

Establishing an enabling environment for civil society organizations in Canada - Key issues affecting Canadian international development and humanitarian organizations

Annex Two: Detailed Analysis of the 2014 Survey Results

List of Tables

A. An Overview of Responding Organizations.....	1
Table 1: Responding organizations by type of organization.....	1
Table 2A: Responding organization by total revenue size.....	2
Table 2B: Small, Medium and Large Organization among responding organizations	2
Table 3: Responding organizations by staff size	3
Table 4: Responding organizations: Members of national and/or provincial/regional councils.....	3
Table 5: Responding organizations: Members of more than one council	3
B. Changes in Organization's Total Revenue since 2010.....	4
Table 6: Changes in organization's total revenue since 2010	4
Table 7A: Changes in total revenue since 2010: By revenue size of organization.....	5
Table 7B: Changes in total revenue since 2010: By small, medium and large organizations.....	5
Table 8: Reasons given for decreased revenue since 2010	5
Table 9: Reasons given for increased revenue since 2010	6
C. The Relative Share of Different Sources of Revenue for Organizations.....	7
Table 10A: Importance of different revenue sources – All organizations.....	7
Table 10B: Importance of different revenue sources (consolidated) – All organizations	8
Table 11A: Small organizations – Importance of different revenue sources.....	9
Table 11B: Medium-sized organizations – Importance of different revenue sources.....	9
Table 11C: Large organizations – Importance of different revenue sources.....	9
Table 12: Reliance on private non-governmental revenue sources	9
Table 13: Reliance on DFATD as a revenue source.....	10
D. Analysis of Patterns in CIDA/DFATD Funding for Canadian CSOs	11
1. <i>Characteristics of CIDA/DFATD Funding for CSOs.....</i>	11
1.1 <i>Length of time with CIDA/DFATD funding and organizational size.....</i>	11
Table 14: Years of finding with CIDA/DFATD: By organizational size	12
1.2 <i>Receiving CIDA funding in the past.....</i>	12
Table 15: Organizations that have never received CIDA/DFATD funding – by organizational size.....	12
1.3 <i>Nature of the funding relationship.....</i>	12

Table 16A: Nature of CIDA/DFATD funding over time: All organizations.....	12
Table 16B: Nature of CIDA/DFATD funding over time: By organizational size	13
1.4 <u>Currently receiving funding from DFATD</u>	13
Table 17A: Currently receiving DFATD funding: All organizations.....	13
1.5 <u>Size of organization and current funding status with DFATD</u>	13
Table 17B: Currently receiving DFATD funding: By organizational size	13
1.6 <u>Trends in organizational revenue and current funding status with DFATD</u>	14
Table 17C: Currently receiving DFATD funding: Organizations with decreasing revenue since 2010	14
Table 17D: Currently receiving DFATD funding: Organizations with increasing revenue since 2010.....	14
1.7 <u>Dependence on former PWCB revenue from DFATD</u>	14
Table 18A: Organizations receiving funding from Partnerships with Canadians Branch: Organizations with decreasing and increasing revenue since 2010.....	14
Table 18B: Organizations receiving funding from Partnerships with Canadians Branch: By organizational size.....	15
1.8 <u>Size of organization and access to funds in other DFATD Branches</u>	15
Table 18C: Organizations receiving funding from Geographic Branches and Multilateral Branch: By organizational size	15
2. <u>Issues arising from the changing funding modalities in CIDA/DFATD Partnerships with Canadians Branch (PwCB)</u>	15
2.1 <u>Expiring contracts in Partnership with Canadians Branch</u>	15
Table 19A: Timing of the expiration of Partnership with Canadians Branch contracts (non-call-for-proposal agreements): All organizations.....	16
Table 19B: Timing of the expiration of Partnership with Canadians Branch contracts (non-call-for-proposal agreements): Organizations with decreasing revenue since 2010	16
Table 19C: Timing of the expiration of Partnership with Canadians Branch contracts (non-call-for-proposal agreements): Organizations with increasing revenue since 2010	16
2.2 <u>Timely assessment of proposals submitted to CIDA/DFATD</u>	16
Table 20A: Treatment of CSO proposals submitted to CIDA/DFATD	17
Table 20B: Longest time for results from a proposal submission.....	17
2.3 <u>Organizational Outcomes from Call-for-Proposal Mechanisms</u>	17
Table 21A: Organizations that have received funding from CIDA/DFATD: Was your organization successful in winning a call-for-proposal contract?	18
Table 21B: Organizations that were successful in winning a call-for-proposal contract: By size of organization	18
Table 21C: Organizations that were successful in winning a call-for-proposal contract: Organizations with increasing / same overall revenue since 2010	18
Table 21D: Organizations that were successful in winning a call-for-proposal contract: Organizations with decreasing revenue since 2010.....	18

Table 22: Total revenue from successful call-for-proposal bids.....	18
2.4 <i>Negotiating a contract for a call-for-proposal</i>	19
Table 23: Length of time for negotiating a call-for-proposal contribution agreement	19
Table 24: Did negotiations result in changes in the budget of the successful call-for-proposal?.....	19
E. Implementing the Call-for-Proposal Mechanism since 2010: Impact of changing CIDA/DFATD funding modalities on CSOs	20
1. <i>Organizational impacts: staff layoffs, reduced activities on the ground, and reduced partnerships on the ground</i>	
1.1 <i>Staff layoffs</i>	20
Table 25: Have you had to lay off any or your staff?	20
1.2 <i>Reduced activities on the ground</i>	20
Table 26: Have you had to reduce activities on the ground?.....	21
1.3 <i>Reduced partnerships on the ground</i>	21
Table 27: Have you had to end some of your partnerships on the ground?	21
1.4 <i>Impact on different sized organizations</i>	21
Table 28: Impact of call-for-proposal implementation on CSOs – By size of organizations.....	22
1.5 <i>Numbers of affected projects/programs</i>	22
Table 29: Total number of partnerships affected by changes in CIDA/DFATD funding mechanisms in former Partnerships with Canadians Branch	22
F. Revenue Diversification Strategies	23
1. <i>Revenue diversification strategies since 2012</i>	23
3. <i>Trends in the different institutional sources of revenue over the past decade</i>	25
Table 30A: Has your organization carried out a revenue diversification strategy in the past two years?	23
Table 30B: Has your organization carried out a revenue diversification strategy in the past two years – By trends in total revenue since 2010	24
2. <i>Access in 2012 to different institutional sources beyond PwCB</i>	24
Table 31A: Is your organization currently receiving funding from the following sources (since the beginning of 2012) – All organizations.....	25
Table 31B: Is your organization currently receiving funding from the following sources (since the beginning of 2012) – by size of organizations	25
Table 32: Has funding increased, decreased or remained the same for this funding source, over the last decade or so?.....	26
G. Spending on Public Engagement.....	27
1. <i>The scale of resources committed to public engagement by responding organizations</i>	27
Table 33A: Scale of resources for public engagement: All organizations	27
Table 33B: Scale of resources for public engagement: By size of organizations.....	27
2. <i>How long have organizations been carrying out public engagement activities?</i>	28

Table 34: How long has your organization been carrying out public engagement activities?	28
3. <i>Council Membership and Scale of Public Engagement Support</i>	28
Table 35: Council membership and scale of public engagement activities	28
4. <i>Impact of the abolition of CIDA's allowable allocation for public engagement</i>	28
Table 36: With CIDA's abolition of the 10% allowable allocation to public engagement, has your organization used other resources for PE – All organizations	29
5. <i>Trends in financing for public engagement activities over the past five years</i>	29
Table 37A: Did your funding for public engagement activities increase, decrease or remain the same in the last five years – All organizations	29
Table 37B: Did your funding for public engagement activities increase, decrease or remain the same in the last five years - All organizations by the size of funding in the organization	30
Table 37C: Did your funding for public engagement activities increase, decrease or remain the same in the last five years – by organizations that used / did not use other revenue for PE with the abolition of the 10% allowable allocation to PE	30
6. <i>Sources of Funding for Public Engagement</i>	29
Table 38: Sources of funding for public engagement	29
7. <i>Objectives for Public Engagement Activities</i>	29
Table 39: Ranking of public engagement objectives: Number of times ranked by responding organizations	31
H. Participation in Dialogues with Government since 2012	32
1. <i>Participation in dialogue with government</i>	32
Table 40: Participated in a dialogue process: By size of organization	32
2. <i>The Nature of the policy process</i>	32
Table 41: Nature of the policy process	32
3. <i>Balance in the participation in policy dialogue</i>	32
Table 42: Did CIDA/DFATD take account the needs of smaller organizations and geographic distance in organizing a dialogue?	33
4. <i>Taking account of CSO input in policy dialogue</i>	33
Table 43: For the dialogues in which you participated, did you think the government took account of CSO input in subsequent government policies and activities?	33
I. Impact of Regulatory Processes on Canadian Not-for-Profit Organizations.. 34	
1. <i>Applications for continuance with Corporations Canada</i>	34
2. <i>Audits by the Canada Revenue Agency since 2010</i>	34
Table 44: Organizations that have experienced a CRA audit since 2010: By organizational size	35
Table 45: Comments on the audit by CRA	35
3. <i>Audits by CIDA/DFATD since 2010</i>	35
Table 46: Overview of CIDA/DFATD audits since 2010: By organizational size	35
Table 47: Perceptions of change in the CIDA/DFATD audits	36

A. An Overview of Responding Organizations

The survey identified several distinguishing characteristics of responding organizations.

1. Type of organizations (Table 1)

Survey respondents were asked to identify their organizational type. More than two-thirds (95 or almost 70% of respondents) indicated that they were an “international development NGO.” The survey had significant representation of trade unions (7), education institutions (9) and faith-based organizations (11). However, only 7 organizations identified themselves as “community groups.”

Table 1: Responding organizations by type of organization

Type of Organization	Number	Percentage
Community Groups	7	5.1%
Cooperative	1	0.7%
Educational Institution	9	6.5%
Faith-Based Organization	11	8.0%
Foundation	4	2.9%
International Development NGO	95	68.8%
Trade Union / Association	7	5.1%
Other	4	2.9%
Total Responding Organizations	138	

2. Size of Organizations, Revenue and Staffing (Table 2A, 2B and Table 3)

The survey sought to distinguish organizations according to the size of their total revenue (the latest year) and the size of their paid staff complement, for both full time and part time personnel.

Small organizations with revenue less than \$500,000 make up 42% of the responding organizations. Just over a third of the organizations (36.7%) can be considered medium-sized organizations with total revenue between \$500,000 and \$5 million. Another 28 organizations (21.3%) are large organizations with total revenue more than \$5 million. This distribution of organizations by revenue size is representative of the overall profile of Canadian CSOs involved in development cooperation.

The largest proportion of organizations (40.6%) has between 3 and 15 staff (either full or part-time). A significant number have no paid staff (15.9%) or just 1 or 2 staff (16.7%). The proportions for ‘no staff’ or ‘1 to 2 staff’ are larger in 2014 than was the case in 2012, when they were 10.8% and 13.3% respectively. At the other end of the scale, 26.8% of organizations in 2014 could be considered large in terms of staffing, with more than 16 staff.

There are 14 organizations (10.1%) that have only part-time staff (3 days a week or less). The total number of organizations with either no staff or only part-time staff is 36 (26%).

Table 2A: Respondent organizations by total revenue size

Total Revenue (2012)	Number	Percentage
0 - \$500,000	55	42.0%
\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	20	15.3%
\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000	28	21.4%
\$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000	12	9.2%
More than \$10,000,000	16	12.1%
Total Responding	131	
No Reply	7	

Table 2B: Small, Medium and Large Organizations among responding organizations

	Number	Percentage
Small organizations	55	42.0%
Medium-sized organizations	48	36.7%
Large organizations	28	21.3%
	131	

Table 3: Respondent organizations by staff size

Current Paid Staff (Either full and part time)	Number	Percentage
No paid staff	22	15.9%
1 to 2 staff	23	16.7%
3 to 5 staff	24	17.4%
6 to 15 staff	32	23.2%
More than 16 staff	37	26.8%
Total Responding	138	

3. Distribution of responding organizations by membership in national and/or provincial/regional councils (Table 4 and Table 5):

About one third of the responding organizations (34.1%) are members of the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC). Among the provincial/regional councils, Ontario has the largest number of respondents (25), followed closely by Manitoba, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and Quebec. A significant number of responding organizations (23) were not a member of any of the council.

Of the 115 organizations that are members of a Council, one-third (36 organizations) maintained a membership in two or more councils, with 3 organizations being members in more than 4 councils. Of these 115 organizations, 68 organizations (59%) were only members of provincial/regional councils (i.e. not members of CCIC).

Table 4: Respondent organizations: Members of national and/or provincial/regional Councils

Council	Number	Percentage
Atlantic Council for International Cooperation (ACIC)	8	5.8%
Association québécoise des organismes de coopération internationale (AQOCI)	21	15.2%
Ontario Council for International Cooperation (OCIC)	25	18.1%
Manitoba Council for International Cooperation (MCIC)	22	15.9%
Saskatchewan Council for International Cooperation (SCIC)	22	15.9%
Alberta Council for Global Cooperation (ACGC)	17	12.5%
British Columbia Council for International Cooperation (BCCIC)	22	15.9%
Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC)	47	34.1%
Not a Member of a Council	23	16.9%

Note: Percentage in each Council is the percentage of total respondents (138). Some organizations are members of more than one Council)

Table 5: Respondent organizations: Members of more than one council

Respondents that are members of	Number
Two Councils	18
Three Councils	12
Four Councils	3
More than Four Councils	3
One or more Provincial Council Only	68

B. Changes in Organizations' Total Revenue since 2010

Organizations were asked whether their total revenue had increased, decreased or stayed the same since 2010. They were also asked to identify the main reasons for the trend.

1. Changes in total revenue since 2010 (Table 6, Table 7A and 7B)

Just over half of the organizations (56.1%) had revenue that increased or stayed the same since 2010. However, a significant number of organizations (57 or 44%) experienced declining revenue during this period. Overall, declining revenue affected small and medium-sized organizations very disproportionately. The larger the organization by revenue size (Tables 7A and 7B), the greater the probability that their revenue has increased since 2010; the smaller the organization, the greater the probability that their revenue has declined.

Small organizations with less than \$500,000 in total revenue had the most organizations (50.9%) with declining revenue. Medium organizations also had significant numbers (44%) with declining revenue. In fact, of the 100 small and medium organizations with revenue less than \$5 million, almost half (48%) had declining revenue. When those for whom revenue stayed the same are included with those with declining revenue, the proportion grows to fully 70% of organizations with less than \$5 million in total revenue. Persistent declining revenue affects both short-term organizational effectiveness (adjusting to smaller budgets, reduced staffing etc.) and longer term programming relationships with partners (see Section F below).

On the other hand, of the 28 large organizations with revenue greater than \$5 million, only 8 (29%) had declining revenue since 2010, dropping even more to 25% of the 16 organizations with more than \$10 million in total revenue.

An opposing trend is apparent when examining the disproportionate concentration of organizations with increasing revenue. Only 46 organizations (35.9% of the respondents) indicated that revenue had increased since 2010. The majority of large organizations (57.1%) with revenue greater than \$5 million indicated that they had more revenue in 2014 than in 2010 (62.5% for those with revenue greater than \$10 million). The proportion of those with increased revenue becomes smaller as the revenue size of the organizations becomes smaller. At the other end of the scale, only 22% of small organizations with revenue less than \$500,000 reported increased revenue.

Table 6: Changes in organizations' total revenue since 2010

Since 2010 total revenue size has	Number	Percentage
Increased	45	34.6%
Decreased	57	43.9%
Stayed the Same	28	21.5%
Total Responses	130	
No Response	8	

Table 7A: Changes in total revenue since 2010: By revenue size of organization

Percentage of revenue category

N=128	Decrease	%age	Increase	%age	Same	%age
0 - \$500,000	28	50.9%	12	21.8%	15	27.3%
\$500,000 to \$1m	7	41.2%	6	35.3%	4	23.5%
\$1m to \$5m	13	46.4%	12	42.8%	3	10.7%
\$5mto \$10m	4	33.3%	6	50.0%	2	16.7%
More than \$10m	4	25.0%	10	62.5%	2	12.5%

Table 7B: Changes in total revenue since 2010: Small, Medium and Large Organizations

Percentage of revenue category

	Decrease	%age	Increase	%age	Same	%age
Small organizations	28	50.9%	12	21.8%	15	27.3%
Medium organizations	20	44.4%	18	40.0%	7	15.6%
Large organizations	8	28.6%	16	57.1%	4	14.3%

2. Reasons for trends in revenue since 2010

Among the 42 organizations that indicated reasons for a decline in their revenue, more than half (54.8%) gave loss of CIDA/DFATD revenue as the primary reason for this decline. A slightly higher proportion of organizations with revenue under \$5 million gave CIDA/DFATD as the sole reason for declining revenue (61.1%).

On the positive side (increasing revenue), improvement in private fundraising was the important factor for almost 50% of those that gave a reason for revenue growth, and even more when including organizations that indicated both CIDA/ DFATD and private donations combined increased. Only 7 organizations suggested that increased CIDA/DFATD revenue alone accounted for their increased revenue.

Table 8: Reasons given for decreased revenue since 2010

(All organizations that indicated decreased revenue [57])

Reason for Decrease in Revenue	Number	Percentage of reasons given
Loss of DFATD/CIDA revenue	23	54.8%
Declining donations	9	21.4%
DFATD/CIDA cuts & declining donations combined	2	4.8%
Cuts in provincial funding	2	4.8%
Other	6	14.3%
No comment given	15	

Table 9: Reasons given for increased in revenue since 2010
 (All organizations that indicated increased revenue [45])

Reason for Increase in Revenue	Number	Percentage of reasons given
Improvements in Private Fundraising	11	47.8%
New DFATD/CIDA funding	7	30.4%
Improvements in both private & DFATD/CIDA funding	3	13.0%
Responses to humanitarian emergencies	2	8.7%
No comment given	22	

C. The Relative Share of Different Sources of Revenue for Organizations

The survey asked each respondent to disaggregate their organization's revenue sources according to,

- a) Private non-governmental contributions (individual, foundations, corporations);
- b) Provincial government funding; and
- c) CIDA/DFATD funding.

Respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of total organizational revenue for each revenue source. The results provide an overview of the relative importance of each revenue source for all the organizations in the survey.

By combining data on revenue sources (Table 10) with organizational size by total revenue (Section A, Table 2A and 2B), an analysis is possible of the importance of different sources of revenue for different sized organizations in the sample. See the differentiation of organizations by revenue size in the methodology annex.

1. Relative importance of different revenue sources (Table 10A and Table 10B)

Non-governmental (private) sources of funding are very important sources for many of the organizations in the sample. Less than 10% of the respondents receive no revenue from private sources, while by contrast 40% currently receive no funding from DFATD. Almost half of the respondents (47.7%) rely on private sources for more than 50% of their revenue.

With respect to DFATD, less than a third of the organizations (30%) are currently dependent on this source of funding for more than 50% of their revenue. Fifteen organizations (11.5%) receive more than 75% of their revenue from DFATD. At the other end of the spectrum, for almost 60% of the organizations surveyed, revenue from DFATD makes up less than 25% of their current total revenue.

Very few organizations (9) rely on provincial governments for more than 25% of their current revenue. Almost two-thirds of the sample (63.1%) received no funding from provincial sources, and a further 27% received less than 10% of their revenue from this source.

Table 10A: Importance of different revenue sources

Percentage of total organizations (130)

	Private		Provincial		DFATD	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
0%	12	9.2%	82	63.1%	52	40.0%
Less than 10%	16	12.3%	35	26.9%	8	6.2%
11% - 25%	13	10.0%	4	3.1%	17	13.1%
26% - 50%	27	20.8%	5	3.8%	14	10.8%
51% - 71%	14	10.8%	2	1.5%	24	18.5%
76%+	48	36.9%	2	1.5%	15	11.5%
Total	130		130		130	

Table 10B: Importance of different revenue sources (Consolidated) – All organizations
Percentage of total organizations (130)

	Private		Provincial		DFATD	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
No revenue	12	9.2%	82	63.1%	52	40.0%
Less than 25%	29	22.3%	39	30.0%	25	19.3%
25% to 50%	27	20.8%	5	3.8%	14	10.8%
More than 50%	62	47.7%	4	3.1%	39	30.0%
Total	130		130		130	

2. Organizational Size and the importance of different revenue sources (Tables 11A, 11B & 11C)

The study examined the experience of different sized organizations with different revenue sources. Comparing Tables 11A, 11B, and 11C with Table 10B, some differences in the relative importance of funding sources are notable, particularly the dependency of organizations on private non-governmental sources and on DFATD financing. Reliance or dependence is defined as a revenue source that makes up more than 50% of the organization's total revenue.

- Private sources are very important for all organizations. Among small organizations, 50.9% rely on these sources for more than 50% of their revenue. But this proportion is down from 57% in 2012. Large organizations also have a high proportion (50%) receiving more than half their revenue from these sources, compared to medium-sized organizations at 42.6%. This proportion for large organizations in the 2014 Survey is an increase from 40% in the 2012 Survey. However for a segment of large organizations, i.e. those with revenue between \$5 million and \$10 million, fully 75% are dependent on private sources in 2014, compared to 41.7% in 2012.
- With respect to DFATD there is greater differentiation among different sized organizations in terms of their reliance on this source. More than two-thirds (67.3%) of small organizations get no revenue from DFATD. Only 18.2% of these organizations get more than 50% of their revenue from DFATD. On the other hand, 42.6% of medium-sized organizations and 32.1% of large organizations are dependent on DFATD, receiving more than 50% of their revenue from this source. Among large organizations, only 7% get no revenue from DFATD.
- Interestingly, the proportion of large organizations that are dependent on DFATD revenue has grown modestly between 2012 and 2014, from 26.7% to 32.1%. But for large organizations with revenue more than \$10 million, this proportion with dependency on DFATD has grown by almost 50%, from 27.8% in 2012 to 50% in 2014.
- There are no discernable differences among different sizes of organizations with respect to dependency on provincial funding sources.

Table 11A: Small Organizations – Importance of different revenue sources

(Small organizations have total revenue less than \$500,000)

Percentage of total small organizations (55)

	Private		Provincial		DFATD	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
No revenue	8	14.5%	36	65.5%	37	67.3%
Less than 25%	9	16.4%	15	27.3%	3	5.5%
25% to 50%	10	18.2%	3	5.5%	5	9.1%
More than 50%	28	50.9%	1	1.8%	10	18.2%
Total	55		55		55	

Chart 11B: Medium-size Organizations – Importance of different revenue sources

(Medium-size organizations have total revenue between \$500,000 and \$5 million)

Percentage of total medium sized organizations (47)

	Private		Provincial		DFATD	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
No revenue	3	5.5%	30	54.5%	11	23.4%
Less than 25%	15	31.9%	14	29.8%	12	25.5%
25% to 50%	9	19.1%	2	4.3%	4	8.5%
More than 50%	20	42.6%	1	2.1%	20	42.6%
Total	47		47		47	

Table 11C: Large Organizations – Importance of different revenue sources

(Large organizations are organizations with total revenue more than \$5 million)

Percentage of total large organizations (28)

	Private		Provincial		DFATD	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
No revenue	1	3.6%	16	57.1%	4	14.3%
Less than 25%	5	17.9%	10	35.7%	10	35.7%
25% to 50%	8	28.6%		0.0%	5	17.9%
More than 50%	14	50.0%	2	7.1%	9	32.1%
Total	28		28		28	

Table 12: Reliance on private non-governmental revenue sources

(Dependency: Private revenue is more than 50% of the organization's revenue)

Percentage of organizations in that category

Percentage reliant on private revenue	2014 Study	2012 Study
Small Organizations	50.9%	56.5%
Medium sized organizations	42.6%	42.1%
Large organizations	50.0%	40.0%
Of which \$5 million to \$10 million	75.0%	41.7%

Table 13: Dependency on DFATD as a revenue source

(Dependency: DFATD revenue is more than 50% of the organization's revenue)

Percentage of organizations in that category

Percentage dependent on DFATD revenue	2014 Study	2012 Study
Small Organizations	18.2%	21.0%
Medium sized organizations	42.6%	36.8%
Large organizations	32.1%	26.7%
Of which \$10,000,000 Plus	50.0%	27.8%

D. Analysis of Patterns in CIDA/DFATD Funding for Canadian CSOs

The survey asked a series of questions regarding the recent experience of Canadian CSOs in their funding relationship with CIDA/DFATD. Of the 138 responding organizations, 112 indicated that they had received CIDA/DFATD funding in the past (but not necessarily currently receiving funding). The remaining 26 have received no CIDA/DFATD funding at any time.¹ The analysis and accompanying tables below is focused on the 112 organizations.

The survey questions explored a number of characteristics in the funding relationship with DFATD, which will be analyzed along the following parameters:

- a) Number of years of funding (whether or not they are currently receiving funding), for all organizations and by different sizes of organizations;
- b) Nature of the funding over time, by different sizes of organizations;
- c) Current status of funding from DFATD, by different sizes of organizations;
- d) Current status of funding from DFATD, by organizations with decreasing and increasing revenue since 2010;
- e) Distribution of funding from different DFATD Branches, for all organizations, for different sizes of organizations, and for those organizations with decreasing and increasing revenue since 2010;

The analysis also addresses a number of issues in current DFATD funding modalities:

- a) Timing of the expiring of current (non-call for proposal) contracts with former Partnerships with Canadians Branch, for all organizations, by size of organization and for organizations with declining and increasing revenue since 2010;
- b) Success in winning a call-for-proposal for all organizations, by size of organization and for organizations with declining and increasing revenue since 2010; and
- c) Experience of organizations that were successful in a call-for-proposal.

Where relevant comparisons will be drawn to the 2012 Survey results.

1. Characteristics of CIDA/DFATD Funding for CSOs (Tables 14 to 18)

1.1 Length of time with CIDA/DFATD funding and organizational size (Table 14)

Large organizations and medium-sized organizations are much more likely to have a longer history of funding with CIDA/DFATD (Table 14B). A majority of large organizations (55.6%) have received funding from CIDA/DFATD for more than 30 years, compared to 10.5% for small and 34.1% for medium-sized organizations. At the other end of the spectrum, small organizations are much more likely have received funding for less than 10 years – 57.9% of small organizations compared to 14.6% for medium and 22.2% for large organizations.

¹ For those organizations that received DFATD/CIDA funding for between 0 and 5 years, each case was examined to eliminate those that might have chosen this option if their answer was 0.

Table 14: Years of funding with CIDA/DFATD: By organizational size
(Whether or not currently receiving CIDA funding)
Percentage of size category

Years of Funding Relationship with CIDA/DFATD	Small Organizations	Medium-size Organizations	Large Organizations
0 to 5 years	13 (34.2%)	3 (7.3%)	2 (7.4%)
6 to 10 years	9 (23.7%)	3 (7.3%)	4 (14.8%)
11 to 20 years	6 (15.8%)	10 (23.8%)	3 (11.1%)
21 to 30 years	6 (15.8%)	12 (29.3%)	3 (11.1%)
31 plus years	4 (10.5%)	14 (34.1%)	15 (55.6%)
Total	38	42	27

1.2 Receiving CIDA funding in the past (Table 15)

Smaller organizations are much more likely to have no funding relationship with CIDA/DFATD. Of the 19 respondents that indicated that their organization had never received funding from CIDA/DFATD, more than two thirds (13 organizations) were small organizations, while only 1 was a large organization.

Table 15: Organizations that have never received CIDA/DFATD funding: By organizational size
Percentage of organizations not receiving CIDA/DFATD funding

	Small Organizations	Medium-size Organizations	Large Organizations
Total number of organizations	55	48	28
Number of organizations never receiving funding	13	5	1
percentage of those organizations never receiving funding (19)	68.4%	26.3%	5.3%

1.3 Nature of the funding relationship (Table 16)

The funding relationship with CIDA/DFATD has been relatively stable for most organizations during these past 30 plus years. When asked whether the funding relationship has been ongoing or periodic, two-thirds organizations responded that it had been ongoing or both ongoing and periodic.

Table 16A: Nature of CIDA/DFATD funding over time: All organizations

	Number of Organizations	Percentage of Total
Ongoing	48	44.9%
Periodic for specific Initiatives	29	27.1%
Both	30	28.0%
Total	107	

Table 16B: Nature of CIDA/DFATD funding over time: By organizational size
Percentage of size category

CIDA/DFATD Funding has been	Small Organizations	Medium-size Organizations	Large Organizations
Ongoing	12 (42.9%)	20 (47.6%)	15 (55.6%)
Periodic for specific Initiatives	7 (25%)	8 (19.0%)	4 (14.8%)
Both	9 (32.1%)	14 (33.3%)	8 (29.6%)
Total	28	42	27
No response	10		

1.4 Currently receiving funding from DFATD (Table 17A)

Despite this long and stable history of funding, in the past several years, funding from CIDA/DFATD has become much more volatile for many organizations. Fully 40% of the 106 organizations with a history of CIDA/DFATD funding indicated that they currently receive no funding from DFATD.

Table 17A: Currently receiving DFATD funding: All organizations

	Number	Percentage of Total
Yes, Receiving DFATD Funding	63	59.4%
No, not receiving DFATD Funding	43	40.6%
Total	106	
No response	6	

1.5 Size of organization and current funding status with DFATD (Table 17B)

There is a notable difference between small organizations and medium-sized and large organizations in their current status of funding from DFATD. While more than 80% of large organizations and 74% of medium organizations currently receive DFATD funding, less than 30% of small organizations are receiving funding.

Table 17B: Currently receiving DFATD funding: By organizational size
Percentage of size category

	Small Organizations	Medium-size Organizations	Large Organizations
Yes, Receiving DFATD Funding	11 (28.9%)	31 (73.8%)	22 (81.5%)
No, not receiving DFATD Funding	27 (71.1%)	11 (26.2%)	5 (18.5%)
Total	38	42	27

1.6 Trends in organizational revenue and current funding status with DFATD (Tables 17C & 17D)

Funding status with DFATD is a critical indicator of trends in revenue since 2010.

Organizations that indicated that they had increased revenue since 2010 were much more likely (70.9% of these organizations) to be currently receiving funding from DFATD than those with declining revenue (47.1% receiving this funding).

Table 17C: Currently receiving DFATD funding: Organizations with decreasing revenue since 2010
Percentage of organizations with decreasing revenue (51)

	Number	Percentage
Yes, Receiving CIDA/DFATD Funding	24	47.1%
No, not receiving CIDA/DFATD Funding	27	52.9%
Total	51	

Table 17D: Currently receiving DFATD funding: Organizations with increasing revenue since 2010
Percentage of organizations with increasing revenue (55)

	Number	Percentage
Yes, Receiving CIDA/DFATD Funding	39	70.9%
No, not receiving CIDA/DAFAT Funding	16	29.1%
Total	55	

1.7 Dependence on former-PwCB in revenue from DFATD (Tables 18A & 18B)

A majority (55.7%) of all responding organizations receive more than 50% of their DFATD revenue from Partnerships with Canadians Branch (PwCB). However medium-sized organizations are particularly dependent on this Branch, with 77.4% of them receiving more than 50% of their DFATD funding from PwCB. On the other hand, only 42.8% of large organizations receive more than half their DFATD revenue from this Branch. The sample size for small organizations was not large enough to identify trends.

While 55.7% of all organizations were dependent on PwCB for more than 50% of their CIDA/DFATD revenue in 2014, the comparable proportion of respondents in the 2012 Survey was 62.6%. This decline is likely a manifestation of a reduction in numbers of organizations currently receiving funding from DFATD in 2014 (see [d] above and Table 17A).

Table 18A: Organizations receiving funding from Partnerships with Canadians Branch:
Organizations with declining and increasing revenue
Percentage of category

Number & %age of DFATD Revenue from PwCB	All Organizations	Organizations with Declining Revenue	Organizations with Increasing Revenue
0%	9 (14.8%)	4 (18.2%)	5 (13.2%)
Less than 25%	11 (18.1%)	5 (22.7%)	6 (15.8%)
25% to 50%	7 (11.5%)	2 (9.1%)	5 (13.2%)
More than 50%	34 (55.7%)	12 (54.5%)	22 (57.9%)
Total	61	23	38

Table 18B: Organizations receiving funding from Partnerships with Canadians Branch: By organizational size

Percentage of size category

Number & %age of DFATD Revenue from PwCB	Small Organizations	Medium-size Organizations	Large Organizations
0%	2 (18.2%)	3 (9.7%)	5 (23.8%)
Less than 25%	1 (9.1%)	3 (9.7%)	7 (33.3%)
25% to 50%	2 (18.2%)	1 (3.2%)	4 (19.0%)
More than 50%	6 (54.6%)	24 (77.4%)	5 (23.8%)
Total	11	31	21
No response	27	11	6

1.8 Size of organization and access to funds in other DFATD Branches (Table 18C)

Of the 25 organizations that receive funding from either Multilateral or Geographic Branches, 20 are large organizations and 4 are medium-sized.

Table 18C: Organizations receiving funding from Geographic Branches and Multilateral Branch: By organizational size

Percentage of size category

Received funding from	Small Organizations	Medium-size Organizations	Large Organizations
Geographic Branch	1	3	13
Multilateral Branch		1	7

2. Issues arising from the changing funding modalities in CIDA/DFATD Partnership with Canadians Branch (PwCB) (Tables 19 to 24)

In June 2010, the Minister for International Cooperation announced that PwCB in CIDA would implement call-for-proposals as the exclusive funding modality for Canadian CSOs by that Branch. Existing programmatic contribution agreements were fulfilled and some of these extended into 2015. The 2012 Survey sets out a detailed analysis of the first calls for proposal. Since these initial calls, there have been no general calls-for-proposals and organizations with expiring contribution agreements from PwCB have no avenues for alternative DFATD funding.

2.1 Expiring Contracts in Partnerships with Canadians Branch (Tables 19A, 19B and 19C)

Close to 40% of all organizations with existing contracts with PwCB have these contracts expiring in 2013 and 2014. These organizations will undoubtedly face major budgetary challenges in 2014 and 2015. Indeed 42.9% of organizations that have had increased revenue since 2010 face expiring contracts with DFATD in 2013 and 2014 (Table 19C), which may reverse this trend of increasing total revenue.

Further investigation reveals that almost half of the organizations that have PwCB contracts expiring in 2013 or 2014 (10 out of 21 organizations), are more than 50% dependent on DFATD in their total revenue. Another 2 organizations are dependent for between 25% and 50% of their total revenue.

Of these 10 highly DFATD-dependent organizations with expiring PwCB contracts, half of them were successful in the call for proposals (2 for the under \$2 million, 2 for the Muskoka Initiative and 1 for the over 2 million). Two of the 5 call-for-proposal contracts expire in 2014, and the remaining 3 in 2015 or beyond.

Of the 21 organizations that have non-call for proposal PwCB contracts expiring in 2013 or 2014, 9 were successful in a call-for-proposal. However, of the 9 call-for-proposal contracts, 6 of them also expire in 2014.

Table 19A: Timing of the expiration of PwCB contracts (non-call-for-proposal agreements) – All organizations

	Number	Percentage
Before December 31 2012	7	13.2%
Before December 31 2013	5	9.4%
In 2014	16	30.2%
Beyond 2014	25	47.2%
Total	53	
Never got funding	10	

Table 19B: Timing of the expiration of PwCB contracts (non-call-for-proposal agreements) – Organizations with decreasing revenue since 2010

	Number	Percentage
Before December 31 2012	4	22.2%
Before December 31 2013	2	11.1%
In 2014	4	22.2%
Beyond 2014	8	44.4%
Total	18	
Never got funding	6	

Table 19C: Timing of the expiration of PwCB contracts (non-call-for-proposal agreements) – Organizations with increasing revenue since 2010

	Number	Percentage
Before December 31 2012	3	8.6%
Before December 31 2013	3	8.6%
In 2014	12	34.3%
Beyond 2014	17	48.6%
Total	35	
Never got funding	4	

2.2 Timely assessment of proposals submitted to CIDA/DFATD (Tables 20A and 20B)

More than half of reported projects submitted to CIDA/DFATD had “a formal response, but after an unacceptable long period of silence”. Moreover 57.1% of the 63 organizations that responded had wait times of more than 12 months.

Table 20A: Treatment of CSO proposals submitted to CIDA/DFATD

How many projects/programs have you submitted to any branch of CIDA/DFATD where they have remained “in the pipeline” under these conditions:

	Number of projects	Percentage
With a timely response, within what can be expected from a government funder (i.e. approx four months)	57	33.7%
With a formal response, but after an unacceptably long period of silence	87	51.5%
With no response	25	14.8%
Total number of projects	169	

Response of more than 5 projects has been treated as 5 projects.

Table 20B: Longest time for results from a proposal submission

	Number of Organizations	Percentage
12 months or more	36	57.1%
Total responses	63	

2.3 Organizational Outcomes from Call-for-Proposal Mechanisms (Tables 21A, 21B, 21C, 21D and 22)

Call-for-proposals were much more accessible to medium and large organizations and the latter were the most successful among the responding organizations. About one third (32.7%) of all respondent organizations indicated that they had been successful in one or more call-for-proposal. Close to 60% of the respondents did not apply or did not reply to the question.

Only 6 small organizations (15.4% of these organizations) indicated that they were successful in a call-for-proposal. Among the large organizations, 56% (14 organizations) were successful in one or more calls. Only 1 large organization indicated that they were not successful in their proposal for a call. For medium-sized organizations, about a third (32.6%) were successful.

A high number of small organizations (79.5%) did not apply or did not answer the question about calls-for-proposals. This compares to 51.2% for medium-sized organizations and 40% for large organizations.

Success in a call-for-proposal made a difference with respect to increased revenue for an organization. Of the organizations that indicated that their total revenue increased or stayed the same, 60.5% were successful in a call, while 45.8% with declining revenue were successful.

More than half the successful organizations (57.5%) will take in less than \$3 million in implementing their proposal, while 10 organizations (30.4% of the successful organizations) will take in more than \$5 million. (Table 22)

Table 21A: Organizations that have received funding from CIDA/DFATD: Was your organization successful in winning a call-for-proposal contract?

Assumption that no response equates 'did not apply'

Percentage of yes / no / did not apply – no response

	Number	Percentage
Yes	35	32.7%
No	10	9.3%
Did not apply – No response	62	57.9%
Total	107	

Table 21B: Organizations that were successful in winning a call-for-proposal contract: By size of organizations

Assumption that no response equates 'did not apply'

Percentage of organizations in each size category

Received funding from	Small Organizations	Medium-size Organizations	Large Organizations
Yes	6 (15.4%)	14 (32.6%)	14 (56.0%)
No	2 (5.1%)	7 (16.3%)	1 (4.0%)
Did not apply – No response	31 (79.5%)	22 (51.2%)	10 (40.0%)
Total	39	43	25

Table 21C: Organizations that were successful in winning a call-for-proposal contract: Organizations with increasing/same overall revenue since 2010

	Number	Percentage
Yes	23	60.5%
No	4	10.5%
Did not apply	11	28.9%
Total	38	
No response	1	

Table 21D: Organizations that were successful in winning a call-for-proposal contract: Organizations with decreasing revenue since 2010

	Number	Percentage
Yes	11	45.8%
No	6	25.0%
Did not apply	7	29.2%
Total	24	

Table 22: Total revenue from successful call-for-proposal bids

	Number of Organizations	Percentage
Less than \$1 million	8	24.2%
\$1 million to \$3 million	11	33.3%
\$3 million to \$5 million	6	18.2%

\$5 million to \$10 million	5	15.2%
More than \$10 million	5	15.2%
Total	35	

2.4 Negotiating a contract for a call-for-proposal (Tables 23 and 24)

While a significant number of contract negotiations (17 or 30% of contracts identified) stretched out for more than 6 months (and 3 for more than a year), it is encouraging that negotiations were concluded in less than 6 months for two thirds of the contracts. It is also encouraging that for the vast majority (83.3%) there was no change in the total budget or budget allocations.

Table 23: Length of Time for negotiating call-for-proposal contribution agreements

	Number of Agreements	Percentage
Two months or less	12	21.1%
Six months or less	26	45.6%
One year or less	14	24.6%
More than one year	3	5.3%
More than two years	0	0.0%
Total	55	

Table 24: Did negotiations result in changes in the budget of a successful call-for-proposal agreement?

	Number of Agreements	Percentage
No significant change	30	83.3%
Change in allocations	0	0.0%
Reduction in Budget	6	16.7%
Total	36	

E. Implementing the Call-for-Proposal Mechanism in 2010: Impact of changing CIDA/DFATD funding modalities on CSOs

The survey asked respondents to indicate the main impacts, if any, from the implementation since 2010 of the competitive call-for-proposals' modality on the organization's work. While some respondents provided a narrative description of impacts in terms of resources (financial viability, future planning of your revenue and expenditures, human resources etc.), all were asked to indicate the impacts on staffing levels, activities on the ground, and partnerships on the ground.

1. Organizational impacts: staff layoffs, reduced activities on the ground, and reduced partnerships on the ground (Tables 24, 25, 26 and 27)

1.1 Staff layoffs (Table 24)

Since 2010, there have been significant reductions in the staffing capacity for Canadian CSOs, with 43.1% of organizations indicating that they have already, or will lay off staff in the next 12 months. Including those that may happen in the next 12 months, 58% of the organizations that are laying off staff indicated that those layoffs are a direct consequence of the changing funding modalities at CIDA/DFATD.

In the 2012 Survey, 25.6% of responding organizations indicated that they had, or were intending to, lay off staff in the next 12 months. Clearly the impact of the declining revenue situation for many organizations has increasingly affected their staffing capacities.

Table 25: Have you had to lay off any of your staff?

	Number	Percentage of Answers	Percentage of Yes
Yes, even before the call-for-proposal mechanisms	10	8.6%	20.0%
Yes, because of the call-for-proposal mechanisms	24	20.7%	48.0%
No, but we will have to in the next 12 months	16	13.8%	32.0%
No	66	56.9%	
Total	116		50
No response	22		

1.2 Reduced activities on the ground (Table 25)

In the 2012 Survey, 37.8% of the responding organizations had specified that they had already reduced activities on the ground due to the impact of the 2010 change in funding modalities at CIDA. In 2014, again a much greater proportion of organizations (53.4%) indicate that they have reduced or will reduce activities on the ground. Almost two-thirds (61.9%) reducing activities confirm that these reductions were a direct result of the shift to an exclusive call-for-proposal mechanism in 2010.

Table 26: Have you had to reduce activities on the ground?

	Number	Percentage of Answers	Percentage of Yes
Yes, even before the call-for-proposal mechanisms	15	12.7%	23.8%
Yes, because of the call-for-proposal mechanisms	39	33.1%	61.9%
No, but we will have to in the next 12 months	9	7.6%	14.3%
No	55	46.6%	
Total	118		63
No response	20		

1.3 Reduced partnerships on the ground (Table 26)

In 2012, very few organizations had made decisions that resulted in a reduction of the number of partnerships in their programs. More than 73% indicated that they had not reduced partnerships at that point in time. By 2014, almost half (46.3%) of the organizations responded that they have reduced or intend to reduce partnerships. Again, almost three-quarters (73.2%) of those organizations reducing partnerships indicate that this is a direct result of the shift to the call-for-proposal modality.

Table 27: Have you had to end some of your partnerships on the ground?

	Number	Percentage of Answers	Percentage of Yes
Yes, even before the call-for-proposal mechanisms		0.0%	0.0%
Yes, because of the call-for-proposal mechanisms	41	33.9%	73.2%
No, but we will have to in the next 12 months	15	12.4%	26.8%
No	65	53.7%	
Total	121		56
No response	17		

1.4 Impact on different sized organizations (Table 28)

A majority of medium-sized organizations (54.2%) indicated that they have laid off staff, reduced activities on the ground and reduced the number of partnerships on the ground. While all sized organizations have reduced activities and partnerships on the ground, only 23.6% of small organizations have had to lay off staff (or intend to do so).

Table 28: Impact of Call-for-Proposal Implementation on CSOs: By Size of Organization

Combination of “yes before the mechanism”, “yes because of the mechanism” and “no, but in the next 12 months”

Percentage of total number of organizations in size category

	Staff Layoffs	Reduced activities on the ground	Reduced partnerships on the ground	Total Number of Organizations
Small organizations	13 (23.6%)	25 (45.5%)	19 (34.5%)	55
Medium-size organizations	26 (54.2%)	26 (54.2%)	26 (54.2%)	48
Large organizations	11 (39.3%)	12 (42.9%)	11 (39.3%)	28

1.5 Numbers of affected projects/programs (Table 29)

Thirty-four (34) organizations (out of 54 organizations with reduced activities on the ground) reported that 440 projects or programs have been affected as a result of the changes in the funding modalities at PwCB in DFATD.

Table 29: Total number of partnerships affected by changes in CIDA/DFATD funding mechanisms in former Partnerships with Canadians Branch

	Number
Projects / Programs Completely Closed	282
Projects / Programs Significantly Downsized	158
Total Number Projects / Programs Affected	440

F. Revenue Diversification Strategies

The 2012 Survey asked respondents how they plan to make up for any lost revenue due to the shift to the competitive call-for-proposal funding modality in PwCB in 2010. Three years later, the 2014 Survey asked respondents to give more detail on revenue diversification since the 2012 Survey. The latter also sought information on trends in institutional funding sources beyond PwCB in DFATD.

1. Revenue diversification strategies since 2012 (Tables 30A and 30B)

In 2012, most ideas to make up lost revenue from CIDA related to increasing fundraising efforts with the general public or other institutional donors. A significant number (18.2%) were not able to determine at the time of that survey how to make up the revenue lost from the changing funding modalities at CIDA. Since then an increased number of organizations have confronted the loss of revenue as various contracts with PwCB continue to expire and no new general calls-for-proposals have been implemented by CIDA/DFATD.

By 2014, more than two thirds of the respondents (68%) indicated that they had developed a revenue diversification strategy in the past two years. (Table 30) When asked whether this strategy had changed in emphasis, 46.3% responded that it had, while 17.9% answered 'no' (with 35.8% providing no answer).

However, not all organizations with a high dependency on CIDA/DFATD have a revenue diversification strategy. Only 53.8% of organizations that were more than 50% dependent on CIDA/DFATD for their total revenue are carrying out revenue diversification strategies.

A revenue diversification plan is important to assure increasing total revenue in the context of declining Canadian government sources of finance (see below), but carrying out these plans for many organizations has not necessarily resulted in increased revenue. When organizations are disaggregated by total revenue decreasing, increasing or staying the same since 2012, a higher proportion (79.1%) of those organizations with increasing revenue indicated that they had carried out a revenue diversification plan since 2012. For 69.8% of organizations with decreasing total revenue, carrying out a revenue diversification plan may have increased revenue, but has not reversed what are likely large declines in revenue since 2012. Interestingly, for organizations whose total revenue remained the same since 2012, there is no seeming pressure to diversify revenue, with a majority (56.5%) indicating that they had not carried out a revenue diversification plan since 2012.

Table 30A: Has your organization carried out a revenue diversification strategy in the past two years?

	Number	Percentage of Answers
Yes	83	68.0%
No	39	32.5%
Total	122	
No response	18	

Table 30B: Has your organization carried out a revenue diversification strategy in the past two years? – By trends in total revenue since 2010

Percentage for each trend category

	Yes	No	Total Responding
CSOs with decreasing revenue	37 (69.8%)	16 (30.2%)	53
CSOs with increasing revenue	34 (79.1%)	9 (20.9%)	43
CSOs with revenue the same	10 (43.5%)	13 (56.5%)	23

2. Access in 2012 to different institutional sources beyond PwCB [Tables 31A and 31B]

Looking at access to different institutional sources beyond PwCB (i.e. not individual donations), and considering all the responding organizations together,

- The top four sources of institutional finance for Canadian CSOs in 2012 have been 1) private foundations (62.1% of all respondents); 2) the private sector (50.5%); 3) provincial governments (43.7%); and 4) Other NGOs (39.8%). CIDA/DFATD Geographic Branches, other government entities (e.g. IDRC), other bilateral donors, and multilateral donors have each been important for a much smaller number of respondents (averaging around 12%).

When access to the different institutional sources is disaggregated by size of organizations, there are some notable differences:

- Large organizations, as might be expected, are highly diversified in their access to all the different institutional funding sources, which presumably provides greater flexibility in responding to fluctuations in funding from a particular sources (see below).
- Small organizations have access to a number of different sources, but are much more concentrated on the top four identified above – private foundations, the private sector, provincial sources and other NGOs. They have virtually no access to revenue from DFATD geographic branch, multilateral branch, and external bilateral and multilateral donors. A small number receive revenue from IDRC (2) and other federal departments (3).
- Medium-sized organizations are more diversified than small organizations, but only a small number receive revenue from DFATD geographic and multilateral branch, other government entities [IDRC], and other external bilateral and multilateral donors. However, more than 70% of medium-size organization respondents indicated that they currently receive revenue from private foundations (the largest proportion among small, medium and large organizations).
- Current access to private sector revenue is spread equally across all sizes of organizations –52.6% of small, 46.3% of medium, and 54.2% of large. Similarly approximately the same proportions of the different sizes of organization have accessed provincial revenue. But only large organizations have significant access to revenue from DFATD geographic and multilateral branches, external bilateral and multilateral sources.

Table 31A: Is your organization currently receiving funding from the following sources (since the beginning of 2012)? – All organizations

Percentage of respondents who responded positively for each revenue source

	Number	Percentage
CIDA/DFATD Geographic	13	12.6%
CIDA/DFATD Multilateral	9	8.7%
Other Federal Department	19	18.4%
Provincial Government	45	43.7%
Other Gov't created entities (IDRC)	13	12.6%
Other bilateral donors	12	11.7%
Multilateral donors	13	12.6%
Private Foundations	64	62.1%
Other NGOs	41	39.8%
Private Sector	52	50.5%
None of the Above / Other*	4	3.9%
Total Respondents	103	

* Other is developing country governments and social enterprises

Table 31B: Is your organization currently receiving funding from the following sources (since the beginning of 2012)? – By size of organizations

Percentage of respondents in each size category who responded positively for each revenue source

	Small Organizations	Medium Size Organizations	Large Organizations
CIDA/DFATD Geographic	1 (2.6%)	4 (9.8%)	8 (33.3%)
CIDA/DFATD Multilateral	0	0	9 (37.5%)
Other Federal Department	3 (7.9%)	10 (24.4%)	6 (25.0%)
Provincial Government	18 (47.4%)	18 (43.9%)	9 (37.5%)
Other Gov't created entities (IDRC)	2 (5.3%)	4 (9.8%)	7 (29.2%)
Other bilateral donors	0	4 (9.8%)	8 (33.3%)
Multilateral donors	1 (2.6%)	7 (17.1%)	5 (20.8%)
Private Foundations	21 (55.3%)	29 (70.7%)	14 (58.3%)
Other NGOs	16 (42.1%)	14 (34.1%)	11 (45.8%)
Private Sector	20 (52.6%)	19 (46.3%)	13 (54.2%)
None of the Above / Other*	3 (7.9%)	0	1 (4.2%)
Total Respondents	38	41	24

* Other is developing country governments and social enterprises

3. Trends in the different institutional sources of revenue over the past decade (Table 32)

While there has been growing diversification of revenue sources for many CSOs, the trends for some important sources (increased, decreased or stayed the same) over the past decade provide some positive directions for many CSOs. For three of the top four funding sources noted above the trend has been towards increasing or stable revenue from this source. Only provincial sources have been declining for a significant number (29.4%), but still 54.9% suggest that this revenue source has remained the same.

As noted above, for more than half the organizations the private sector is an important source of revenue in 2012. When asked about the trends for this source, 56.9% indicated that financing from the private sector for international CSOs has increased over the past decade and only 8.6% suggested that it had been decreasing. For Other NGOs 43.5% suggest an increasing trend and a further 43.5% indicate that it has remained the same. Similarly, for private foundations, 43.1% say that this revenue has increased and another 45.8% that this revenue has remained the same.

Other sources, mainly Canadian government sources – DFATD Geographic (55.6% decreasing), DFATD Multilateral (32% decreasing), Other Federal Departments (42.4% decreasing), Other Government Entities [IDRC] (40.7% decreasing) – had more respondents indicate that finance had decreased than those indicating an increase from that source. However, for DFATD Multilateral and for Other Federal Departments, a significant number (52% and 45.5% respectively) indicated that revenue from these sources had remained the same over the past decade.

Table 32: Has funding increased, decreased or remained the same for this revenue source, over the last decade or so?

Percentage of total responses for each funding source

	Increased funding	Decreased funding	Same funding	Total Responses
CIDA/DFATD Geographic	10 (27.8%)	20 (55.6%)	6 (16.7%)	36
CIDA/DFATD Multilateral	4 (16.0%)	8 (32.0%)	13 (52.0%)	25
Other Federal Department	4 (12.1%)	14 (42.4%)	15 (45.5%)	33
Provincial Government	8 (15.7%)	15 (29.4%)	28 (54.9%)	51
Other Gov't created entities (IDRC)	6 (22.2%)	11 (40.7%)	10 (37.0%)	27
Other bilateral donors	6 (30.0%)	6 (30.0%)	8 (40.0%)	20
Multilateral donors	8 (32.0%)	8 (32.0%)	9 (36.0%)	25
Private Foundations	31 (43.1%)	8 (11.1%)	33 (45.8%)	72
Other NGOs	20 (43.5%)	6 (13.0%)	20 (43.5%)	46
Private Sector	33 (56.9%)	5 (8.6%)	20 (34.5%)	58

G. Spending on Public Engagement

While the 2012 Survey asked some questions about future intentions for spending on public engagement (PE), the 2014 Survey developed a profile of PE for responding organizations and the consequences of changing funding in the sector for this important activity.

Using the broad definition of public engagement activity in the survey (see Table 39), 105 of the 138 organizations (76.1%) have had some experience with public engagement. In terms of size of organization, 73% of small organizations, 79% of medium-sized organizations and 96% (all but 1) of large organizations carried out public engagement activities. The 105 organizations indicating some PE activity were then analyzed accordingly.

1. The scale of resources committed to public engagement by responding organizations (Tables 33A and 33B)

The majority of organizations that support public engagement (58.1%) provide less than 10% of their resources to public engagement. The organizations devoting less than 10% to PE were evenly divided among the small, medium and large organizations. Medium-size organizations at 41.0% were the most numerous in this level of allocation of resources to PE.

However, small organizations were much more likely to be focused more directly on public engagement. Of the organizations that devoted more than 20% of their resources to PE, 56% were small organizations. Four out of the seven organizations devoting more than 50% were small organizations, and the remaining three were medium size organizations.

Table 33A: scale of resources for public engagement: All organizations

	Number of Organizations	Percentage
0%	3*	2.9%
Less than 10%	58	55.2%
10% to 20%	19	18.1%
20% to 30%	11	10.5%
30% to 50%	7	6.7%
More than 50%	7	6.7%
Total	105	

Note: These 3 organizations were not able to specify their budget for public engagement.

Table 33B: Scale of Resources for Public Engagement: By size of organization

Percentage of organizations in each allocation of resources category

	Small Organizations	Medium-size Organizations	Large Organizations	Total
0%	(0.0%)	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	3
Less than 10%	18 (31.0%)	23 (39.7%)	17 (29.3%)	58
10% to 20%	8 (42.1%)	5 (26.3%)	6 (31.6%)	19
20% to 30%	6 (54.5%)	3 (27.3%)	2 (18.2)	11
30% to 50%	4 (57.1%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	7
More than 50%	4 (57.1%)	3 (42.9%)	(0.0%)	7

Note: These 3 organizations were not able to specify their budget for public engagement.

2. How long have organizations been carrying out public engagement activities? (Table 34)

The vast majority of organizations (74.5%) have been doing PE for more than 20 years, and 92.7% indicate that they have been doing PE for more than 10 years. There is therefore a wealth of PE experience in the community.

Among those organizations indicating PE activities for more than 20 years, 25% of these organizations devote more than 20% of their resources to PE work. This compares favourably to 23.8% for all organizations undertaking PE work.

Table 34: How long has your organization been carrying out public engagement activities?
Percentage of total responses

	Number	Percentage of responses
For less than 1 year	0	0.0%
For 1 to 4 years	1	1.0%
For 5 to 9 years	3	5.6%
For 10 to 19 years	10	18.2%
For 20+ years	41	74.5%
Total	55	
No response	50	

3. Council Membership and Public Engagement Support (Table 35)

Approximately the same proportion of those organizations that devote less than 20% to public engagement are either a member of one provincial/regional Council or member more than one Council.

At the other end of the spectrum of support for PE, 18.8% of those organizations that are members of only a provincial or regional council devoted more than 30% to PE, compared to 6.8% of organizations that are members of more than one Council, which tend to be national organizations.

Table 35: Council Membership and Scale of Public Engagement Support

	Prov/Regional Council Only	%age	More than one Council	%age
0%	1	2.1%	1	2.3%
Less than 10%	25	52.1%	28	63.6%
10% to 20%	9	18.8%	7	15.9%
20% to 30%	4	8.3%	5	11.3%
30% to 50%	7	14.6%	0	0.0%
More than 50%	2	4.2%	3	6.8%
Total	48		44	

4. Impact of the abolition of CIDA's 10% allowable allocation for public engagement (Table 36)

What has been the trend in allocating resources to PE since 2012, given the 2010 abolition of CIDA/DFATD incentive to use 10% of contribution agreements for PE work? In the 2012

Survey just over half the respondents indicated that they had made use of the 10% allocation. But almost two-thirds of all organizations in 2012 indicated that they did not intend to undertake public engagement with other organizational revenue.

However the 2014 Survey suggests that many of these organizations did indeed use other organizational revenue for public engagement, with 71.6% of respondents indicating that they had used other revenue to replace the 10% allowable allocation for PE. (Table 36) This is a significant change in attitude since 2012.

Table 36: With the abolition of the 10% allowable allocation for Public Engagement, has your organization used other resources for PE? – All organizations

Some organizations did not get CIDA/DFATD funding

	Number	Percentage
Yes	68	71.6%
No	27	28.4%
Total	95	

5. Trends in financing for public engagement activities over the past five years (Tables 37A, 37B and 37C)

The 2014 Survey suggests that expenditures on PE have been relatively stable over the past five years. Almost 70% of the organizations indicated that their spending on PE work has increased or remained the same over the past 5 years. This stability is even more pronounced for organizations spending more than 20% of their revenue on PE. Among these organizations, 88% indicated that spending has either increased (36%) or remained the same (52%). At the other end of the spectrum, declining commitment to PE is more apparent among organizations that spend less than 20% of their resources on PE, with 39.0% of these organizations decreasing funding on PE (compared to 30.5% for the sample as a whole).

The decision to use alternative resources to replace the 10% allowable allocation from CIDA contracts is also not necessarily reflected in an increase in resources for PE beyond what was being spent. For some organizations allocating new resources, funding for PE dropped. A higher percentage (36.4%) of organizations decreased PE among those that did use alternative resources than is the case for all organization in the sample (30.5%).

On a more positive note, among those that indicated that they did not use alternative resources, 55.6% indicated that revenue for PE work remained the same over the past five years, compared to 41.9% for all organizations in the sample. It is not clear how these organizations sustained their level of funding for PE. However, one explanation may be that PE is not a significant investment, with 76% of those organizations that did not find alternative resources spending less than 10% on PE work (compared to 55% for the sample as a whole).

Table 37A: Did your support for Public Engagement increase, decrease or remain the same in the last five years? – All organizations

Percentage of total organizations

	Number	Percentage
Increased	29	27.6%
Decreased	32	30.5%
Remained the same	44	41.9%
Total	105	

Table 37B: Did your support for Public Engagement increase, decrease or remain the same in the last five years? – All organizations

Percentage of organizations in each allocation of resources category

	Increased	Decreased	Remain Same	Total
Less than 10%	11 (23.4%)	23 (48.9%)	13 (27.7%)	47
10% to 20%	7 (36.8%)	7 (36.8%)	5 (26.3%)	19
More than 20%	9 (36.0%)	3 (12.0%)	13 (52.0%)	25

Table 37C: Did your support for Public Engagement increase, decrease or remain the same in the last five years? – By organizations that used / did not use other revenue for PE with the abolition of the 10% allowable allocation to PE

Percentage of total that indicated use / not use alternative resources

	Yes, used other revenue	No, did not replace 10% allocation
Resources for PE increased	16 (24.2%)	6 (22.2%)
Resources for PE decreased	24 (36.4%)	6 (22.2%)
Resources for PE remained same	26 (39.4%)	15 (55.6%)
Total	66	27
No response	2	

6. Sources of Funding for Public Engagement

In terms of sources for funding for PE (Table 38), responding organizations indicated that the top three sources are 1) private individual donations, 2) CIDA/DFATD, and 3) corporate donors. Respondents were not asked whether these sources have been increasing, declining or remaining the same as sources for PE. All organizations, however, did report that funding from DFATD sources have been declining overall in the past five years (see Section G, Table 32).

Table 38: Sources of Funding for Public Engagement

Respondents can select more than one source

Number of respondents = 94 (11 provided no response)

	Number of Times Selected	Ranking
CIDA/DFATD	26	2
Other Federal Government Agencies	2	6
Canadian Foundations	6	5
Provincial Government Agencies	7	4
Corporate Donors	9	3
Members	7	4
Individual Donors	33	1
International Foundations	0	7
Research Institutions	2	6
Multilateral Orgs	0	7
Other Governments	0	7

7. Objectives for Public Engagement Activities

The most popular objective for public engagement activities is “raising awareness about particular issues”, which ranked first by 40% of the organizations and in the top three by 80% of the organizations. On the other end, “advocacy” was ranked in last position (#6 or #7) by 52.7% of the organizations.

“Information sharing about organizational programs” was the second most common ranking for the first objective for PE (18.2% of the ranking for first spot). Thirty-six percent (36.4%) of the organizations ranked this objective within the top three objectives. Similarly “changing broad attitudes” was ranked in first place by 10.9% of the organizations, but among the top three objectives by 41.8% of organizations.

The objective, “empowering target populations,” has a mixed reaction. It was placed in first spot by 12.7% of the organizations (and among the top three by 32.7%), but it was also ranked last by 45.5% of the organizations.

“Fundraising” is a controversial objective for PE activities. Among responding organizations, about a third (34.4%) ranked it among the top three and about a third (36.4%) also ranked it among the least most important objective.

Table 39: Ranking of public engagement objectives: Number of times ranked by responding organizations

(Only 55 out of 105 organizations completed the ranking, which reduces the statistical validity of the scores)

	Ranking #1, Times Ranked	%age of organizations	Ranking #1, #2, & #3, Times ranked	%age of organizations	Ranking #6 & #7, Times ranked	%age of organizations
Raising Awareness about particular issues	22	40.0%	44	80.0%	0	0.0%
Advocacy (political action)	0	0.0%	13	23.6%	29	52.7%
Information sharing about organizational programs	10	18.2%	33	36.4%	7	12.7%
Volunteer recruitment and action	1	1.8%	15	27.3%	22	40.0%
Fundraising	9	16.4%	19	34.5%	20	36.4%
Changing broad attitudes etc	6	10.9%	23	41.8%	7	12.7%
Empowering target population	7	12.7%	18	32.7%	25	45.5%
Number of organizations ranking	55		55		55	

H. Participation in Dialogues with Government since 2012

The survey sought out the degree to which respondents had been invited and participated in various forms of policy dialogue with government, including departments outside of DFATD.

1. Participation in a dialogue with government (Table 40)

Only 33 organizations out of 138, or 23.9% of respondents indicated that they had engaged in a policy process with government since 2012. While the different sized organizations were relatively equal among the 33 organizations, double the proportion of large organizations (42.9%) participated in policy dialogue than small (20%) or medium-sized (20.8%). A similar proportion of small and medium sized organizations participated in these policy dialogue.

Table 40: Participated in a dialogue process: By Size of organization

Percentage of total respondents for each size category

	Number	Percentage	Total respondents in size category
Small	11	20.0%	55
Medium-size	10	20.8%	48
Large	12	42.9%	28
Total	33		

2. The Nature of the policy process (Table 41)

As would be expected, most of the 33 organizations participated in CIDA/DFATD policy roundtables or other dialogue event, with little distinction between the two. The Department of Finance events attracted only 2 or 3 organizations. There were also a significant number of other government policy roundtables and events spread among several government departments.

Table 41: Nature of the policy process

	Number of Organizations Participated
CIDA/DFATD official policy roundtables	17
Other CIDA/DFATD dialogue or event	25
Dept of Finance official policy roundtable	3
Dept of Finance other dialogue or event	2
Other Govt official policy roundtable*	7
Other Govt dialogue or event*	12

* Other departments include Environment (2), Health (1), DFAIT (2), a Provincial process (2) and a parliamentary committee (1)

3. Balance in the participation in policy dialogue (Table 42)

The survey asked all respondents whether CIDA/DFATD took account the needs of smaller organizations and those that are based in provinces beyond Central Canada. Unfortunately only 17 respondents choose to answer this question, making the sample size too small to draw conclusions on it alone.

It is perhaps a positive indicator that 5 of the 11 small organizations that indicated that they had participated in a policy dialogue were from western Canada, mainly British Columbia and Alberta. However, when the 33 organizations are correlated with membership in a provincial/regional council, with only a few exceptions, those that were members of MCIC, SCIC and ACIC were national organizations. Almost half (15) of the 33 are members of the CCIC.

Table 42: Did CIDA/DFATD take account the needs of smaller organizations and geographic distance in organizing a dialogue?

N = 17	Number	Percentage
Yes	7	41.2%
No	10	58.8%
Total	17	

4. Taking account of CSO input in policy dialogue (Table 43)

Participants were evenly divided when asked whether the government took account of CSO input in the dialogues and policy events.

Table 43: For the dialogues in which you participated did you think the government took account of CSO input in subsequent government policies and activities?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	13	52.0%
No	12	48.0%
Total	25	

1. Impact of Regulatory Processes on Canadian Not-for-Profit Organizations

Since 2012 organizations have been impacted in a number of non-financial areas. All federally incorporated not-for-profits must apply for “continuance” as a not-for-profit organization under a new Not-for-profit Corporations Act. Federally incorporated charities must also file new by-laws with the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) as part of the continuance process. The survey asked these organizations about any reactions or issues from CRA that significantly affects the operations of the organization.

The survey in this section also asked about organizations’ experience with audits by the CRA and audits by CIDA/DFATD.

1. Applications for continuance with Corporations Canada

While the total number of federally incorporated organizations in the sample is unknown, 30 organizations indicated that they had completed the compliance process with Corporations Canada. These 30 organizations indicated that they had no issues with Corporations Canada in receiving a certificate of compliance.

Only 8 organizations out of the 30 that had received compliance certificates had to submit new by-laws as charities to Canada Revenue Agency. The main issue with CRA is CRA challenges when the organization changes its objects in the new by-laws. There were three organizations that indicated that CRA raised questions about objects – one reverted to the old objects, another sought legal advice and their new objects were approved, and a third indicated that issue was cleared up with CRA.

2. Audits by the Canada Revenue Agency since 2010 (Tables 44 and 45)

A total of 25 organizations, just less than 20% of the sample, had been required to undergo an audit by CRA since 2010. Four of these organizations had more than 1 audit and one had 4 audits in this time period. Within the sample of those undergoing an audit, there is little difference based on the size of the organization.

Of the 19 organizations that commented on the CRA Audit, the majority found ‘no problems’, ‘helpful’ or ‘thorough but fair.’ One indicted it was more intense than previous CRA audits and two others found it ‘onerous and time-consuming.’ Five respondents suggested that their audit was more precise and detailed than previous. Eight respondents indicated that their audit did focus on political activities under the charity regulations.

There was a wide range of answers as to how long the audit took to complete. Respondents answered differently – some focused on the audit itself and others focused on the whole audit process ending in the sign-off by CRA and the organization. The latter mainly ranged from two months up to a year, with two going beyond one year. Ten organizations had the audit done within three days, while four other organizations specified 4 or 5 days.

Table 44: Organizations that have experienced a CRA Audit since 2010: By size of organization

	Number of Organizations	Percentage of Organizations Audited
Small	9	36.0%
Medium	10	40.0%
Large	6	24.0%
Total	25	

Table 45: Comments on the Audit by CRA

	Number	Percentage
Helpful	3	15.8%
Thorough but fair	4	21.1%
No problems	9	47.4%
More intense than earlier CRA audits	1	5.3%
Onerous and time consuming	2	10.5%
Total	19	

3. Audits by CIDA/DFATD since 2010 (Tables 46 and 47)

Forty-eight organizations – 45.7% of organizations that have a history of funding with CIDA/DFATD – indicated that they had been audited by CIDA/DFATD. Within this sample, the focus has been on medium sized organizations and to a lesser extent on large organization. Very few organizations with less than \$500,000 in total annual revenue were audited. Twenty-one organizations (21), or 43.8% of audited organizations, were more than 50% dependent on CIDA/DFATD in their total revenue.

Among those audited, less than a third (27.1%) suggested that their audit was different in any way than those that had taken place before 2010. For these 13 organizations, the main difference was “less flexibility / more attention to detail.”

Table 46: Overview of CIDA/DFATD audits since 2010: By organizational size

Different audits as a percentage of number of audits for that size category.

	Number with Audits	%age of total sample audited	Audits since 2010 different	%age that were different
Small	3	6.3%	1	33.3%
Medium	28	58.3%	9	32.1%
Large	17	35.4%	3	17.6%
Total	48		13	27.1%

Table 47: Perception of change in CIDA/DFATD audits
Percentage of those that indicated a change in the audit

	Number	Percentage
Less flexibility and/or more attention to small detail	9	69.2
Less audit budget & focus on unrepresentative sample of partners	1	7.7%
Unfamiliarity with organization mandate in PE	1	7.7%
Slow response back after the audit	1	7.7%
Burden on partners in the field	1	7.7%
Total Responses	13	