

# PHE partnerships guide

Resourcing PHE partnerships

Version 1

blue ventures
beyond conservation



## About this guide

This guide consists of 15 chapters covering the core values, skills and knowledge needed to develop and implement effective cross-sector Population-Health-Environment (PHE) partnerships. You have downloaded chapter 6 - Resourcing PHE partnerships. If you wish to download other chapters or the entire guide please visit the Madagascar PHE Network's website here.

This guide is primarily designed for use by the staff of environmental organisations wishing to develop cross-sector PHE partnerships with health service providers in line with priority community needs and their organisational missions. Many chapters will also be relevant to the staff of health organisations wishing to develop cross-sector PHE partnerships with environmental organisations working in underserved zones. And of course livelihoods-focused organisations working at the interface of sustainable development and natural resource management are also ideally placed to develop and implement collaborative PHE initiatives with relevant partners.

This guide draws on the PHE implementation experiences of Blue Ventures and other members of the Madagascar PHE Network in order to provide practical advice structured in a conversational format with case study examples. As such it should be highly relevant to organisations working in Madagascar and much material will be applicable to organisations working in other countries as well.

This guide is accompanied by various complementary resources including an integrated PHE community outreach tool (illustrated PHE story cards) available via the Madagascar PHE Network's website <a href="here">here</a>. Please note that a comprehensive online library of documents relating to PHE programming has been collated by the Population Reference Bureau and can be found <a href="here">here</a>.

This guide should be considered a living document and as such it will be updated regularly. Please don't hesitate to contact Blue Ventures (pheinfo@blueventures.org) if you have any suggestions for improvement or requests for elaboration. We look forward to incorporating your feedback into future versions of this guide.

#### **Credits and acknowledgements**

This guide was written and produced by Laura Robson, Blue Ventures' Health-Environment Partnerships Manager.

Thanks to all Madagascar PHE Network members who provided case study examples of various aspects of their PHE partnerships for this guide. Thanks also to the following members of Blue Ventures' health and conservation teams who provided valuable input and feedback on the content and structure of this guide: Caroline Savitzky, Dr Vik Mohan, Nicholas Reed-Krase, Urszula Stankiewicz, Charlie Gough, Rebecca Singleton and Kitty Brayne.

Valuable feedback on the content of this guide was also received from the following organisations via a PHE training and experience sharing workshop held by the Madagascar PHE Network in March 2016: Association Cétamada, Catholic Relief Services, Centre ValBio, Community Centred Conservation, Conservation International, Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust, Honko Mangrove Conservation & Education, JSI/MAHEFA (now Mahefa Miaraka), Madagascar Fauna & Flora Group, Madagascar Wildlife Conservation, Marie Stopes Madagascar, MIHARI Network, Ny Tanintsika, Population Services International, Reef Doctor, SEED Madagascar (formerly Azafady), Stony Brook University, USAID Mikolo, Voahary Salama, Wildlife Conservation Society and WWF. The photo on the cover page of this guide was taken by Jean-Philippe Palasi at that PHE training and experience sharing workshop. All other photo credits can be found on top of the photos included throughout this guide.

This guide should be referenced as follows: Robson, L. (2017) PHE partnerships guide. London, UK / Antananarivo, Madagascar: Blue Ventures Conservation.



## 6. Resourcing PHE partnerships

#### By the end of this chapter you should:

- Understand that it may not be necessary to raise dedicated funds in order to operationalise a PHE partnership
- ► Know the benefits and challenges associated with combining singlesector grants or seeking cross-sector grants
- Know how to frame your PHE initiative as a solution that addresses key concerns held by a funder

### This chapter may be of particular relevance to:

- Managers and fundraising staff of environmental organisations
- Managers and fundraising staff of health organisations

# Is it necessary to raise dedicated funds in order to operationalise a PHE partnership?

No, in fact often it's not necessary! Your first step should be to draw up a rough work plan with your partner(s), then see what funding each of you already has secured or available for these activities. In many cases it won't be necessary to raise funds specifically for the PHE partnership, as often such partnerships can be operationalised by combining already funded activities.

In these cases, it may simply be helpful to communicate the "added-value" benefits of the PHE partnership to your respective funders so that they can see how the PHE partnership is contributing to the achievement of the objectives in which they're interested. For example, environmental funders may be pleased to hear that working with a health partner is allowing you to increase access to voluntary family planning services, thereby enabling women to engage more in natural resource management initiatives and enabling couples to attain their desired family sizes, thus bolstering local natural resource management efforts. Meanwhile, health funders may be pleased to hear that working with an environmental partner is allowing you to reach under-served communities and engage men in discussions about family health, thereby increasing your reach and building support for uptake of your services.

Madagascar Fauna & Flora Group (MFG) partners with Marie Stopes Madagascar (MSM) without dedicated funds:

MFG has been collaborating with MSM since 2015 in order to increase access to family planning services for isolated communities around the Betampona Natural Reserve in east Madagascar. MSM's mobile outreach team now visit every few months to offer long-acting reversible contraceptives while MFG's environmental outreach staff incorporate basic health information and messages into their community work. MSM already had funding secured for its mobile outreach team to operate in this region (although they weren't previously reaching these particular communities) and MFG already had funding secured for its

community conservation activities around the Betampona Natural Reserve so this complementary PHE partnership was rapidly established simply by coordinating and integrating their already funded activities.





## If dedicated funds are needed to operationalise a PHE partnership, how can these be secured?

There are two main approaches to securing grant funding for a PHE partnership: fundraising for single-sector activities to be implemented together as an integrated initiative (i.e. combining single-sector grants from single-sector funders), or fundraising for an integrated cross-sector initiative from the outset (i.e. seeking a cross-sector grant from a cross-sector funders). Some of the advantages and disadvantages to these different approaches are detailed below:

Approach	Advantages / strengths	Disadvantages / challenges
Combining single-sector grants	<ul> <li>Often easier to find funders wanting to support single-sector work than cross-sector work</li> <li>Single-sector grants allow partners more autonomy in managing their respective funds / reduce the need for a shared accounting system</li> <li>Single-sector grant applications can be strengthened by explaining how the PHE partnership (/ linked activities funded separately) will contribute to the achievement of the objectives in which the funder is interested</li> <li>Single-sector grant applications can leverage funds already secured for complementary single-sector activities (i.e. cost-sharing)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Can be difficult to align grant start / end dates</li> <li>Can be difficult to account for shared expenditure (e.g. splitting receipts across grants for shared transport or equipment if necessary)</li> </ul>
Seeking a cross-sector grant	<ul> <li>Shared work plan and budget enable streamlined programme and financial management</li> <li>May encourage closer / stronger coordination of PHE components</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Often difficult to find funders willing to fund cross-sector work</li> <li>May need to set up a shared accounting system or sub-granting arrangement</li> </ul>

#### Some top tips for PHE grant proposals

- Try to find funders willing to support cross-sector work (although it's often more feasible to expect to have to combine single-sector grants)<sup>1</sup>
- Research the funder's thematic priorities
- ► Frame your integrated PHE initiative as a solution that addresses key concerns held by the funder for example, you could emphasise the programme's health or environmental goals more strongly if the funder is particularly interested in one or the other sector, without changing the overall focus of your integrated PHE initiative
  - ► For example, if approaching a health funder you could say that this cross-sector initiative aims to improve community health outcomes by increasing access to family planning and health services, as well as advancing nutrition and food security through support for livelihood diversification and sustainable natural resource management.
  - For example, for the same initiative approaching an environmental funder you could say that this cross-sector initiative aims to conserve priority ecosystems by supporting community-based natural resource management efforts, with complementary support for livelihood diversification and access to family planning services (as lack of alternative livelihood options and unmet family planning needs threaten to restrict and undermine the viability of community-based natural resource management efforts).

<sup>1</sup> Funders that have / are currently supporting PHE partnerships and programmes include: USAID, The David and Lucile Packard Foundation, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, The Leona M. and Harry B. Helmsley Charitable Trust, The Segal Family Foundation, Comic Relief, Amplify Change, UNFPA.



- Present evidence of PHE issues in the target intervention zone unmet family planning needs, other health indicators, measures of environmental degradation, etc. - and relevant insights from your community consultation
- ► Clearly describe your PHE approach / components and how each of these activities is vital for achieving the objectives in which the funder is interested²
- ▶ Present evidence of the effectiveness of PHE programmes for example, reference studies (such as IPOPCORM detailed in chapter 1 Evidence suggests that PHE is more cost-effective than single-sector approaches) demonstrating that PHE programmes generate better outcomes than single-sector interventions
- Make sure that your commitment to reproductive rights is stated clearly

<sup>2</sup> For example, addressing unmet family planning needs should increase women's engagement in natural resource management and boost the sustainability of local conservation efforts, while support for community-based natural resource management should increase livelihood sustainability and improve food security thereby impacting positively on nutrition and community health outcomes.



# blue ventures beyond conservation





**Laura Robson**Blue Ventures
aura@blueventures.org



Nantenaina Andriamalala Madagascar PHE Network nantenaina@phemadagascar.org