAS as a foreign donor.

3.3 KAS as foreign donor

Foreign donors are sometimes perceived as untrustworthy, as pretending to care about the needs of the third world countries, whereas they are only interested in their own aims or mandates from their governments. As (Mebrahtu et al 2007:28) state, “there are exceptions but a significant proportion of African CSO representatives view INGOs as
neo-imperialists, disproportionately controlling international aid resources and forever playing the dominant role in response to African humanitarian crises”. Furthermore, INGOs are criticized that they are more accountable to their home countries than to Africa. They ensure that they achieve the mandates of their governments, not really caring about African problems.

KAS is also viewed in a suspicious manner in some circles, but in most cases it is well accepted and respected. Der Spiegel (2012) concludes that “regimes in authoritarian countries, in particular, quickly come to suspect the Foundations of working against them”. It is important for foreign donors to prioritize their relations with local recipients, to have acceptance and respect in the country. KAS in South Africa has tried on numerous occasions to engage the African National Congress by inviting the ruling party to its events, but the response is mostly negative. However, some government officials and ministers have addressed some KAS funded events, mostly through invitation by local partners.

During apartheid times, South African civil society benefitted a lot from donor funds. Donors worldwide sympathised with South Africans and wanted to assist to fight apartheid. Weissenbach (2010:1239) asserts that Nelson Mandela appreciated the support of donors in the fight against apartheid; he visited the FES and the SPD (Social Democratic Party) in Germany four months after his release to show his gratitude. The advent of democracy saw some donors leaving South Africa as they felt that their job was done; however, KAS still has a presence in South Africa. A former resident representative of KAS once mentioned that Germany sees South Africa as a very important country on the African continent.

The following section focuses on KAS in South Africa.

3.4 KAS in South Africa

The office of KAS in South Africa was opened in 1982, during apartheid times. KAS was therefore already working within South Africa when the country attained freedom. Prior to freedom, the apartheid government was considered illegitimate. Kragelund (2011:589) states that as a result, before 1994, South Africa received aid from bilateral donors who
did not recognize the incumbent government’s institutions. Civil society therefore benefitted a lot from such funding. According to Hearn and Robinson (2000:250), South Africa is the most important African country for the German political foundations: their largest programmes are in South Africa. Hearn (2000: 822) asserts that “after 1994 the primary focus of Konrad Adenauer Foundation was influencing the design of the final South African constitution as this would affect the whole political framework of the country”. KAS brought constitutional law experts from Germany to assist with the drafting of the Constitution of South Africa. The South African constitution has some similarities to the German one. It was fitting for South Africa to emulate the German constitution because both countries come from a painful past of segregation, therefore both constitutions needed to address the inequalities of the past.

KAS funds research on diverse topics and it also provides funding for publishing books on important issues, among others, *Zunami – the South African Elections of 2009; Local Elections in South Africa – Parties, People and Politics; Paying for Politics: Party funding and political change in South Africa and the Global South; and Public Opinion and Interest Group Politics: South Africa’s Missing Links*. Some of these books are used by policymakers and others are prescribed for students at diverse institutions of higher learning.

The recipients whom KAS works with are mostly urban-based and their staff component, both senior management as well as junior staff, mostly have university qualifications. It is therefore not necessary to participate in their planning processes because they have expertise in doing own planning. In terms of democracy assistance, Dietrich (2012:4) states “there are four main categories of nonstate development actors: local/international NGOs, multilateral organizations, public-private partnerships, and “other”, which subsumes a host of categories such as private contracting businesses, research facilities, and international networks”. Indeed, in South Africa KAS works with a variety of recipients to fulfil its mandate. In some instances KAS approaches a recipient with a proposal to work together on a conference/workshop or to write a paper on a specified topic. However, in most instances KAS receives numerous proposals from organizations or individuals who are interested to work with KAS and access funding from KAS. KAS not only gets requests for funding; some requests are for cooperation on a project, or requests for material for workshops/seminars.
Mair (2000:137) states that the local partners submit their proposals to the resident representative who then drafts new projects and submits them to KAS head office. The resident representative therefore uses own prerogative when selecting proposals. The KAS head office will see only what he/she has recommended. The “resident representative enjoys a high degree of autonomy, at the same time they are securely state-funded by the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development – and therefore, but only to a moderate degree, subject to ministerial controls” (Weissenbach 2010:1228).

Mair (2000:136) further asserts that the Foundation’s resident representatives are fundamental to its international engagement. They are charged with ensuring that KAS achieves its aims and objectives and this is realised by choosing programmes that fall under the funding criteria of KAS. The current profiles of the resident representatives are mostly academics with a background in economics or social sciences, unlike in the past where resident representatives were active party members.

The disadvantages of over-reliance on the resident representative are stated by Mair (2000:137), “the main disadvantage is the dependence on the personal qualities of the resident representative – their competence to analyse the situation on the ground adequately, to deal with the media, partners, politicians and other prominent people correctly, to manage an office of considerable size and substantial sums of money in an accountable way, and their commitment of energy to the promotion of democracy”. As a result of the distance between KAS head office and the KAS offices abroad, “a representative may feel and behave like a king in his/her small kingdom…” (Mair 2000:137). Nevertheless, he further states that there may not be such problems because the resident representatives are competent people who are well-informed about the issues on the ground and know how to react in different situations. The resident representative of KAS is stationed in a country for a maximum period of five years, with exceptions made to accommodate their family needs. The main reason KAS discourages resident representatives to be stationed in a country for a long time is to avoid a situation where a resident representative is too absorbed in the host country that he/she is no longer objective when carrying out their duties.
Van Rooy (1998:62) states that “political foundations have earned a good reputation with civic and political actors such as trade unions, business associations and political parties”. This is true also of KAS, which views political parties as one of its main stakeholders.

The following section deals with KAS and political parties in South Africa.

3.4.1 KAS and political parties in South Africa

According to Weissenbach (2010: 1226), political parties are imperative to the construction of democracies. Through political parties, citizens are able to participate in the democratic process. Most political parties provide civic education to their members, which they would not get elsewhere. Political parties also help to raise the percentage of electorates participating in elections by encouraging their members to vote.

Hofmeister (1995:466) states that the promotion of political parties includes assisting them with leadership training as well as providing them with opportunities for political education. The office of KAS in South Africa does exactly that; it offers diverse political parties capacity training for their members, to enable them to participate better in the electoral process. This training is not limited only to South Africa. In 2005, KAS started a project called SASA (Southern Africa Summer Academy). SASA is an annual workshop which takes place over a week in Johannesburg; it’s a platform for young political party leaders from diverse countries in the region namely, South Africa, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Namibia, Malawi, Mozambique, Angola and Tanzania. Zambia was invited only once and it was decided that due to budgetary issues it had to be dropped. Angola was also dropped in 2011 because there were issues with some participants from there who had confirmed their participation, allowing air tickets to be issued and their accommodation and other bookings made, and they then failed to arrive.

The majority of the participants were always actively involved in the discussions, even participants from the DRC and Mozambique who sometimes struggled with English, but they would still contribute where possible. The themes of SASA were mostly centred around preparing the party for elections, but some topics also included fundraising for the political party, because a lot of parties cannot compete fairly in elections due to lack of
adequate funds, and where membership fees alone are not adequate to manage the day
to day operations of the party as well as to cover the expenses of an election campaign.
The other topic which was interesting for participants was ethical leadership. The majority
of African leaders are not good examples of ethical leaders; they are corrupt and loot the
resources of the state while their people live in abject poverty. This was interesting,
because it launched the participants into self-reflection. If the participants of SASA would
be future presidents of Africa, then Africa will be in safe hands. It was deliberate to invite
young party leaders because they are the future of tomorrow. If they grow up with
democratic and ethical values, they will do well in leadership.

KAS, however, is clear that it doesn’t fund election campaigns under any circumstances,
and this is to ensure that it doesn’t interfere in the electoral process which must be left to
the citizens of the country. Citizens are the only ones who have a right to decide on the
electoral process. However, KAS is involved in the election observation, to ensure that
the electoral process is free and fair.

In South Africa, KAS works with the African Christian Democratic Party (ACDP) because
it shares the Christian principles of the Christian Democratic Party to which KAS is
affiliated. However, KAS does not share one of the core ideals of the ACDP, that of the
death penalty. KAS also has long-standing relations with the Inkatha Freedom Party
(IFP). The IFP promotes federalism, which is also one of the ideals of KAS. According to
Adenauer Foundation to source funds for development”. The Foundation agreed to
provide the IFP with assistance regarding their projects on education, as well as projects
dealing with socio-economic issues” (Temkin 2003:214).

KAS has also worked with the United Democratic Movement (UDM), because KAS is
interested in promoting multiparty democracy and therefore would like to give small
parties capacity training to enable them to grow. Lately, the President of the UDM,
General Bantu Holomisa, has been advocating reform of the electoral law, through which
the electorates would be able to vote directly for their leaders instead of for the party.
KAS also advocates for an electoral system where electorates voted directly for the
leaders; there would not be complacency because leaders would know that if they did not
deliver, they would not be elected in the next elections. KAS also cooperates with the
Congress of the People (COPE). Although KAS does not have cooperation with other political parties like the African National Congress, the Democratic Alliance and many others, it does however invite all parties to its events such as conferences and seminars.

De Zeeuw (2005:486) asserts that political aid is sensitive in nature and as a result, instead of directly giving aid to political parties, aid is channelled through multi-partisan organizations like the National Democratic Institute (NDI) or the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty democracy (IMD), as well as through political foundations. The FES works closely with the African National Congress, and the Naumann Foundation focuses on organizations with a liberal focus like the South African Institute of Race Relations and the Helen Suzman Foundation (Hearn and Robinson 2000:250). The Naumann Foundation also has close relations with the Democratic Alliance (DA).

The following section deals with the KAS scholarship programme.

3.4.2 KAS scholarship programme

During the early years of KAS work in South Africa, it initiated a scholarship programme for journalism students. This scholarship assisted many young South Africans who studied journalism at the Natal Technikon. Some of them still maintain close links with KAS. In 1999, KAS started funding an internship programme that is managed by the South Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA), commonly known as the KAS/SAIIA Internship programme. The internship programme targets deserving students who study for a master’s degree in International Relations, Political Science or Journalism, at the University of the Witwatersrand (http://www.kas.de/suedafrika/en/pages/1630/).

KAS is proud of the scholarship programme because the alumni give back to South African society, with most of them working in the South African government locally and others in different South African missions abroad. The advantage of the internship is that the students get work experience while they study. Some of them co-publish journal articles with SAIIA staff during their internship. Even though some of the KAS projects are not sustainable, the scholarship programme is the one programme that is fully sustainable; all of the students who have been through the programme are employed almost immediately upon completion of their studies and others are offered employment.
while they are still busy with their studies. The recipients of KAS are important as they help KAS to achieve its aims.

The following section deals with partnership with recipients.

### 3.4.3 Partnership with recipients

The KAS emphasizes partnership with the recipients of its funding. Thesing (1999:64) states: "partnership implies opportunities for open-minded dialogue about issues of regulatory policy, legislation, the economy, culture and philosophy". Thesing (1999:64) further asserts that “in the legal sense, projects subsidized by KAS are usually directed by local partner organizations”. In selecting partners, the KAS look for partners who share its ideals of freedom, solidarity and justice. Partnerships with local organizations enhance the impact and effectiveness of KAS programmes (Thesing 1999:64).

The Konrad Adenauer Foundation cooperates with partner organizations and diverse groupings in society by funding their political and social activities (Thesing 1999:17). The strategy of the KAS in choosing partners also aims to strengthen societal organizations to enable them to enter into dialogue with government, and influence governmental policies. The KAS, like other German political foundations has the prerogative to choose own partners and this helps in choosing partners who “display a genuine interest in reforms and contribute towards their implementation” (Thesing 1999:11).

The relationship between KAS and its recipients is one based on mutual respect. Recipients decide on own projects independently or in cooperation with KAS. However, partners have the freedom to make own decisions about the projects they wish to engage in. The basis of partnership is such that both KAS and its recipients need each other: recipients need funding from KAS to do their work. In similar vein, KAS needs recipients because it would be difficult for KAS to have credibility if it did not actively engage local partners. The benefit that KAS derives from having partnerships is that it can call upon any of its recipients for advice or expertise on any matter. For instance, sometimes KAS hosts visitors from Germany who ask for a meeting with the local experts. It is easy for KAS to ask any of its recipients to have such meetings, or to suggest other people who may help. Some of the recipients offer to co-host events with KAS, and in that way both
organizations benefit. The KAS funding allocation is decided based on a number of factors: the relevance and importance of the proposal, the proposed budget, which, depending on the cost, may be covered in full by KAS, or they may offer to contribute a percentage of the budget. Each of the KAS recipients gets different allocations which, due to the sensitivity of the issue of funding allocations, cannot be disclosed.

The following section deals with recipients of KAS funding in South Africa.

### 3.5 Recipients of KAS in South Africa

In South Africa, KAS works with diverse organizations: among others, the Institute for Democracy in South Africa (Idasa); the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR); Sustainable Energy Africa (SEA); South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA); the Democracy Development Programme (DDP); the South African Institute for Advanced Constitutional, Public, Human Rights and International Law (SAIFAC); the Law Faculty of the University of North-West (Potchefstroom Campus); Impumelelo; St Augustine College of Southern Africa; and the University of Pretoria (Law Faculty). KAS also cooperates with political parties like the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP); the African Christian Democratic Party (ACDP); the United Democratic Movement (UDM); and the Congress of the People (COPE). The support of KAS to political parties is limited to capacity training programmes.

According to (Thesing 1999:64), “international co-operation as a rule involves independent partner organisations in the Foundation’s host countries”. KAS refers to the recipients of its funding as partners and this is because KAS does not disburse funds and let recipients do projects on their own. For every KAS project there is a project manager from the KAS office who is assigned to it, to ensure that recipients do what the project is aimed to do and also to ensure that funds are properly accounted for. The relationship between KAS and its recipients is one of mutual respect. Each cannot function without the other.

Mair (2000:140) states “the choice of respective partners is based on the political values and convictions that are upheld by the respective foundations”. In some cases recipients approach KAS with a proposal requesting funding, or KAS would approach recipients
who share the same ideals or interests. Due to the limited funds KAS has at its disposal, it is sometimes forced to reject some proposals even if they are good and in line with its funding criteria. The recipients of KAS funding in South Africa vary from universities, NGOs, think-tanks, political parties and individual academics.

It is very rare for KAS to accept a proposal and later decide to discontinue a project. In the period 2002-2011, it was only on two occasions that this happened. On both occasions it was because KAS didn’t want to associate itself with extreme viewpoints that might have upset some communities in South Africa. However, the recipients were at liberty to source other funding. The KAS funding cycle is from January to December. This puts pressure on both KAS and the recipients to ensure that funds and projects budgeted in a financial year are used in that year, otherwise it becomes difficult to re-allocate the funds in the following year. Sometimes, recipients complain about the accounting regulations of KAS. They say that they are too strict compared to other donor regulations. Indeed, it may seem strict, but this helps both recipients and the local staff of KAS who have to compile accounting for the auditors and for the KAS head office. In the history of the KAS South Africa office, there has never been a query about misappropriation of funds.

The following section provides background information about the recipients of KAS who were interviewed for this study: the Democracy Development Programme (DDP); the South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA); St Augustine College of South Africa; Sustainable Energy Africa (SEA); the South African Institute for Advanced Constitutional, Public, Human Rights and International Law (SAIFAC); Impumelelo Social Innovations Centre; the Institute for Democracy in South Africa (Idasa) and the Law Faculty of North West University (Potchefstroom Campus). These organizations were selected on the basis that they had been funded by KAS for a minimum of at least three years during the period 2006-2011, which would help to provide substantial information about their relationship with KAS.

3.5.1 Democracy Development Programme (DDP)

The DDP was initiated in 1993 as a partner project of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation. For the last 20 years it has been a non-partisan non-profit organization, supporting
capacity building on governance and civil society levels to ensure that both are empowered for meaningful participation in South Africa’s social transformation.

**DDP Programmes**

The DDP is engaged in the following programmes:

Local Government – the DDP provides capacity building for stakeholders in local government and helps them to engage with each other effectively and efficiently.

Civil society – the DDP aims to create a vibrant civil society and to host debates and seminars on diverse topics as well as voter education programmes.

Youth – the DDP engages the youth and high school learners in civic education programmes.

Political Parties – the DDP provides capacity and leadership training for political parties on a non-partisan basis;

Community Conversations – the DDP encourages active citizenship and community-building ([http://www.ddp.org.za/programme-events](http://www.ddp.org.za/programme-events)).

The following section deals with the KAS/DDP partnership.

**3.5.1.1 KAS/DDP Partnership**

KAS funds a variety of DDP programmes including:

- Youth programmes and high-school learners workshops to teach young people about civic education and help them to become responsible citizens;
- Political party workshops are for individual parties or multi-parties to help with capacity building;
- Political forums which are held on a bi-monthly basis where diverse topical issues are discussed and the delegates are from all sectors of society including businesses, politicians, government officials and faith-based organizations.

DDP supports KAS when KAS has events in Durban by sending out invitations to its database and helping with the logistics for the event. KAS also supports DDP when the
former needs assistance when having engagements in Johannesburg. The KAS and DDP share a liaison office in Cape Town; though each manages its own projects, both organizations help each other when necessary.

3.5.2 South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA)

SAIIA is a non-governmental think tank which aims at producing high-level research and promotes dialogue and contributes to policy-making in Africa. It is highly respected by both government and non-government actors. It has a variety of funders including foundations, international governments and multilateral organizations. It derives its core funding mainly from member fees (http://www.saiia.org.za/about-saiia/about-saiia.html).

The Institute’s activities include:

- Undertaking research on important themes which are relevant for Africa, and focusing on governance, accountability, trade and development;
- Creating networks with international organizations;
- Organising and hosting seminars and conferences which are attended by people from diverse sectors. These events attract local and international speakers as well as diplomats;
- Engaging the high school learners and university students through their leadership programmes (http://www.saiia.org.za/about).

Research Themes

SAIIA focuses on the following research themes:

- Governance and Democracy
- Governance and APRM Programmes
- Economic Diplomacy
- Global powers and Africa
- South African foreign policy and African drivers
- Global governance and sustainable development
- Youth Programmes

(http://www.saiia.org.za/research)
3.5.2.1 KAS/SAIIA Partnership

The KAS/SAIIA partnership started in 1999 with a scholarship programme for master’s students, which is combined with an internship at SAIIA, commonly known as the KAS/SAIIA Internship programme. The students are enrolled for master’s in politics, international relations, journalism, law or economics. Initially the scholarship was for South African students only however, recently it was awarded to students from Zimbabwe as well. KAS funds the students’ tuition, accommodation, and provides them with a monthly allowance.

KAS also funds diverse SAIIA conferences including:

- Values in global economic governance: Do India, Brazil and South Africa share a common vision? The conference was held after the KAS guidelines for prosperity were published. The aim of the conference was to explore if the three countries could align to the KAS guidelines.
- Sovereignty in the 21st century: Protecting states or citizens?
- New Actors in Africa: How is their entry affecting the continent’s relations with the EU? The aim of the conference was to engage in debate to look at the implications of these new actors on the African landscape. The delegates were from the diplomatic corps, government, and the private sector, as well as from civil society.

SAIIA expertise is often called upon quite by the local KAS office in South Africa as well as the KAS head office, and SAIIA, equally, also approaches KAS whenever it needs assistance which KAS can provide.

3.5.3 St Augustine College of South Africa

St Augustine College of South Africa is a private Catholic College but it welcomes students from different religious backgrounds. It forms part of the International Federation of Catholic Universities and as such, the members visit regularly to monitor its standards, and its membership is renewed only if the members are satisfied (http://www.staugustine.ac.za/Background).
3.5.3.1 KAS/St Augustine College Partnership

The KAS/St Augustine partnership started in the early 2000s, with KAS funding conferences in cooperation with St Augustine. Around the same time St Augustine partnered with KAS for a certificate course on political education. The aim of the course was to teach political education to party activists who had at least a Matric certificate. KAS and St Augustine College continue to cooperate on diverse conferences including:

- New Directions in Economics and Ethics: Towards a New World Order;
- Reframing Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainability; and
- Ethics, Education and Economy: Challenges and New Directions.

The delegates for these conferences are students from St Augustine College, academics, and civil society, including faith-based organizations. The aims of the conferences were to focus on ethics and social responsibility and also to make recommendations for ethical leadership. Comparisons were also drawn between the education systems in Germany and South Africa, to determine lessons which can be learnt by both countries.

KAS cooperation with St Augustine also extends to inviting some of the lecturers to make presentations at KAS events. KAS also supports St Augustine College by donating books to its library.

3.5.4 Sustainable Energy Africa (SEA)

SEA focuses on the promotion of sustainable energy approaches. It also focuses on institutional capacity building of cities and provinces.

The themes of SEA are:

- Sustainable Energy
- Integrated Urban Planning
- Green Development
- Sustainable Transport
- Climate Change
- Organizational Sustainability
3.5.4.1 KAS/SEA Partnership

The KAS/SEA partnership started in 2007. KAS funded the Green Goal Legacy Report for the 2010 FIFA Soccer World Cup as well as workshops on developing a greening strategy.

- Green Goal Legacy report – the aim of the report was to share lessons and make recommendations in terms of the greening lessons learnt during the 2010 FIFA Soccer World Cup.
- Workshop – Carbon Offsetting Action Plan for Host City Cape Town – the aim of the workshop was to see how carbon offsetting works, which various options exist, and specifically which options would be suitable for Cape Town as the host city.
- Workshop – Sharing insights on greening 2010 FIFA World Cup with Brazil – the aim of the workshop was for the City of Cape Town to share their expertise with Brazil.

SEA was instrumental in assisting KAS with expertise during the 2010 FIFA World Cup, and generally, on greening matters. KAS also assists SEA whenever needed.

3.5.5 South African Institute for Advanced Constitutional, Public, Human Rights and International Law (SAIFAC)

SAIFAC is a non-governmental research institute. SAIFAC was founded by Justice Laurie Ackerman who was one of the first eleven judges appointed to serve in the Constitutional Court of South Africa. He and another judge were tasked with starting the development of the Court’s library collection, and SAIFAC was started to ensure that material from the library could be accessed by all who need it, in order to promote democracy (http://www.saifac.org.za/about_us.html).

3.5.5.1 KAS/SAIFAC Partnership

The KAS/SAIFAC partnership started in 2008. The KAS funding is for three SAIFAC conferences/seminars: the Constitutional Court Review seminar and the International
Law seminar, with the theme of the third seminar changing every year but always having a constitutional element:

- Constitutional Court Review seminar – the aim of the seminar is to bring together legal academics who contributed a chapter/s to the CCR publication. The publication comprised the findings of the Constitutional Court in the previous year.
- International Law Seminar – the aim of the seminar is to bring together Internal Law academics to discuss a topic of international law relevance. This seminar created a network of international law academics.
- The Constitution and the Masses – this seminar dealt with the issue of whether South Africans are enjoying the rights enshrined in the Constitution.

KAS uses SAIFAC expertise whenever needed and SAIFAC equally requests assistance or support from KAS when needed.

3.5.6 Impumelelo Social Innovations Centre

Impumelelo Social Innovations Centre used to be known as the Impumelelo Innovations Awards. Its aim was to showcase best practice examples at local government level. It later expanded into NGOs, the private sector and civil society. Its main programmes include “masters class training, case study research as well as the documentation and publication of best practice” (http://www.impumelelo.org.za/About%20Us).

The Impumelelo Social Innovations Centre awards are divided into the following sectors:

Skills development and employment; sanitation and waste; governance; HIV/AIDS; education; food security; justice and security; the arts; public works; rural development; housing; social welfare; water and environment.

Master classes cover the following sectors:
Housing; public works; sanitation and waste; HIV/AIDS; education and skills development; environment and rural development; skills development and job creation.
Case studies
Impumelelo has produced 13 case studies: justice and security; water; environment; food security; education; HIV/AIDS; skills development and employment; sanitation and waste; public works and housing (http://impumelelo.org.za/About%20Us).

3.5.6.1 KAS/Impumelelo Partnership

The KAS/Impumelelo partnership started in 2009. The partnership included funding for Master Classes, Skills Development Workshops, Case Study Research and the 2010 Sustainability Awards.

- Sustainability Awards – the aim of the awards is to highlight success stories in the area of sustainable development;
- Master Classes – the participants are government officials from civil society as well as from the private sector. The winners of the Sustainability Awards make presentations to the delegates to train them to make their municipalities function better;
- Skills Development Workshops – the aim of the workshops is to provide capacity training for government officials and civil society members.

KAS and Impumelelo help each other like all the other recipients mentioned above. Impumelelo makes its case studies available to KAS whenever the latter needs them.

3.5.7 Institute for Democracy in Africa (Idasa)

Idasa was founded by former politicians Frederik van Zyl Slabbert and Alex Boraine in 1987 as the Institute for a Democratic Alternative in South Africa. It later changed its name to Institute for Democracy in Africa. The aim of Idasa was to promote negotiations for a democratic South Africa by reducing the fears of white people and introducing them to the hopes of black people. It used to operate entirely on donor funding; the money was political as there were no development partners inside South Africa. Idasa relied mainly on international donors for its work. It closed in March 2013 due to lack of funding. According to Calland (2013), Idasa’s fate was sealed by donors cutting budgets, especially to countries which were considered strong. The Idasa budget was also badly affected as a result of the fluctuating exchange rate. At the same time, it lost qualified
personnel, and the fact that it had grantees around the continent also added to its problems and ultimately it had to close. Unfortunately, many other NGOs suffered the same fate as Idasa.

3.5.7.1 KAS/Idasa partnership

The KAS/Idasa partnership started in 2009 and was limited to the dissemination seminars of the Afrobarometer survey findings. The Afrobarometer covered 35 African countries and did a comparative survey of public attitudes on democracy as well as the evaluation of governance and economic performance. The aim of the dissemination workshops was to engage with the delegates on the findings of the survey and its implications for South Africa. The workshops were at times sector specific, for instance, only for business or politicians, however, sometimes they were for all sectors.

3.5.8 Law Faculty North-West University (Potchefstroom Campus)

The Law Faculty is based at the North-West University, Potchefstroom Campus. In January 2004, there was a merger of the Potchefstroom Campus, with those of Mafikeng and Vanderbijlpark, and they became known as NWU Potchefstroom Campus. KAS has been cooperating with the Law Faculty since the late 1990s. The cooperation is mainly on hosting an annual conference on a law theme. The conferences are always well attended by academics, politicians, members of the legal fraternity and people from the community. It provides a platform where judges, politicians and trade unionists can engage openly.

3.5.8.1 KAS/Law Faculty partnership

The KAS started cooperation with the Law Faculty in 1997. The KAS funding is for diverse conferences, the delegates are drawn from civil society, academia and the legal fraternity. Some of the conferences which were funded by KAS:

- The Human Rights Indaba – the indaba aims at sensitising municipal officials and councillors as well as magistrates in the lower courts on the relevance and implications of South Africa’s Bill of Rights (Chapter 2 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996) for (local) public administration, governance and
the operation of the lower courts, in general. The overall project objectives were to contribute to the improved realisation of different constitutional rights (especially socio-economic rights) and to conceptually assist in strengthening the protection of constitutional rights, particularly in the often neglected North West, and the Free State and Northern Cape Provinces of South Africa.

- Green Paper on Land Reform – Challenges and Opportunities. The aim of the seminar was to bring together experts including academics and lawyers as well as civil society to discuss the green paper and to sensitise them to the contents thereof. Also to establish a network of people who were engaged in the debate and lastly, to publish the conference proceedings to serve as a future reference.
- Good governance in land tenure. The aim of the conference was to discuss the land tenure problems in South Africa including the failure of many land redistribution and restitution processes in South Africa.

KAS uses Law Faculty expertise on legal or constitutional matters and sometimes the lecturers are asked to make presentations at KAS events. The Law Faculty also asks KAS’s assistance whenever necessary, for instance when inviting law professors from Germany.

3.6 Conclusion

Partnership is important even where the donor gives money without which the recipient will not be able to do its work. The partnership is necessary because donors in most cases cannot do their work without the support of local organizations. KAS values its recipients for this reason. However, KAS does not fund all the operations of the abovementioned recipients; it funds a project/projects and, therefore, the recipients also have a variety of other donors. In all instances, recipients have to source other donors to fund their other projects and also to pay institutional costs like rent or office equipment, and find ways of sustaining themselves.

Chapter four provides empirical findings and analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR
EMPIRICAL FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

In Chapter four the focus is on the analysis of interview data. Eight KAS recipients were interviewed; some interviews were conducted telephonically while others were face to face. All Johannesburg-based respondents, namely SAIIA, St Augustine, SAIFAC, Idasa and the Law Faculty of North-West University were interviewed face to face. DDP, which is based in Durban, and Impumelelo Social Innovations Centre and SEA, both of whom are based in Cape Town, were interviewed telephonically because of budgetary constraints. Idasa was initially selected as one of the respondents because KAS had funded its Afrobarometer dissemination workshops during the selected period 2006-2011. However, Idasa closed in March 2013 due to lack of donor funding, a month before the interviews were conducted. The researcher included Idasa in the study hoping that some of the lessons Idasa learnt would be helpful to other civil society organizations who rely on donor funding for their existence and survival.

Official permission to conduct the interviews was granted by the KAS resident representative, Dr Werner Boehler, who served during the term 2006-2011. He was happy about the research and was interested in the findings. The interviews were conducted on the basis of a set of semi-structured questions aimed at eliciting qualitative responses. The interviews took on average 45 minutes to one hour to conclude. All respondents were cooperative and agreed to be interviewed. All the respondents were fully knowledgeable about the KAS funded programmes in their organization. The interviews were conducted with six directors of the organizations, who were familiar with the KAS funded programmes as well as the KAS partnerships; two respondents were directly involved and they were the contact persons in the organization of the KAS partnerships.

A summary of the responses during the interviews, the findings, and an assessment of the data which was collected follows. Annexure 1 contains an example of the questions which were asked, and several selected responses.
4.2 Organizational independence

The respondents were asked about “organizational independence – do you feel you have room to decide on own projects?” All the respondents stated that though they got funding from KAS, they had independence when deciding on their projects. They all acknowledged that in submitting proposals to KAS, most times KAS agreed fully to the proposal; however, sometimes KAS, as a political foundation, insisted on including the political angle in the proposal. For instance, youth unemployment is a critical issue in South Africa and KAS shares that sentiment. However, when an organization approaches KAS to fund a conference on youth unemployment, KAS may suggest that the conference must also explore the political effects of youth unemployment. Do unemployed youth engage in the political process? Are they apathetic because they feel neglected?

One respondent declared that at one point KAS approached his organization with a proposal to engage in research on a topic and his organization accepted because they were also interested in the topic. However, if they were not interested they would have declined. His organization would not have accepted to do the research only to satisfy KAS. A resident representative of KAS once mentioned that KAS doesn’t like to dictate to recipients; it, therefore, prefers recipients who can do things on their own and come up with own proposals.

The respondents confirmed that if KAS was not interested in a proposal due to other reasons, for instance if KAS didn’t have the adequate funds, or if KAS felt that the topic had already been covered by another organization, or if the proposal didn’t fall within the KAS funding guidelines, KAS would inform them without hesitation. All of them agreed that there is an open-door relationship between themselves and KAS, and that they could always inform KAS if they were dissatisfied about something. For instance, a respondent mentioned that he engaged with a KAS resident representative who refused to grant funding for a seminar on animal rights because he felt that animal rights’ was not a political issue. After engaging, KAS agreed to fund the seminar since it formed part of a series of topics dealing with rights in general, and was not a seminar on its own.
It became apparent in the interviews that the recipients valued the role that the project managers of KAS play. The KAS project managers are in most cases the first point of contact with recipients. Though some organizations which make contact with KAS for the first time would send their request for funding to the resident representative, most are sent to the project managers who then pass it to the resident representative. The project managers frequently deal with the recipients although the resident representative signs the partner contracts on behalf of KAS and has the final say on which proposals to accept. The project managers, being local staff, assist him by giving input about the credibility of the recipients. On some occasions a resident representative may accept a proposal based on the guidance and persistence of the project manager. This testifies to the value some resident representatives place on the project managers. The project managers also manage the funds and keep an eye on the spending patterns to see that incurred costs are those which were stipulated in the contract. They also ensure that where recipients must be refunded by KAS, those refunds are processed speedily. Recipients hardly ever deal with the resident representative on project matters; he will be asked for guidance if there are some issues which may derail the project. Sometimes he may participate in meetings with the project managers and recipients to keep him abreast of developments.

All the respondents stated that because of the good working relationship with the project managers they hardly see the need to deal directly with the resident representative about a project issue. A respondent stated that at one point her organization had under-budgeted for a conference and the project manager at KAS actually informed them that their budget was not realistic for the number of delegates they were aiming for. They then amended the budget. Seven respondents also stated that because of the good working relationship they have, KAS sometimes approached their organizations for advice on diverse issues.

The word honesty came across very strongly. Two respondents stated that personnel at KAS is honest with regard to what they are allowed to fund. Because of this they know where they stand with KAS, especially with regard to the type of projects KAS funds and also the expenses KAS is prepared to pay. KAS, as a political foundation, does not ordinarily pay for items like business class flights for speakers, chocolates at conferences (which some organizers demand), and car hire if using a taxi is cheaper. Other donors do
pay for such, and project managers at KAS have a duty to inform the recipients about this. In most instances recipients do not have problems with this, however, it becomes problematic if the person for whom the business class flight is sought, considers themself to be a high ranking member of society. Sometimes this creates problems for recipients who must inform the person that the request for a business class flight was rejected.

One respondent stated that he never felt pressure to change his goals to suit KAS preferences; however, one of his projects was rejected by KAS because it didn’t fall in line with its funding criteria. He then looked for other funding and continued with the project without KAS funding. However, on the issue of honorarium, it is difficult for respondents because there is no blanket rule. Three respondents mentioned that they would prefer KAS to pay honorarium to speakers and facilitators whenever they participated at the KAS funded events; however, KAS does not always do that. It seemed from the responses that this non-payment creates difficulties for them because these people assume that the recipients expect them to participate free of charge. As a result of a lack of standard rule on this issue, respondents always need to consult with KAS as each case is dealt with differently.

An issue which was not part of the interview questions but which came up during the interviews was the issue about the reluctance of German political foundations to fund the same recipients/projects. Four of the respondents raised this as a matter of concern, specifically because the pool of donors in South Africa is small. All the German political foundations get their funds from BMZ (see Chapter three). As a result of being funded by one source they are discouraged from funding the same partners/projects, however, exceptions could be made upon consultation and agreement with the resident representatives. The query, which came from four respondents, was that they were not informed about this issue at the beginning of the partnership, they realized it only after approaching another German political foundation, and this created problems for them. They were not at liberty to request funding from other German political foundations, even though KAS would not fund their project. There have been a few instances where two German political foundations have funded the same organizations for different projects, but this takes place only after the resident representatives of both foundations have agreed that the partnership may continue. Another issue besides funding coming from BMZ was that the German political foundations are value-based. It is, therefore, not
desirable for them to co-fund an organization if their values are different; for instance, KAS would under no circumstances co-fund a project with the Rosa Luxembourg Stiftung.

4.3 Partnership aspect of the relationship with KAS

The respondents were asked “how do you understand the partnership aspect of your relationship with KAS?” Is your relationship with KAS according to your perceptions of what it is supposed to be?” All respondents stated that they saw their relationship with KAS as a partnership. It was a transparent relationship based on trust, and a real partnership which assists in the development of the country. There is continuous engagement and discussion on the projects, unlike other donors who advance the funds and require the accounts and reports at the end of the financial year. All interviewees except one stated that they saw the partnership as mutually beneficial. Some of the benefits of receiving KAS funding as stated by respondents:

- organizations are able to host conferences/seminars/workshops on diverse topics and this helps society to be informed about issues affecting their lives and about their rights;
- attendance at KAS funded events is generally free of charge. This helps to attract many people, some of whom would not afford to pay a registration fee;
- papers presented at the conferences or seminars contribute to academic output; some are published as books, others are published in scholarly journals;
- it makes research accessible; and
- it assists to have a network of academics engaged in the same field.

One respondent commended KAS for funding the KAS/SAIIA internship programme. It helps to give young and intelligent students an opportunity to study at master’s level at the University of Witwatersrand. Most graduates work in the public sector locally, others are at different South African missions abroad. The internship programme also helps to create a community of alumni who are invaluable when the need for research assistance arises.

Another respondent stated that KAS funding allows his organization continuity in their work. There is a planning mechanism to generate new seminars, because KAS provides
funding. KAS allocates funding in the preceding year and signs contracts with recipients at the beginning of the year in which the programmes will take place, thus recipients are aware of the allocations they have and can therefore plan ahead with the guarantee of funding. The partnership also entails clear lines of responsibility when engaged in a KAS funded project. Both organizations know each other’s responsibilities, and there is mutual engagement.

Two respondents mentioned that being KAS recipients helps them when sourcing speakers, especially in Germany, because of the good name that KAS has. The KAS partnership also helps them to form other partnerships with people or institutions in Europe.

A criticism which echoed strongly from six of the respondents is the lack of institutional funding from donors in general, not only from KAS. It is problematic because the majority of donors prefer to fund projects without due consideration for the staff working on the project, and also not considering that the organization needs to pay for office space, telephone costs etc. One respondent elaborated further and suggested that if KAS really values the partnership, it must consider institutional funding for organizations it has worked with for some time. His argument is that KAS would know the manner in which the organization works, and it would have established trust with the recipient. True partnership, according to him, entails the donor being considerate to the needs of the recipients. It is interesting that in the rare cases where KAS grants institutional funding, the organization applauds KAS for it, and states that because of such funding the staff is able to devote its attention to doing the real work, instead of having to raise funds to pay their salaries and other institutional costs, and shows the difference that institutional funding can make to an organization.

One respondent suggested that if KAS cannot grant institutional funding fully, it could offer to pay a percentage towards the time the employees spent on a KAS funded project. All respondents declared that if they had any concerns, they would take them up with KAS.

Another respondent declared that since 2008, donors have changed the way they relate to recipients of funding. Donors have started dictating the terms and set the parameters
very tightly, such that recipients can only do what is on their list of priorities. There is no consultation, and strings are attached in a subtle way. They have changed reporting mechanisms, making it difficult for recipients to know exactly to whom they report. It seems that in some organizations, after donors have changed priorities they expect the recipients, if they need funding, to submit proposals that suit these new priorities; some are even told that if they lack the expertise they must work with other organizations who have the expertise and then share the funds, but this creates problems when dividing the funding. This makes the working relationship difficult and when recipients have problems they don’t know whom to consult. KAS is, therefore, seen as treating its recipients fairly.

In discussions with a KAS resident representative he highlighted the importance KAS attaches to the relationship with its recipients. He also stressed that the relationship is mutually beneficial; recipients need KAS funds to do their work and likewise, KAS needs recipients to do its work. Most importantly, recipients can get other donors to fund their work, but it would be difficult for KAS to pick and choose recipients because KAS needs recipients with credibility and dedication to their work, and such recipients are hard to find. Partnership is built on trust, therefore, it is always difficult to find new recipients because it takes time to build trust.

4.4 Relationship with resident representatives

The respondents were asked “does the change of resident representative have an effect on your work with KAS?” The resident representatives of KAS have an important role in representing KAS in South Africa. They are assigned to a country for two years, or up to a maximum of five years. They have the prerogative to choose their own recipients and projects. One respondent felt that this had an effect on the projects because when there was a changeover they worried whether the new resident representative would continue cooperation with their organization. The other respondents felt confident that the changeover did not have an effect on their cooperation. One respondent stated that the project managers help with continuity. They have been with KAS for a long time and help the recipients by informing the resident representative about the cooperation and by providing feedback on the partnership.
Though one respondent stated that a true partnership is when the resident representative shows genuine interest in one’s work, the majority of the respondents were happy with the contact with project managers and one actually stated that she never dealt directly with resident representatives apart from meeting them at joint functions, or when there was an initial meeting to introduce the new resident representative. KAS is applauded for having a trainee programme giving young people experience on the job, but a respondent who dealt with a trainee remarked that while she appreciates that trainees are educated with postgraduate qualifications, they need to work together with the resident representative or project manager to learn and to be conscientized with regard to dealing with recipients. As a result of lack of experience, the trainee may assume that because KAS funds the recipients he/she has the upper-hand when dealing with them, not realizing that there is an equal partnership.

South Africa is generally not used to a trainee programme where a young person, in most instances fresh from university and with little experience, is given a senior role and the local staff with many year’s experience of working for the KAS are expected to report to the trainee. In one instance, during a changeover between the resident representatives, a trainee was announced at a KAS event as being responsible for the office. There was an outcry from some recipients attending the event about the insensitivity and total ignorance of the senior staff member who was seen as being ideal to take care of the office while waiting for the new resident representative to arrive.

4.5 KAS Funding Model

The respondents were asked “what are your views about the current funding model and approach of KAS?” The KAS funding model is such that in exceptional cases where recipients have partnership contracts with KAS head office, their funds are advanced at the start of the project. However, in general KAS doesn’t advance funds to recipients; it pays service providers directly on receipt of invoices, or it reimburses recipients upon receipt of invoices and proof of payment. Six respondents are satisfied with the KAS funding model: they stated that it encourages transparency and compels grantees to be accountable. However, the model may be detrimental to smaller NGOs who sometimes lack own finances and must always rely on KAS to pay their service providers. However, for recipients who have own finances, they can pay the invoices and claim
reimbursement from KAS. All respondents categorically stated that there is no delay from KAS to pay service providers, or to get their reimbursements. KAS does not provide funding for all programmes of the recipients it works with; therefore, it is necessary for recipients to look for other funders. In some instances KAS cannot pay for all costs of specific programmes, thus the recipient is at liberty to look for other funder/funders however, there must be transparency of who pays for what line items. For instance, for a conference costing R200 000, KAS may allocate only R50 000, and upon consultation with the partner, KAS may suggest to cover all accommodation or catering costs, and the recipient will look for other funders for the remainder of the costs, with all funders being duly acknowledged. The KAS, however, will only sign a contract with the recipients for the stipulated costs it will cover.

One issue which emerged very strongly is that recipients do not want to face issues of money missing, or having been used for things that KAS didn’t agree to. The KAS funding model prevents this, and the responsibility for managing the funds lies solely with KAS. In two separate interviews, respondents claimed that they had problems with one of the big international donors who refused to pay after they had delivered the service, and that this had put them in a difficult position. In one instance the organization forfeited the money and had to use own funds to pay in; in another instance a third party refunded the organization, but the refund came after five years and without interest. Unfortunately, the recipients incur costs while waiting for their money, and because of institutional costs not being covered, they are sometimes compelled to use funds from other projects while waiting for their money. A situation like this does not show good management and may put them in trouble should the donors find out, but they often do not have a choice.

In general, respondents unanimously declared that the KAS accounting requirements are strict, and three respondents mentioned that sometimes KAS is unfairly demanding. For instance, if KAS funds an air ticket for a speaker, it requires a copy of the electronic ticket and the boarding pass, and the traveller must sign both the travel and participant list. Some of these requirements, especially the boarding pass, create tension, because some travelers, even if they are informed beforehand that they must keep the boarding pass, throw it away, making it difficult for the partner to fulfil their accounting obligations to KAS. Some of the travellers do not cooperate when asked to sign both the travel and the participant list; they feel that if they sign the one list, it should be fine. This was the
one major criticism of the accounting requirements. In general, recipients understood the need for signing both the participant and travel list, though it was difficult at times to convince the speakers.

One respondent felt that they understood the need for KAS to be strict with its accounting and she also stated that because she studied and lived in Germany for some time, she understood the functioning of German administration. One respondent declared that KAS as a donor is strict but fair, whereas other donors are strict but unfair to recipients. He added that because of the good partnership with KAS, if there were unforeseen changes with a project KAS accommodated them, whereas with other donors they did not allow room for such changes, but instead penalized the recipients for unforeseen changes. In general, there is no perfect funding model; the mix of advancing money may work for one organization and the cost recovery one may work for another.

When asked about the funding model, a resident representative of KAS stated categorically that KAS does what its funder, BMZ, requires it to do. While he understood the partners’ frustrations, he could not singlehandedly do things differently, because KAS ultimately reports to BMZ. KAS sympathizes with its recipients, and always tries to ensure that payments or reimbursements which are due to recipients are processed speedily.

The issue of honorarium payments also emerged during the interviews. KAS does not have a clear policy on when to pay an honorarium, or how much should be paid for specific tasks. In the majority of KAS funded events, speakers at conference/seminars are not paid an honorarium, and this sometimes creates problems for recipients when inviting speakers. KAS pays for the travel, accommodation and meals of the speakers, but does not pay an honorarium for the paper or the actual presentation. Each case is dealt with on its merits. The same applies to KAS funded publications; in most cases authors are paid an honorarium for contributing a chapter and editors are also paid for editing the book, however, some publications, due to budgetary constraints, pay neither editors nor authors.
4.6 Staff retention

The issue of staff retention is a difficult one for recipients, especially for those organizations that do not get institutional funding but only project related funding. The issue here is that even if donors pay the staff working on the project during the life of the project, when the project ends and there is a gap until the other starts, then it means they will not be able to get salaries. As a result, they quit and look for other jobs and when the next project kicks in, the organization has to start with new staff. One respondent stated that donors always expect civil society organizations to employ qualified staff, however, they do not want to pay them market related salaries, or any salaries at all. Another stated that if donors pay only for project related costs, how do they expect the recipients to pay the salaries? Projects cannot manage themselves, personnel is needed to do that.

4.7 Publications

The respondents were asked “what is it you would like to change with regard to your cooperation with KAS?” KAS mostly funds conferences, seminars and workshops and in some instances, papers presented at these diverse forums are collated and published. One respondent highlighted an incident where his organization had requested funding from KAS for publishing conference papers. Unfortunately, the presenters failed to deliver the papers on time and as it was the end of the KAS financial year, KAS asked for its funds to be returned. The respondent felt that KAS should have been flexible and considered the obstacles facing the partner with regard to papers being delivered on time. Another factor he highlighted was that sometimes publishers also cause delays which impact on the agreement the recipient would have made with KAS.

4.8 Income generating measures

The respondents were asked “do you have other income generating measures?” Only one organization declared that it had seven million rands of its own reserves, and should donors discontinue funding, it would be able to continue operations for some years. One organization had reserves which could sustain it for a year, and even then it would have to retrench some staff members. All these organizations are funded mostly by international donors; the feeling is that local donors are more interested in funding
grassroots communities and also mostly in building schools or funding women’s self-help organizations and other socio-economic activities. It seems they see funding research as an elite initiative.

Some of the income generating measures used by these organizations are hiring out their boardroom, charging a facilitation fee, and selling some of their reports and case studies. However, it takes years to build substantial reserves using these initiatives. Unfortunately, some of the money has to be used from time to time when there is a delay in getting funding from other donors.

There was a specific resident representative of KAS who had made it his priority to always conscientize the recipients about generating own income and therefore being sustainable. Interestingly enough, he was not trying to tell them only about their partnership with KAS, but he would speak in general about all donors.

4.9 Sustainability

The respondents were asked “do you have any sustainability measures in place for your projects if donor funding runs out?” Over-reliance on donor funding leads to recipient organizations closing when donors discontinue funding. Four respondents declared that they relied on donor funding only and that they didn’t have any sustainability measures in place. Though this may seem shortsighted, it is difficult to see how these organizations can be sustainable if they mostly get project related funds. A respondent stated that the civil society sector is always criticized for high staff turnover, but that it is difficult for them to retain qualified staff if they can’t pay decent salaries and also if they can’t pay such salaries on time. One respondent mentioned that if KAS stops funding for their conferences, they would charge a conference registration fee. Unfortunately, this would mean that some people, like community members who would have benefitted from the conference, would not be able to attend. Other sustainability measures suggested were to:

- form partnerships and apply for large funding;
- respond to call for proposals;
- apply for tenders.
4.10 Limitations of the study

The study is limited by not including all the recipients of KAS funding in South Africa during the period 2006-2011. If all of them had been included, the findings may have been different. The reason for this is that due to the nature of the KAS funding, some recipients are funded for only one activity, and for a minimal amount, and thus they are not in a position to provide a considered input on their experience of being funded by KAS.

4.11 Conclusion

All the respondents in this study were cooperative and interested to be part of the study. They were forthright in their answers and the general view was that they felt that they had a partnership with KAS due to a variety of reasons; for instance, there is open engagement and they felt at liberty to inform KAS if they were not satisfied about something. However, there was a strong feeling that in general, donors must grant institutional funding because giving only project related funding is not fair to partner organizations. All respondents were thinking about sustainability, however, not all of them have sustainability measures in place.

In Chapter five conclusions and recommendations are made based on documentary and the interview findings.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter the problem statement, research questions and objectives are linked to the documentary and interview findings, and conclusions and recommendations are made, drawn from the findings.

5.2 Problem statement

What is the perception of the KAS recipients’ relationship with KAS?

The recipients of KAS share the KAS view that their relationship is a partnership. There is open engagement and independence to decide on own projects. There is an open-door policy at KAS which encourage recipients to engage on diverse issues.

5.3 Research questions

What is the nature of the relationship between KAS and its recipients?

The relationship between KAS and its recipients is based on mutual respect and it is mutually beneficial. There is open engagement and the recipients feel free to engage KAS if they are dissatisfied with the partnership. KAS is also free to ask recipients for advice on any matter related to its work in South Africa.

How could this relationship be improved?

The relationship could be improved by KAS being considerate to the recipients’ needs and assisting them with, among others, institutional funding. Such funding would help most recipients to focus their efforts on projects rather than on looking for funds for salaries, rent etc. The relationship could also be improved by recipients being co-operative and submitting all documentation which KAS needs for its financial reporting.

5.3.1 Sub research questions

Do both parties see their relationship as an equal partnership?

Both parties see the relationship as an equal partnership because KAS does not dictate terms to its recipients, and the recipients feel that they have the independence to decide on own projects and do not feel pressure from KAS. KAS is also free to suggest some
projects to recipients, and if the recipients are interested in a project, they will cooperate with KAS. However, if they are not interested, they are at liberty to inform KAS. KAS is also free to reject a proposal from a recipient, for a variety of reasons, and the reasons will be disclosed to the recipient.

**How did they view the KAS funding model?**

The respondents were unanimous that generally, the funding model is strict but fair. On the one hand, those in big organizations who do not struggle for funds were happy that KAS did not advance funds directly to them. This took the responsibility of managing funds away from them. On the other hand, the others in smaller organizations were not happy that KAS did not advance funds directly to them; they felt that they would work efficiently if the funds were advanced instead of them always having to submit invoices to KAS for payment, or having to pay for expenses and being reimbursed by KAS.

**Did they have plans to ensure sustainability if KAS funding were discontinued?**

In general, most had sustainability plans, however, they differed with the amount of time the funds would be able to sustain them; for some it was a year, for others, a few years or even some months. Others who did not have sustainability plans would change the way they worked if KAS funding were discontinued. For instance, they could charge a registration fee for attendance at their events.

### 5.4 Research objectives

The objectives of this study were for KAS to know how the recipients perceived it, and to improve on the relationship.

The objectives of this study were met; both KAS and the recipients now know some of the concerns each have had about the partnership, that were not mentioned before.

**To sensitize recipients to think of ways of ensuring sustainability should KAS funding discontinue.**

Those recipients who had not seriously thought about sustainability before would now do so, because they were confronted with questions which forced them to review their funding patterns.
To generally improve the relationship between KAS and its recipients.

The relationship would be improved if KAS were to take some of the concerns the recipients had, and try to initiate solutions. Recipients should be considerate and cooperative and always provide KAS with any documentation required for its accounting requirements. Some recipients, because of having worked with KAS for years, took KAS and the project managers for granted, and even though contracts were signed stipulating the required documentation, the project managers always had to pursue them to submit the documentation.

A project manager of KAS gave an example of one recipient, they have cooperation with KAS for many years but they still fail to take the KAS requirements seriously. The KAS project manager must always ensure that she is in attendance during their joint events to supply the necessary forms for participants to complete. In the same organization, the project manager knows that she will have to pursue them for a partner evaluation form, which is a 2 to 3 page document which aims to evaluate the KAS funded activity. Ideally it should be submitted to KAS soon after the event, however, that organization would take up to six weeks before it submits the form to KAS.

In another instance, another project manager at KAS was told by employees at a recipient organization that they were tired of the KAS accounting demands. Unfortunately the project manager didn’t lodge an official complaint with the director of that institution in order to avoid problems for the employees, but she knows that the director takes KAS seriously and would not be happy to hear such utterances.

5.5 Summary of documentary analyses

The literature on donor-recipient relationships claims that there is an unequal relationship between donors and recipients because donors, as the controllers of funds, dictate the terms of the relationship. Furthermore, it claims that recipients are powerless and that they do not have the independence to engage in projects which they are interested in. It also states that donors claim to care about recipient countries, but that they are only interested in pursuing the mandates from their countries, and tie conditionality to their aid to force the recipients to fulfill the donors’ wishes. The literature further depicts recipients
as complacent and not devising means to ensure sustainability if donor funding is stopped, and forgetting that donor funding is supposed to be a temporary arrangement.

The KAS, as a German political foundation, was formed to teach German citizens about democracy and civil rights. It is affiliated to the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) but is, however, independent of it. The KAS gets its funding from BMZ. Its office in South Africa was opened in 1982 and it works with a variety of local partners to do its work. KAS refers to the recipients of its funding as partners and it takes these partnerships seriously by treating them with respect.

5.6 Summary of interview data

The KAS recipients who were interviewed for the purpose of this study were welcoming and cooperative. They were open with their answers and honest about the positive and negative aspects of their partnership with KAS. Mostly, the negative aspect of the partnership was lack of institutional funding, which is a big problem not only of their partnership with KAS, but also in general with other donors. They felt they had an open engagement with KAS and that they could inform KAS if they had concerns. They felt they were independent and could decide not to take up projects suggested by KAS, and that this would not create problems in their partnership. Some had sustainability measures in place whereas others did not however they are now thinking of putting some measures in place.

5.7 Conclusion

The literature on donor funding states that there cannot be a partnership between a donor and a recipient because the donor, who controls the funds, dictates to the recipient. It further states that donors set the agenda and do not give recipients the space to decide on own projects. Recipients do not have ownership of the project, but are accountable to the donor. This study has shown that it is possible for donors and recipients to have a partnership; true partnerships that are not driven by the donor. The selected recipients of KAS in South Africa who participated in the study see their relationship with KAS as a partnership, not just a donor-recipient relationship. Though there are some aspects of the partnership which they would like to see improved for the better, but they are generally satisfied. Recipients appreciate the donor engagement in
their work but they also want the donor to trust them and grant them independence when designing their projects.

KAS as a donor gives its partners space to initiate own projects without undue influence. Recipients decide on own projects, or in consultation with KAS, and if KAS proposes a project to them they are at liberty to reject the project. The study has also highlighted that Lack of institutional funding is a critical issue for the recipients of donor funding, not only for KAS partners. A critical issue which donors must reconsider is to change from paying only for project activities, and to include staff salaries project funding alone does not help, because projects do not run themselves, there must be personnel to manage them, and those people need salaries. Civil society organizations struggle to retain qualified staff because of lack of funds to pay adequate salaries. Donors must be considerate of the plight of recipients, especially with regard to staff salaries. If staff are not paid they quit, and the recipients struggle to replace them with qualified and experienced personnel. The study also highlighted the ‘fear’ of recipients of donor funding should the donor stop funding them, and the difficulties they would have to deal with as a result.

Some recipients rent office space where there are no security guards and given the crime rate, they need guards for their offices and office equipment. Without institutional funding they battle to raise funds to pay security companies, and if their goods are stolen they struggle to get funds to replace them.

The issue of sustainability of donor funded organizations must be taken seriously by partners because donors will not provide funding forever. It is apparent that some of the organizations which took part in this study take the sustainability issue seriously, however, they are limited with regard to income generating measures for reserve funds. Also, the reserve funds only sustain the organization for a short period before they are forced to close if they don’t find more funding.

Recipients of funding must also be considerate and fulfil their obligations to the donor. Donors in general and KAS in particular must create space for recipients to voice their grievances or dissatisfactions, and this can be done by having a proper monitoring and evaluation system in place. Such a system would not only help to improve the
relationship with recipients, but would also help KAS to see that they achieve their objectives and targets.

The study and the interview findings had similarities with regard to the lack of sustainability. Many recipients did not have sustainability measures in place and if donor funding were discontinued, the organizations would face closure. The interviews highlighted that some recipients had sustainability measures which could last for a few years, others for a few months, while others were thinking about them.

5.8 Benefits of the study

This study should benefit donors and recipients of donor funding. Donors can learn lessons about how recipients feel about the way funds are disbursed, and how recipients see themselves as partners in a donor-recipient relationship. Recipients of donor funding should be conscientized to think about sustainability issues. The study may also have presented an opportunity for them to deal with these issues, and to ask themselves if they are in a partnership, or if the donor has the upper hand?

5.9 Recommendations for the study

Partnership aspects of the relationship with KAS

KAS must be considerate of the problems which are faced by some recipients, for instance by assisting them with institutional funding. Recipients must also be considerate and cooperate with KAS on any documentation needed to meet its accounting obligations. Donors are leaving South Africa, thus forcing civil society organizations to close, and therefore recipients of funding must take donors seriously and cooperate with them. KAS receives countless requests for funding each week, so recipients must not be complacent and ignore donor regulations.

KAS funding model

The funding model must take into account the challenges which the recipients face; that smaller NGOs with limited funding are delayed when doing their work because of not having direct access to funds when needed urgently. KAS must consider advancing funds to such NGOs and doing quarterly accounts to ensure that funds are spent as agreed.
There must be uniformity when dealing with the issue of honorarium to avoid putting recipients in a difficult position by not knowing where they stand.

**Staff retention**

KAS must consider allocating funds to pay a percentage of the salaries of all staff working on its funded projects. This will help to ensure that partners retain qualified staff because in most cases, due to the non-payment of salaries, employees have to leave and thus there is a high staff turnover in the partner organizations.

**Publications**

KAS must consider the problems which recipients face over their publications. Some authors do not stick to agreed deadlines and thus delay publication. KAS must have a grace period for recipients, trusting that they will deliver.

**Sustainability**

All donor funded organizations need to take the issue of sustainability seriously. They must devise ways of generating own income for the time when donor funding stops. Civil society is vital for the functioning of democracy, and if organizations close because of lack of funds, there will be a gap, and no one will hold government accountable. Many recipients rent office space, thus every month they are expected to pay rent and this also has a negative effect on their funds. It is better for such organization to ask for funds to buy property, or to request a donation for a property, and in that way they will pay only for services.

One query which the respondents mentioned, though not applicable to KAS, is that donors change priorities without informing the recipients in time. Some donors do not devise proper exit strategies to prepare the recipients for when funding is cut, thus recipients are suddenly faced with unemployment; at times they even incur costs to wrap up their work and some are even threatened with imprisonment for failing to pay taxes.

**5.10 Recommendations for further research**

Further research needs to be conducted among the recipients of all the German political foundations based in South Africa, to make a comparison of the manner in which they
deal with their recipients, considering that they are all funded by the BMZ. The research will give partners a platform to highlight any issues they may have, and will also have space to highlight any positive aspects they derive from the partnership, thus helping to improve the partnership in general. The KAS must have a proper monitoring and evaluation system in place to improve its relationship with its partners and their work.
ANNEXURE 1

Interview questions and main responses

1. Briefly tell me about the nature and purpose of your organization.
   - See chapter three for responses.

2. When did your cooperation with KAS start?
   - See chapter three for responses.

3. Briefly tell me about the KAS funded projects in your organization.
   - See chapter 3 for responses.

4. Organizational independence – do you feel you have room to decide on own projects?
   - Yes I have room to decide on own projects.
   - I initiate projects without interference from KAS.
   - Some projects are done in consultation with KAS.
   - I submit my own proposal or I consult KAS on a theme I am interested in and KAS would advise if they are interested to fund such an initiative and I’ll submit a proposal.
   - KAS sometimes engages us on a theme they are interested in. If we have an interest we’ll work together with them, if not, we’ll reject the offer.
   - Sometimes there are compromises from both sides before a decision is reached.
   - KAS trusts my organization to work independently.

5. How do you understand the partnership aspect of your relationship with KAS?
   - There is open engagement. I am free to inform KAS if I am not happy about the partnership.
   - An open door policy.
   - A good relationship and no compromise on professionalism.
   - True partnership must assist with institutional funding and unfortunately, currently KAS doesn’t assist with that.

6. Is your relationship with KAS according to your perceptions of what it is supposed to be?
   - Yes, we have a good relationship. Sometimes KAS asks my organization for advice.
   - No, I wish KAS would consider assisting with institutional funding.

7. Have you taken up any concerns that you might have had with KAS?
   - Yes.
8. If not, why not? If yes, what was the response from KAS?
   - KAS and my organization had a disagreement with regard to KAS funding a seminar. After deliberations, KAS agreed to fund the seminar.
   - My organization intended to request funding from another German political foundation. We asked KAS if we may go-ahead and KAS explained that it may be problematic and we couldn’t go-ahead.

9. Have you experienced pressure from KAS to change your project goals to suit KAS goals and preferences better? What was your response to this?
   - No, if KAS cannot fund something they inform us up front and we are at liberty to look for other donors.
   - No, there was no pressure, but a suggestion to work on a theme which KAS was interested in; we compromised and accepted the KAS suggestion because we were also interested in the theme.

10. What are your views about the current funding model and approach of KAS?
    - I like the KAS funding model, it encourages accountability and transparency.
    - It helps us to focus on our work, knowing that KAS keeps track of our funds.
    - It works for us as a big NGO, but it may be detrimental to small NGOs.
    - I don’t like that we must always send invoices to KAS for payment. I would prefer that KAS advance funds to us and we account at the end of the project.
    - The administration fee cap which KAS offers to organizations may be problematic sometimes when the costs are above the allocated amount.
    - Another issue is for KAS to consider offering funds to some employees of the partner organization e.g. paying 20% towards staff members who are directly involved in the KAS funded projects.

11. Do you have other funders? If yes who are they?
    - All interviewees mentioned a variety of other funders but unfortunately due to confidentiality I shall not list them here.

12. What is your relationship with your other funders?
    - The relationship is good.
    - The relationship is hostile, the donor wants to dictate; they change priorities and expect us to adapt quickly.
    - They dictate the terms.
• Some donors’ conditions are unreasonable; they create a lot of work for the staff and fail to accommodate any changes which took place as a result of unforeseen circumstances.

13. How would you compare the KAS funding model with those of other funders?
• It is fair but strict.
• It is demanding on the recipients.
• At some point KAS expected my organization to pay an average of R 40 000 per quarter to the auditor, but this has since changed.

14. What is it you would like to change with regard to your cooperation with KAS?
• I would like KAS to be considerate and assist the long-term partners with institutional funding.
• I would like KAS to be considerate when dealing with publications. Some authors don’t deliver on time and this creates problems for us with KAS.

15. Does change of the resident representative have an effect on your work with KAS?
• No, it doesn’t have an effect.
• Yes, it could have an effect, but the project managers assist with continuity.

16. Do you have other income generating measures?
• Yes, I do. I charge a facilitation fee and the money goes to my organization.
• Yes, I sell our reports to diverse stakeholders.
• Yes, I write a column for a newspaper and the money goes to my organization.
• Yes, I write journal articles and the money goes to my organization.
• No, we don’t have any.

17. Do you have any sustainability measures in place for your projects if donor funding runs out?
• Yes, however the money will only last for two or three years.
• Yes, the money will last for a year only and we must retrench some staff members.
• No, we don’t have any sustainability measures.
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