

# *Of Narratives, Networks and New Spaces*

*A Baseline Mapping of the African Philanthropy Infrastructure Sector*

Halima Mahomed  
March 2014

Supported By:

THE  
CKEFELLER  
FOUNDATION

## **Acknowledgements**

The author is indebted to all the individuals and institutions who agreed to participate in this research study and who generously gave of their time, knowledge and insights to help develop what we hope may serve as a baseline report on the African philanthropy infrastructure. Without these contributions, there would be no report.

This research has been generously supported by grant funding from the Rockefeller Foundation Africa Regional Office. In particular, sincere appreciation goes out to Mwihaki Kimura Muraguri and Wairimu Kagondu.

## Executive Summary

This research reflects a sector that is small, but growing steadily in numbers and diversity of offering. It also shows, not surprisingly, that the sector is mainly aligned with where institutionalised philanthropy is most visible i.e. South Africa. At the same time, however, the growing number of pan-African institutions reveals the commitment to broadening the base, and perhaps an increase of demand.

It shows that while the sector is maturing in capacity, depth and vision, with an increase in those writing and thinking about it, its knowledge base and its human and financial capacity are still slender and require considerable long-term, sustained investment.

There are both opportunities and challenges for the sector.

While the number of networks in the sector has increased, no common agenda has yet emerged which brings together African narratives on philanthropy. Rather, the ideological tensions between those narratives still need to be grappled with.

Increasing wealth on the continent holds out the possibility of growth for philanthropy, while greater recognition of multiple narratives of African philanthropy points the way to a fuller acknowledgement of the mechanisms and roles of giving on the continent that have traditionally been discounted.

There is a much increased attention to corporate and high net worth giving, both of which offer great untapped potential, however, respondents noted both the existing limitations of corporate giving in addressing longer term systemic issues but also significant opportunities in the sector for this when corporate giving is prioritised at the executive level.

Another caution is that an overwhelming focus on business solutions can both drown diverse African narratives and endanger the support to issues that require non-business solutions.

At the opposite pole, there is also an increased focus on social justice philanthropy, with individual and collective efforts in this area of work becoming more relevant.

There is, in the sector, a tendency to focus on polarities, but it need not be so, and opportunities for dialogue between differing views and perspectives need to be created, and interrogated.

There are strong leaders in the sector, but also space for development. The research highlighted the need to strengthen existing leadership as well as develop next tier leadership. Specific attention is needed to create spaces for thought leadership in the field.

New economic and political configurations are posing both opportunities to broaden philanthropy and platforms for giving, but in some contexts, there is a tying of philanthropy to politics, with the infrastructure sector needing to trade warily.

There is an increasing focus on developing enabling legislative environments for giving, in a context where this is not the norm, and much work will be required to advance this. It is also recognised, however, that existing definitions of what constitutes an enabling environment for philanthropy are limited and that African contexts may yield a wider definition which needs to be interrogated. Moreover, in countries struggling to build a tax base, questions of tax evasion arise; as well, that tax inducements may not necessarily lead to increased philanthropy.

Poor visibility of the sector and the limitations of existing frameworks in reflecting adequately its value, role and impact have been cited as important issues, as is the necessity of developing strong communications strategies to help profile and build awareness of the work.

Issues of ethics, transparency and accountability appear to be gaining some foothold in parts of the sector, linked to the notion of resource governance; as are questions of how the sector and the field manage and negotiate power, both internally, where they hold the power, and in relation to external power holders.

Overall, significant progress has been made in the last 15 years, and the growth and development of the field must be acknowledged. Given the baseline at which the field has begun, however, there is still much work to be done.

## ***Contents***

TERMINOLOGY & ACRONYMS .....	6
INTRODUCTION.....	7
METHODOLOGY .....	9
BACKGROUND.....	10
A SNAPSHOT OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE TODAY.....	12
WHAT THE SECTOR SEES AS IMPORTANT AREAS OF ENGAGEMENT .....	17
OBSTACLES TO THE FIELD’S DEVELOPMENT .....	29
EMERGING AREAS OF OPPORTUNITY .....	34
A NOTE ON NARRATIVES AND VOICE .....	41
A SUMMARY OF THE CRITICAL ISSUES THE SECTOR NEEDS TO ENGAGE WITH .....	43
OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE INFRASTRUCTURE SECTOR.....	45
APPENDIX A: LIST OF INFRASTRUCTURE INSTITUTIONS AND RESOURCE PEOPLE.....	47

## ***TERMINOLOGY & ACRONYMS***

Philanthropy: The giving of private resources for public good. This refers to all forms of resource, including money, assets, time, expertise, labour, equipment; through institutionalised and non-institutionalised fora; at all levels of scale and; across societal classes.

ABCD	Asset Based Community Development
AGN	African Grantmakers Network
APF	African Philanthropy Forum
BBBEE	Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
EAAG	East Africa Association of Grantmakers
GFCF	Global Fund for Community Foundations
GIBS	Gordon Institute for Business Science
HNW	High Net Worth
KCDF	Kenya Community Development Foundation
NPO	Non Profit Institution
PPC	Private Philanthropy Circle
PSJP	Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace
TSDP	Technical Support Dialogue Programme

## ***INTRODUCTION***

When it comes to bringing together philanthropy in Africa as a field, we are very much in the early stages. This can be a double-edged sword. On the one hand, we lag behind in terms of knowledge, data, systems, infrastructure, communication and discourse and have much to catch up on. This puts us at a distinct disadvantage in developing the field, maximising the potential resources we have to transform the societies we live in and, in engaging at global levels where evidence, knowledge and information on African philanthropy are still largely anecdotal.

On the other hand, there is space to revise, reframe, and conceptualise our own history and narrative of giving so that is rooted in our practice and relevant to our context. There is room to develop models and tools appropriate to our realities, and to explore opportunities for strengthening the role and impact of the variety of formal and non-formal giving mechanisms – and in doing so, help to build a stronger, more independent civil society and amplify and strengthen local voices, local agency and local power in the design of social, economic and political agendas. We can only do so, however, if we give this area of work specific attention, and if we purposefully invest in laying the foundations required to move this field forward – thus a significant focus on the infrastructure to advance, strengthen and promote the quantity, quality and impact of African philanthropy.

While the philanthropy infrastructure in Africa, and interest in it, has grown significantly over the last few years, and some conversations about strengthening infrastructure have been brewing within particular institutions, no sector-wide conversations on that infrastructure have taken place, and no documented research on the infrastructure exists. This report therefore seeks to put forward a baseline analysis of the infrastructure sector for institutionalised giving in Africa, tracing how it has evolved and what it looks like at present, as well as reflecting on what the infrastructure itself sees as core areas of engagement; barriers to development and emerging opportunities.

While this report focuses on strengthening the infrastructure for philanthropy per se, so that it, in turn, is able to support philanthropy on the continent, it is important to explicitly note that an increase in philanthropy is, by itself, not the focus; the ultimate aim is to seek to enhance the impact of such philanthropy on society. Hence this research has sought to interrogate issues related to both scope and depth of the work required.

While an analysis of the philanthropic sector in Africa is beyond the scope of this report, a few basic points need to be made to place the report in context.

The institutionalised philanthropy field in Africa, though relatively small, is diverse. It is a landscape of private, corporate and family foundations, public trusts, CSI units, community foundations and intermediary agencies.

Institutionalised philanthropy has been growing steadily across the continent. While no data exists to chart this growth, this is borne out by those providing support on the ground – new institutions are emerging and reaching out to them each year. The pace of this growth, however, varies considerably across countries, with the economic hubs in each region seeing the most activity. While some information exists on particular parts of the field and in particular countries, no in-depth pan-African studies, analysis or reviews of the field have been completed, which brings us to another point: the field is extremely diverse across the continent. There are strong and divergent views on many issues, making generalisations very difficult.

The spectrum of individuals and organisations that make up African philanthropy is much wider than has been traditionally recognised. In addition to the smaller, more formal set of institutionalised philanthropy institutions referred to above, there is a much larger, much more prevalent and very diverse set of practices, mechanisms and traditions of giving. These include *merry go rounds* (rotating savings and/or credit associations), communal asset building mechanisms such as *harambee*, provision of assets such as oxen or farming equipment, communal grain savings schemes for those who are in need, burial associations and pooled support for educational opportunities to labour-intensive ventures. These and other systems of mutuality and reciprocity are embedded in African societies but, for the most part, have been ignored or deemed inconsequential and not seen as part of the mainstream philanthropy narrative. While there is some body of work on these, what exists has been carried out from sociological or anthropological perspectives, or from the view of community-based safety nets, and linkages to the philanthropy discourse have been few and far between.

Lastly, in a continent where faith plays an important role in people's lives, faith-based giving, both institutional and informal, is prevalent and long-standing. Again, however, it has mainly been excluded from consideration by mainstream philanthropy. Moreover, faith based philanthropy institutions have also tended to operate very separately from the broader sector.



## ***METHODOLOGY***

This report relates to a very specific set of organisations, and few parameters need to be noted:

- The report relates directly to the support structure for institutionalised philanthropy – hereafter referred to as the infrastructure sector for philanthropy – and not to philanthropy institutions themselves.
- The focus is on efforts that support, promote and strengthen institutionalised giving, taken to mean here giving that is mediated by formally registered institutions. Support for informal or semi-formal means of giving, and for volunteering, all of which are important parts of African philanthropy, fall outside the scope of this study.
- Similarly, social entrepreneurship and impact investing are treated as separate but related fields, and infrastructure for these areas is not included as part of the study.
- Lastly, this report focuses on operating institutions. As such, it does not include those international institutions who are providing funds for infrastructure work or consulting companies who do not engage in their own infrastructure support programmes.

Within these parameters, the research is based on 43 qualitative interviews with representatives of infrastructure organisations and philanthropy experts. The research has an inherent bias toward South Africa, as this is where the infrastructure is most prevalent. Twenty-four interviewees were based in South Africa (five of whom work at a pan-African level), seven interviewees in Kenya, three in the United States, two each in Nigeria, Egypt and Jordan, and one respondent each in Senegal, Ghana and United Kingdom. Interviews in South Africa and Kenya were undertaken in person, the remainder were conducted by telephone. To enable a comfortable space for critical reflection on respondent's own institutions and on the sector as a whole, all interviews were conducted on the basis of confidentiality.

## ***BACKGROUND***

The last decade has seen the emergence of a philanthropy support infrastructure sector on the African continent. Fifteen years ago, there were no infrastructure support institutions, and today we are able to identify at least 35.<sup>12</sup> So, while still fairly small, the growth both in the quantity and range of initiatives and organisations has been quite rapid. Overall though, it must be remembered that this is still an emerging field.

A significant part of this support infrastructure emerged early in the last decade through or following specific initiatives by international philanthropic institutions. Several other initiatives were also seeded as a result of the reflection and discussion created by such interventions. Other efforts emerged more organically, particularly those focused on specific parts of the philanthropic space. For instance, efforts to support corporate giving emerged in response to increased interest or regulations within the business sector. Similarly, initiatives to revive the *waqf* were born out of locally-led efforts to reinvigorate this once prevalent and valuable faith-based practice and financial institutions expanded and strengthened philanthropic advice arms in response to increasing wealth and private giving on the continent.

Many of the broad-based initiatives drew significant funding from international sources, while trying to build local support – with very mixed results. In an environment where the sector was still emerging, making the case for broad philanthropy infrastructure organisations was, and still is, a difficult endeavour. The Ford Foundation played an important role in supporting the emerging sector and the withdrawal of that support a few years ago had a dramatic effect on the trajectory of the sector, particularly on some parts of the sector in South and East Africa, where many infrastructure institutions relied heavily on their support. As a result, some had to change their focus, others had to scale down significantly. In many cases, there is a feeling that the sector has not really fully recovered from this.

The field has also matured considerably in range and scope of support. We now have an infrastructure at local, regional and continental levels; informal collaborations have developed into formal networks, generalised support has developed to include very specific sector support, and

---

<sup>1</sup> These are institutions based in Africa and which have a specific programme/initiative related to philanthropy infrastructure. A further three institutions based in Jordan engage in regional work, which target parts of North Africa. In addition, a few other institutions have played key leadership roles in developing the infrastructure, but do not have a specific infrastructure programme/initiative.

very limited capacity has become a steadily growing number of experts on the field. From little, and narrowly focused knowledge, there is now an increasing knowledge base on a range of philanthropic expressions. More and more informal and semi-formal means of philanthropy are now recognised and there is greater discussion not just on numbers, but on substantive questions on the character, role and impact of philanthropy.

The landscape is varied, and has evolved, but the infrastructure is still concentrated in very specific geographic spaces - South Africa, Nigeria, Kenya and Egypt- and this is where the report will focus.

## ***A SNAPSHOT OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE TODAY***

International philanthropic interventions, a rising demand for infrastructure support and a fairly well developed non-profit sector have combined to make South Africa the country with the most infrastructure activity by a long way, hosting seventeen local and regional institutions. The majority of these focus specifically on South Africa, and while two have a regional lens, South Africa-related activity dominates. South Africa is also home to five pan-African initiatives.

Kenya has a much smaller number of institutions, again, most emerging out of targeted international philanthropic support. Five institutions were identified in Kenya, with four operating at local level and one at regional level.

In Nigeria, three institutions were identified, all working at country level. While one is several years old, the other two are fairly new. There is a view that the philanthropy sector in Nigeria is a bit different, with a significant number of operational to grantmaking foundations, and hence in the past, philanthropy infrastructure as a topic has not had much traction. With renewed interest in corporate philanthropy, new infrastructure efforts may have different results.

In Egypt, two infrastructure institutions were identified, one working at the local level, and the other at the regional level, though three additional infrastructure efforts based outside of the continent (in Amman, Jordan) also work in parts of North Africa. Apart from Egypt, Tunisia and Libya, very little is documented about institutional philanthropy in other parts of North Africa, and while there is some indication that local networks may exist – for instance, there is mention of a family philanthropy network in Morocco, no specific information was found.

In central Africa, no support structure for institutional philanthropy has been identified.

There are eight initiatives that are pan-African in scope. Five are African initiatives; one is a regional affiliate of a global institution, one a global institution based on the continent, and one the local office of an international institution. In addition, there are several African philanthropic institutions, which, while not having a specific infrastructure related programme or initiative, have contributed significant intellectual capital, engaging in thought leadership and advocacy and are key players in regional and continental initiatives.

**Sector location:** the majority of the institutions/initiatives are in the non-profit sector. Two in South Africa are in the private sector and one each in Egypt, Kenya and South Africa are located within institutions of higher education.

**Strategies:** Strategies employed by the institutions vary across the board. Research, capacity building and advocacy are most common. Peer-learning fora and philanthropy intermediary services are increasing and there is some work on the development of tools and platforms to strengthen giving, and a much smaller focus on curriculum development and support related to endowment building. There also appears to be a budding interest in pledge-based systems of resource mobilisation, with two new initiatives emerging in the course of the last year.

**Constituency:** at least half the institutions do work that benefits the field broadly. Of these, two institutions operate at a pan-African level and two at regional level.

Community philanthropy - Just under a third of the institutions include a focus on community philanthropy organisations. While there is some form of infrastructure support for this work in each region, and at the pan-African level as well, the nature of support varies considerably, with South Africa hosting the biggest number of institutions and offering the largest range. While South Africa also hosts the only network dedicated to community philanthropy institutions, the *South African Community Grantmakers Leadership Forum* (SACGLF), in Nigeria, *Pronatura* is working specifically on helping to seed and support community foundations in the Niger delta; and the *Global Fund for Community Foundations* (GFCF) provides support to community foundations across the continent.

Individual Philanthropy - The individual giving sector has some support, primarily through institutions that cut across constituencies. This type of support occurs across the four countries, though at very limited scale in Nigeria. Dedicated support for this constituency is in the form of employee giving mechanisms/advocacy and online giving portals.

Corporate philanthropy - The support structures for corporate philanthropy are probably seeing the largest growth, both through dedicated institutions and as part of a broader philanthropic support strategy. Structures exist in South Africa and Kenya. In Egypt, there is no dedicated space for corporate philanthropy, though some foundations (in Egypt and possibly other parts of North Africa) belong to the *Arab Foundations Forum* in Jordan. This

group could also be served by the two other regional institutions. In Nigeria, no support structure exists for this constituency.

High Net Worth Philanthropy - Initiatives and research related to high net-worth giving is also considerably on the rise, with almost a third of the institutions doing work in some way related to understanding or advocating for this space. Over the last few years, this has suddenly become a much profiled topic, as much locally as internationally, and cuts across the four countries.

Faith-based institutions - Support for faith-based institutional giving is much less, with three institutions doing work linked to understanding the space or promoting philanthropic models rooted in religious practice. Faith-based giving has been included in some research and writing, but for the most, has not been explored in much detail and, beyond North Africa, is often unconsidered. In many areas, faith-based giving has long operated independently from the broader philanthropic sector. In other places, while they don't engage in collective conversations, there are on-the-ground, issue-based, collaborations.

Diaspora giving - Diaspora giving is mentioned as important by many, however, no initiatives specifically aimed at this area have been identified – though there are indications that one or two institutions plan to take this up more strongly in the coming year.

Family foundations - Family foundations as an entity are not dealt with specifically, but in the African context often family, HNW and corporate giving are closely related and thus not so easily segregated. In addition, anecdotal evidence suggests that family giving, while very prevalent, tends to go unannounced and unpublicised.

## THE ROLE OF NETWORKS

In a context where learning on and about the sector has largely been located in the global north, philanthropic institutions and infrastructure organisations, for a long time, based their learning on the narratives, dialogues and practices of institutions that emerged from those contexts. As the sector on the continent has grown and evolved, however, we have seen the recognition of the need for locally-based and locally-driven fora, premised on local contexts and agendas - and hence the emergence of member-based networks on the continent.

Eight different networks have been identified, at different levels of formality. At present, the networks that exist vary in focus, geography and target area. A brief description of these networks follows.

The *African Grantmakers Network*, formally established in 2009, is a continent-wide network that seeks to serve as a platform for the promotion of an African voice and agenda for philanthropy. Its focus includes member services such as tools development and peer learning, but also knowledge building, thought leadership and advocacy on the field.

The *East Africa Association of Grantmakers*, formally established 2003, is a regional membership association that aims to promote philanthropy. It does this through four key components: peer learning, capacity building, research and advocacy.

The *Southern African Community Grantmakers Leadership Forum (SACGLF)* was established as an independent entity in 2010 (out of a *Synergos Community Grantmakers Cooperative* that had existed since 2005). It is a regional network, dedicated specifically to community grantmaking institutions and has focused primarily on knowledge building and peer learning for its members.

The *Private Philanthropy Circle* emerged out of a consultative donor forum hosted by *Inyathelo* in 2012 and is an independent forum of individual philanthropists, local trusts and foundations in South Africa. Its strategies revolve around developing a community of practice, raising awareness about social giving and engaging with government to have the sector recognised a key partner.

The *Philanthropy Service Providers Network*, hosted by *Inyathelo*, was established in 2013 and focuses on bringing together those who provide services to the sector in South Africa – consultants,

wealth management companies, service institutions, etc. Still developing, it seeks to provide a space for such entities to communicate and collaborate, and also collectively engage with the state.

The *African Philanthropy Forum*, launched in 2013 as an affiliate of the *Global Philanthropy Forum*, aims to work across the continent and serve as a learning and dialogue platform for high net worth philanthropists and social investors on the continent. Its more detailed agenda and workplan will emerge from the inaugural planning forum in February 2014.

The *Africa Social Justice Philanthropy Group* is a recently formed initiative that emerged out of a convening held on this topic in 2012 and seeks to strengthen the role and impact of social justice philanthropy in Africa. It has three prongs: knowledge building, advocacy and strengthening practice. Again, the detailed agenda of work will emerge out of the first planning meeting of this group, to be held in March 2014.

The *ABCD Forum* was established in 2013 and is co-hosted by *TSDP* and *Tshikululu*. It brings together donors in South Africa who frame their philanthropy on the Assets Based Community Development methodology and who come together specifically to look at the challenges involved in, and long-term engagement necessary for, this approach.

## **Form and function**

As can be seen, the functions of these networks vary. The significance of these institutions, however, is beyond just their programmatic functions, and lies as much in what they represent. Three particular things have been identified here; relevance, ownership and voice. That the work of these networks are directed by local philanthropic institutions, that the agendas and programmes are crafted upon local issues, values and contexts and, most importantly, that these networks represent the driving spaces to lead voices and narratives on African philanthropy, voices that are not generally included in the mainstream global discourse.



## ***WHAT THE SECTOR SEES AS IMPORTANT AREAS OF ENGAGEMENT***

### **Knowledge Building: institutionalisation and thought leadership**

*'We are seeing also a flourishing of publications, a renewed sense of knowledge on Africa that may be unique... but need more analytic data on the state of philanthropy in Africa that could speak to [our ]economic, social and cultural contexts.'*<sup>3</sup>

*'We don't document what we do and where we do, someone from outside is telling our story'*.<sup>4</sup>

One of the areas of work most emphasised in this research is that of knowledge building -- from descriptive mapping to analysis, to exploring new areas of work to developing evidence-based discourse. Looking at the current knowledge base, the field has moved considerably over the last 10 years, when it was extremely difficult to find writing on African philanthropy, especially by Africans. Today, the sentiment is that the arena of knowledge building on philanthropy is developing significantly, but that in starting from a very low baseline, much more needs to still be done.

Until very recently, even a basic repository of knowledge on African philanthropy did not exist. In the last few months, more than 1000 documents across four key languages and spanning all five regions of Africa have been pulled together into a database by *TrustAfrica*. This database has not as yet been analysed and it remains to be seen which of the above gaps can be filled out a bit and what remains to be explored.

*"It's very difficult to find people who can undertake analysis. And we need to build that up fast because we are being asked for evidence".*<sup>5</sup>

It is also recognised that the sector needs investment in developing additional capacity within the continent to do research and analysis. There is a caution that we still do not have enough internal analytical capacity within the field and that research and analysis is being conducted by entities outside of the field or context that do not understand its complexities and nuances and which might therefore exert a distorting influence on the presentation of our narratives.

---

<sup>3</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

<sup>4</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

<sup>5</sup> Interview, East Africa

The view in the sector at present, is that we have only slices of knowledge about particular parts of the sector and only in very few geographic areas; that we need much more analytical knowledge about the nature of philanthropy and the role it plays in society; about the attitudes to philanthropy of different demographic groups and; that we need more evidence-based knowledge to highlight our own discourses. Developing such a knowledge base will require not only investment and capacity, but a coordinating space for this agenda.

*'We want to get people thinking about philanthropy and grant making more academically and theoretically, feeding into coursework...allow research projects that look more closely at including systems and philanthropy, and on impact of grants on people and projects'.<sup>6</sup>*

In this regard, the issue of institutionalisation of philanthropy as a field of inquiry or a discipline met with much resonance among respondents to the research. For some, an academic base linked to other institutions of higher learning as well as to the sector directly is a strongly supported option. This would comprise a research chair that would engage in curriculum development, spearhead a knowledge building agenda and support Masters and PhD students, thus at the same time building capacity in the field. Others, however, are concerned that an academic base may be too isolated from reality and advocate for a think-tank type of initiative or a collaborative comprising several institutions in the sector that would act as a coordinating and agenda development node.

It must be noted that some efforts at institutionalisation do exist, and with one exception these are not on philanthropy per se, but on specific aspects of it. For instance, a collaboration between *GIBS* (a South African business school), *TSDP*, the *Mott Foundation* and *Coady Institute* in Canada has seen the development of a tailored ABCD training for South Africa. Collaboration between *Inyathelo* and the *University of Grahamstown* in South Africa has developed a course on 'Advancement'. At the *Gerhart Centre*, some effort is being put into developing training and curriculum. In addition, the *Gerhart Centre* has recently initiated a collaboration of Arab universities interested in the topic of civic engagement and philanthropy. The *Centre for Civil Society* has in the past included some modules on philanthropy in its civil society curriculum, together with a young writer's philanthropy initiative, which supported master's students to undertake research on philanthropy. Resource constraints, however, have now affected this substantially. In addition, both the Southern Africa Trust and TrustAfrica have been engaging on discussions around options and next steps for institutionalisation of the field.

---

<sup>6</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

While institutionalising philanthropy as a discipline is one area of work, there is also a sentiment that more thought leadership is needed. While this is happening in some spaces, it is often siloed. There is a view that collaborative spaces need to be created to: re-examine our priorities and agendas based on evidence, systematically surface issues that are driven from below – by those we seek to support - and more intensively examine, develop and define our discourse.

*‘Let’s open the narrative so that we start addressing the substantive issues, the foundation, not just like ‘what is grant making’.*<sup>7</sup>

*‘In our field we don’t know what the priorities should be because we have not had the time to look at what the critical issues are’.*<sup>8</sup>

Critical analysis and reflection by the sector is increasing, but it is felt that this needs to go further. Some are of the opinion that the sector does not push itself enough in dealing with contentious, substantive and ideological issues, creating spaces for dissenting voices, being critical and honest about its limitations and asking the tough questions of itself and its constituencies. There is also concern that the low hanging fruit - to build capacity on technical grantmaking issues, address institutional development, resource mobilisation and service provision – can become overwhelming and discussions on the nature of what it means to be a philanthropic institution, the responsibilities and opportunities it carries and the advantageous roles it allows us to play, and being accountable to those roles, can easily fall by the wayside. There are varying opinions about whether this thought leadership role is a network function or whether a dedicated institution, or collective of institutions, may be the appropriate vehicle to specifically take this on.

Lest this be misunderstood, it is important to emphasise here, that issues of research and thought leadership, for the most, have not been raised as stand-alone aspects or separate from informing action – they have been raised to help the field interrogate and strengthen its narrative, practice and impact. As such, these aspects are seen as critical foundations upon which the infrastructure can more purposefully function, and upon which new strategies, tools, models and innovations can be developed.

---

<sup>7</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

<sup>8</sup> Interview, East Africa

## Leadership and capacity

*'I worry that there is a huge gap in understanding the leadership style and characteristics in African philanthropy. Because it's so individualised that it becomes about one or two people but [there is] no serious conceptualisation of the leadership level work'.<sup>9</sup>*

*'There is an innate problem in grantmaking institutions that have people with [a] transactional background but not necessarily the development capacity... need to be wary of this'<sup>10</sup>*

Another area of neglect was felt to be that of leadership and capacity. There is a call by many for efforts to help support existing leadership, as well as help to develop the next tier of leadership in the infrastructure sector. Expanding to the philanthropy field broadly, there is a concern that in many parts of the field, there are capacity challenges related to the substantive development issues and that the sector has not really addressed this or its implications. There is a need to address more directly the areas in which limited capacity and development expertise constrain, and at times even negatively influence, the impact that philanthropy institutions could have.

## Measurement and impact

*'We want people to see beyond the tangibles. The challenge to us is how to borrow from the traditional and adapt it to more complex fields and break it down into deliverables that people can relate to'.<sup>11</sup>*

*'Why is everyone thinking that philanthropy is not happening? It's because it is being measured at a level that is not measuring what we do, and just taken for granted... we are assigning value to the wrong things'.<sup>12</sup>*

Related to this is the broader issue of impact of philanthropic funds – what is it, how do you define it, what do you measure, what is being left out? These are questions the infrastructure sector needs to be engaging on. Several things are important to note here. For long, impact has been measured by frameworks developed outside our context and which often do not measure the things we value.

---

<sup>9</sup> Interview, West Africa

<sup>10</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

<sup>11</sup> Interview, South Africa

<sup>12</sup> Interview, South Africa

Added to this is an increased push for numbers, tangible results and quick wins; the sentiment is that the discourse on impact needs an intervention. There is a concern by some that the emphasis on 'quick wins' has had a negative effect on the long-term philanthropic investment approach, and that as the sector increases opportunities for 'easy' giving, it needs to be mindful of taking attention away from more considered approaches and from tougher issues, the ones where evidence of impact is unlikely to be seen for several years.

Many feel that the sector needs to go much further in explicitly talking about how long-term impact requires both risk taking and engagement on contentious societal issues, and on systemic fault lines. Lastly, there is also an increased questioning on whether the sector is critical enough about the limitations of its philanthropic impact, and what the implications of those limitations are. The sentiment on impact overall is that there is a need to shift the discourse so that reflections on impact need to change to take into account long-term development goals.

## **Enabling environment**

*'We need to work in helping to build [an] ethos for [an] enabling environment for philanthropy on the continent. From legal environment, to banks making it easier to give, to tax breaks to help promote an enabling environment. But this needs to be done in a way that fits into the context on the continent.'*<sup>13</sup>

Unsurprisingly, there is considerable discussion about developing an enabling environment for giving. In many parts of the continent, there is little evidence of official encouragement, fragile tax policies or poor implementations of good policies, and in others, such an environment is non-existent. In each of the four countries, however, some activity has been ongoing.

In Kenya, the East Africa Association of Grantmakers has undertaken research on the tax environment in the region and has been thinking about how to advocate/develop systems to record and capture philanthropy in an organised manner e.g. through the revenue authority ; the Kenya Community Development Foundation has established a dedicated *Policy, Research and Advocacy Programme* and also hosts the *Tax Incentives Initiative*, a collaborative of several institutions engaged on working towards a more enabling legislative environment for philanthropy through a combination of research and advocacy. As well, other institutions have been advocating on a range

---

<sup>13</sup> Interview, West Africa

of issues related to the non profit sector and philanthropy. Interestingly, Kenya has a long-standing *waqf* law, but not much is known about whether it is still utilised.

In South Africa, CAFSA, Inyathelo and the Private Philanthropy Circle are some who have been particularly active in this space. There are efforts advocating for more appropriate non-profit legislation and a regulatory framework that deals with philanthropic institutions as separate entities, engaging with treasury departments and revenue authorities to gain political acknowledgement of the importance and contribution of the sector. There are efforts to have philanthropy reflected in national accounts and census statistics<sup>14</sup>, and lobbying for more legal incentives for giving, financial or non-financial. Responses have been varied and while the categories of giving allowed on the *Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment (BBBEE)* scorecard have been narrowed, there are recent indications by the Treasury that a more enabling legislative environment for philanthropy is being given attention.

In North Africa, given current political contexts, and where the consensus is that philanthropy cannot be divorced from politics, current efforts by the Gerhart Centre are going into protecting hard won gains in *waqf* legislation from being removed by new regimes, a move that has borne some fruit in Egypt and is being worked on in Tunisia. Philanthropists in Libya are thinking about a *waqf* law, but no moves have been made on this as yet.

In Nigeria, following the Nigeria Philanthropy Summit in 2013, and a willingness to collaborate by the State, a collective of institutions has recently submitted draft legislation to the government.

In both Kenya and Nigeria, there are some sentiments that devolved political decision-making to county and state levels respectively, with different legislation governing them, poses additional challenges for how to address the enabling environment question.

At a pan-African level, *Nexus Africa* is engaging with a United Nations body around a resolution on philanthropy and the *African Grantmakers Network* is seeking to engage with regional and continental bodies on a more pan-African recognition of the value of philanthropy and the need for more enabling legislation, as well as to undertake research on enabling environments. TrustAfrica and the Southern Africa Trust have also been involved in research and publications on the enabling environment for the non-profit sector in Africa, and this is ongoing.

---

<sup>14</sup> By Social Surveys, a research consulting firm.

Given narrowing civic spaces, antipathy to private philanthropy in some places, and differing legislative environments, work on enabling legislation for philanthropy will vary considerably across countries. Another problem expressed was that we do not know enough about what kind of legislation has been successful within the continent and in similar contexts outside the continent, and that it is crucial to know this before determining what would be appropriate to advocate for. There is also a caution that the sector needs to guard against the assumption that legislation automatically leads to positive results. For instance in South Africa, where corporate giving has been linked to the BBBEE mandate of 1% of after tax giving, no studies have as yet been done on how this has influenced giving, though one will be undertaken later this year. Before replicating such legislation, we need to understand the long-term effects.

*'We need to do work on what the enabling environment means to us.'*<sup>15</sup>

Legislation, however, is not the only element of an enabling environment. In the African context, a few additional questions need to be looked at:

- What does an enabling environment mean for those givers who are not part of the tax base?
- How do we unlock blockages to small-scale giving?
- How do tax polices deal with non-monetary giving?
- There is a growing movement for tax justice. What are the conflicts between the kind of tax regime the tax justice movement seeks and that which proponents of philanthropy want? Do we understand enough about where tax exemption may enable tax evasion?
- What are other enabling factors for giving? For instance, what can be done by financial institutions in terms of fees and interest rates?

These questions suggest that our definition of an enabling environment to date has been quite narrow, and that investment is needed in examining what an enabling environment means in African contexts.

Another area of work on institutionalisation relates to linkages between the private philanthropy sector and state institutions. Some efforts are underway to engage states on either including data on philanthropy in statistical measures, or segregating existing data so that philanthropic contributions can be identified and profiled as a sector contribution. Others are working on legislative

---

<sup>15</sup> Interview, West Africa

frameworks, as mentioned elsewhere, and others remark on the need to work with regional and pan-African bodies to prevail on national governments either to report on activities that are related to philanthropy or, to explore ways of engaging with philanthropic arms being set up by such supra-national entities. Having dedicated capacity within networks or institutions to work on such policy and integration issues is another area of potential focus.



## Grant making vs. business solutions

*‘One challenge is that people here see the philanthropy space as completely separate from the social entrepreneurship space’.<sup>16</sup>*

*There are things that can be supported by business e.g. raising employment, but business money needs to go here. Why should it be philanthropy money? Philanthropy should really be looking at systemic change and rights, but are shifting into business’.<sup>17</sup>*

The idea of business solutions for development is gaining ground, not across the board, but certainly in several specific spaces. While much of this comes under the heading of impact investing or social investing, which are excluded from this study, it is important to note the shift in emphasis in some spaces. The discourse often falsely pits the business channel against a grantmaking channel without acknowledging the need for a broad range of methodologies and the ability to use different methodologies or tools depending on issues and contexts. There is a tension emerging here: some parts of the sector view business solutions as just that, “business” and feel that such strategies need to be dealt with separately. Others see “grantmaking” as outdated and lacking impact. There are many conversational extremes, with several assumptions within these dialogues that need to be interrogated and mediated by those within the sector.

## Learning

*‘We need a combination of things where we talk about impact but also our own issues and challenges, a space to share learning’s... that was unique about Ford – it gave space to develop institutions, develop board, hire staff. Not just a programme – funders need to look at that’.<sup>18</sup>*

*‘We need to look at institutional strengthening and skills transfer to embed a culture of interrogating and documenting’.<sup>19</sup>*

In an arena where we need to build the capacity of the sector, many feel that spaces for reflection and learning need to be emphasised. Conferences, training programmes and case studies are all a

---

<sup>16</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

<sup>17</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

<sup>18</sup> Interview, East Africa

<sup>19</sup> Interview, East Africa

part of this learning agenda, but many feel they do not go far enough – that conferences are once-off, that training programmes often deal with technical questions rather than substantive issues and that case studies are drafted for particular isolated purposes. Many highlight the need for a stronger, more critical and more reflective edge to our learning and a coordinated agenda to enable it to help change practice. This is something that infrastructure organisations and particularly networks, need to take on as an active area of work. This is not about the academic knowledge-building process; it is about the creation of spaces and mechanisms through which those in the field are able to individually and collectively critically analyse their work, and the assumptions and hypotheses upon which it is based. It is also about creating forums to learn from others *‘without having to go through the bloody experience’*<sup>20</sup> and in which communities of practice can be built. Such forums should also support documentation and case studies on practice and impact and help develop the tools to compile them. However, though the need for these things is clear, in a context where funds are allocated to programmes and operations, a learning agenda is often left by the wayside. There is a need to recognise the importance of this learning agenda and fund it accordingly.

## Communication

*‘People need to know that philanthropy is a sector. [It’s about] getting the word onto decision makers tables, media etc. Start pushing mainstream media, pick at it, educate’.*<sup>21</sup>

Many remark that one of the areas the sector has not done well on is communication; we have not adequately reached out to the general public on philanthropy. More recently, efforts have begun to try to help address this, specifically through media outreach. For instance, last year, *Nedbank Private Wealth* hosted a seminar for journalists on philanthropy and is keen to see how to deepen and expand that kind of work; the *Southern Africa Trust* embarked on a partnership with a local newspaper to publish a weekly series of profiles of African philanthropists; and *CAFSA* is exploring a journalist’s fellowship related to social justice philanthropy. These are small efforts, and isolated ones, and the feeling is that we need to work on this much more broadly and consistently and that infrastructure organisations need to give significant thought to media and communications strategies for the field within their respective contexts.

---

<sup>20</sup> Interview, East Africa

<sup>21</sup> Interview, East Africa

## The issue of power

*'First, we need to address [the] issue of power. The first thing is a consultative approach to power, but we must be in a position to support the agenda of existing institutions. And [we] need to have a format of equalising forces so that we are not just equals, but are seen to be equals'<sup>22</sup>*

Increasingly, the issue of how power in philanthropy is managed and negotiated is being raised as an important area that infrastructure institutions need to engage with - more broadly, and in more depth. This ranges from issues of unequal power relations with external donors, to power dynamics in local philanthropy; from questioning whether the processes that dominate practice in fact entrench elite voices and agendas, to reframing narratives about how resources need to be integrally linked to local agency; from the use of philanthropy to offset reputational damage or exploitative business practice to the external agenda setting that is often used to determine local priorities. These are not issues that are easily confronted and the perceived trend in the field has been to continue as though the issue of power has no effect on philanthropic agendas, and thus on philanthropic impact. There is a call that as we bring forth African narratives on philanthropy and as we seek to strengthen leadership and build capacity, we need to confront the issue of power more openly and honestly, and find ways to critically interrogate its implications on our practices, roles and impact.

Related to this are issues of active citizenship and notions of African agency. There is increasing discussion of the role philanthropy can play in specifically and strategically opening the spaces for local agency and active citizenship. The Gerhart Centre has a strategic focus on this topic, each year hosting a conference called *Takaful*, which is focused on Philanthropy and Civic Engagement in the Arab region. In addition, both the Global Fund for Community Foundations and TrustAfrica have used these as key perspectives for their work.

---

<sup>22</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

## Political environment

*'It's very difficult to think about philanthropy without thinking about politics ... in Egypt, there is no civil front that could mediate. We need for a new non-elitist movement that can look at the problematic issues, thus how do you develop linkages and use philanthropy long term to get dialogue happening in the public sphere'.<sup>23</sup>*

The work of infrastructure institutions, as with the development sector broadly, must be seen in the context of the political environment in which it is placed. While philanthropic institutions exist across the continent, the political contexts within which they function vary considerably. In most places, it is tolerated but not formally recognised, in others there is active hostility and in yet others, philanthropy is used for political ends. Many in North Africa, for instance, feel that philanthropy cannot be divorced from politics, and infrastructure organisations thus need to operate in a way that it is not seen to be espousing a political position or ideology, as well as guarding against the rolling back of enabling policies which are under threat because they are associated with specific regimes or political ideologies. In some parts of the continent, active civil society is seen as a threat to the regime and so work on enabling legislation becomes quite tricky. Whatever the context, the view prevailing in the research is that there are certainly ways for infrastructure organisations to engage and influence. Regulation is one avenue, but not the only one, and we need to explore what kinds of relationships can be developed.

---

<sup>23</sup> Interview, North Africa

## ***OBSTACLES TO THE FIELD'S DEVELOPMENT***

### **Capacity, resourcing and sustainability**

*'The challenge is that people think that such networks will coordinate itself and be light on capacity – but actually we need to build the infrastructure of the network'.<sup>24</sup>*

*'This is a sector that in itself does not attract resources. People assume that because you are in the philanthropy sector that you sit on a resource base, and so should easily access funds'<sup>25</sup>*

Given the scope of work to be done and the growth of the philanthropic field, expectations of and demands on locally led networks can be quite heavy. Yet for the most, these networks, particularly regional and pan-African ones, are extremely light on capacity (actual staff) and resources (financial). The nature of the work that needs to be done in Africa calls for a revisiting of the assumption that networks in the development sector need to be light on capacity. Significant infrastructure support is in fact needed, but it is important that such support is made in a way that allows and enables these networks to be flexible and agile enough to respond to fluid contexts and evolving narratives. These networks hold significant potential to change the discourse, practice and impact of philanthropy in Africa, but without more investment in them, their impact will always be far below that potential.

The philanthropy infrastructure sector is small, and while it does a lot, the issue of resources and sustainability is a major concern, particularly for institutions that do not engage in the private or corporate giving space. Where evidence of the value of philanthropy has not been adequately reflected, attracting local support for the infrastructure sector has been a hard sell. Over the last 10 years, several initiatives have been set up with strong potential, and then had to narrow down their focus, amend their strategy or in some cases close down. While many see this as a resource issue, it has also been an issue related to lack of local ownership in some cases.

Given limited external support and the difficulties of raising local support, alternative income generation streams are being explored and developed. Some of the strategies mentioned include service provision related to tools, knowledge or grantmaking support; the development of infrastructure assets, the building of collective endowments, targeted corporate investments etc.

---

<sup>24</sup> Interview,, Southern Africa

<sup>25</sup> Interview, East Africa

However, alternative financing needs to be done in a way that balances sustainability with the ability to continue core infrastructure work in a responsive manner. In some cases, the drive for income generation has negatively affected the focus on core work .

## **Perception of the sector**

*'We have not given the sector the kind of publicity it needs – we've not made it matter to the point that people can say this is important and encourage it'.<sup>26</sup>*

Philanthropy is very rarely perceived by outsiders as a field. Partly this is because of the sector's inability to be cohesive and to speak with a collective voice, partly it is due to lack of knowledge (on the part of the public, government and at times even the broader development sector) about how much is given and what role the sector plays, which in turn is to do with the fact that we do not reflect enough the evidence of giving and its impact, and so cannot make a case for why it should be recognised. Several respondents feel that the infrastructure sector needs to support efforts to make the case for African giving-- its prevalence, its nature and its impact. This requires a shift on the ways in which giving is thought about and counted, the development of appropriate tools, and a critical mass of data and evidence that adequately and accurately reflects the variety and role of African giving.

Lastly, there is a feeling by some that the sector needs to distinguish more consciously between philanthropy and aid and that the two are often lumped together with the result that assumptions about, and accusations against, foreign aid are often seen to apply to private philanthropy as well.

## **Fragmentation**

*'At the infrastructure level, there is no coherence. Everyone is doing their own thing. Organizations are not talking about language or platform'<sup>27</sup>*

*'The time has come for us to do a big scenario planning exercise for philanthropy over 10 years... and look at where we will be in 2025 and then work back from that – if we don't it's very hard to see the wood for the trees'<sup>28</sup>*

---

<sup>26</sup> Interview, East Africa

<sup>27</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

One of the main criticisms to emerge from the research about the sector is that, overall it is still fragmented. Despite the increase in networks and coalescing of some institutions around specific opportunities, institutions, for the most part, operate fairly independently. Many feel that the sector lacks coherence and a collective agenda. The reasons given for this vary. Some feel that in a situation where there is much to be done and few resources to do it, some level of competition is unavoidable. Others see the reason as the absence of a dedicated network/space for infrastructure institutions to meet, others feel that institutions focus on their narrow constituencies and lose sight of the broader picture – in the words of one interviewee: *‘Territory, time, funding are all factors, and reduction of financial resources has exacerbated the lack of collaboration.’*<sup>29</sup> Overall there is a need for *‘more cross sectoral conversation and leadership’*<sup>30</sup> and a dedicated discussion on how to create the space for a more cohesive infrastructure sector.

One recommendation made to address this is to develop an infrastructure network within the AGN. More broadly, however, are two critical questions:

- (i) what is required for the sector to collaborate in developing a diverse but shared agenda and
- (ii) what needs to happen for the sector to connect in a way that brings our cumulative strengths to bear on influencing the field

## External engagement

*‘The biggest role international organisations can play is to guide us away from this dependency model’*<sup>31</sup>

Philanthropy in Africa is gaining increased attention from external players - international philanthropy, media, governments and regional and continental bodies. A few things need to be mentioned here:

While there is increasing excitement from external players about the potential and role of the philanthropic sector in Africa, this has yet to be translated into adequate, long-term, support for the infrastructure sector. With a few exceptions, (e.g. the *Mott Foundation* has had a dedicated

---

<sup>28</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

<sup>29</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

<sup>30</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

<sup>31</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

programme to support philanthropy institutions and the infrastructure in South Africa for several years, and *Synergos* works with *Global Philanthropy Circle*) much of the external support for philanthropy is seen to be ad hoc, and not part of a comprehensive programme strategy – a circumstance that affects the viability and effectiveness of the sector over the long term. It must be noted, however, that there are a few international philanthropic organizations that are looking at becoming more strategically involved in this space

There are, however, two recent infrastructure initiatives, accompanied by resources, that need to be mentioned. The first is the establishment of the *African Philanthropy Forum* (mentioned earlier) by the *Global Philanthropy Forum* and the second is the establishment of the *Global Community Philanthropy Alliance*, a collective of institutions supporting the efforts of the *Global Fund for Community Foundations* in helping to build the evidence on community philanthropy. While this is a global initiative, part of the focus will include African community foundations. Other proposed initiatives under preliminary discussion have included a *United Way* presence in South Africa, a philanthropy school in South Africa linked to *the* Johnson Centre for Philanthropy and an extension of the pilot based on the ‘funding exchange’ model in the UK. In addition, there is an increased focus on specific Global South conversations, and in the last year two convenings took place: one by the Emerging Societies – Emerging Philanthropies Forum (convened by a collaborative of institutions) and another, on ‘Empowering Families for Innovative Philanthropy, convened by the *Rothschild Foundation*

*‘We need more conversations between [the] philanthropy and development sectors because often their theories of change contradict each other’.*<sup>32</sup>

There is a strong desire to attract additional infrastructure support but with the proviso that such support needs to engage, collaborate and coordinate with the infrastructure on the continent and be predicated on a locally led infrastructure development agenda. There is also some critique about how international aid models and mechanisms have not always been to good effect and the need for the infrastructure sector to be able to put forward evidence based positions on what has and has not worked within our context. There is also some feeling that while the support for infrastructure is vital, some of these conversations have been had before – e.g. under the *Ford Foundation’s Africa Philanthropy Initiative* – but we have not built on those discussions or evaluated what the impact of that initiative has been.

---

<sup>32</sup> Interview, Southern Africa



## Relationships between networks

*'It is not said, but a conflict is having multiple memberships and having to pay each network. This is a burden for organisations that don't have budgets'<sup>33</sup>*

As is also evident, the geographic spread and strategic functions of these networks vary, and while there are significant differences in some areas, there are also areas where collaborating could have a much greater effect. Given the newness of the field, the relationship between pan-African, regional, country and thematic networks is not one that has been looked at. Discussion is needed between the various networks about what is the most productive kind of relationship between them, how they align, collaborate and avoid duplication, and how they maximise their value to their own members on one hand, while fully capitalising on their relationships with each other. Among the questions arising are: what kind of relationship is required between a pan-African and a regional institution that have the same constituency? Should pan-African networks be a convening space or provide some dedicated forum for other more localised or thematic networks (a network of networks)? What is the relative role of regional and continental networks in areas where there is no network infrastructure? Are the different networks working to advance a collective voice?

Respondents also sounded some cautions for networks. One is the danger of leadership becoming closed and inadvertently excluding others with different voices and perspectives, and that specific effort to bring others in needs to be made. The second is the danger of falling into the trap of dealing with institutional issues only (organisational development, sustainability, board training, leadership, etc) at the expense of the network's role in raising critical substantive issues like power, agenda setting, exclusion, transparency, accountability and ethics and how to create links between philanthropy and the broader development dialogue. A third caution was to be mindful of power relations both within networks and between them and with external players. Finally, respondents warned of the need to beware of becoming so focused on specific constituencies at the poles, that those in between are neglected.

---

<sup>33</sup> Interview, East Africa

## ***EMERGING AREAS OF OPPORTUNITY***

### **Issue-based collaborations**

‘The definition of philanthropy in Nigeria is very fluid, there are many operational foundations . What does that mean for infrastructure?... a leverage point would be to come in by sector... no one is creating a platform with a compelling reason to bring people together’.<sup>34</sup>

For long, the view has been that collaborations between philanthropists are not looked upon very favourably and that philanthropists prefer to go it their own way. This is still the dominant view, and from most accounts, appears to be the general practice with high net worth philanthropists. In some spaces, however, glimmers of a different picture are beginning to emerge. While most of the infrastructure supports either philanthropy generally or specific constituencies, issue-based collaborations by philanthropists themselves appear to be increasing in some places – something that the infrastructure in general has not as yet engaged with, but needs to explore how it may do so. This is not a replacement for the generalised infrastructure support, but may have convening power in areas where ‘philanthropy’ does not draw much interest, or where philanthropy institutions are more likely to be operational rather than grant-making. In Nigeria, in the last 10 years, for instance, two previous efforts at convening networks of Nigerian philanthropy have not met with success, though one newer philanthropy collaboration effort emerged in 2013, with the launch of the Nigeria Philanthropy Summit. It appears, however, that issue-based collaborations between philanthropists have been much more robust – particularly around health and education. In South Africa, major donor collaboration on education is also emerging and, within the *PPC*, a network dealing with private philanthropy, issue-based collaborations on health, education, environment, social justice and health, have emerged out of the forum and meet independently. It is very likely that many more such initiatives exist, quite independently from the infrastructure support sector. The question for the sector is, which of these initiatives would benefit from infrastructure support and how.

---

<sup>34</sup> Interview, West Africa

## Waqf

*'We thought that zakaat was the way of giving but seeing a host of waqf related things that we have not thought about... there may be many different models of waqf. We need to see what they are rather than giving them terms'*<sup>35</sup>

A *waqf* is a philanthropic mechanism rooted in Islamic tradition. Essentially, it is an endowment that can be made for public good. Its use, however, need not be religious, and can embrace economic, social and political purposes too. Once a cornerstone of faith-based giving, the practice of *waqf* fell into disuse for decades but is slowly seeing a revival of interest, both globally and locally. In Egypt, the *Maadi Community Foundation* pioneered the first recent non-state *waqf* and has been working to popularise the model in communities. In Egypt and Tunisia, following the revolution, clauses on *waqf* have been put into national documents. In South Africa, the *Awqaf Foundation* has been engaging in efforts to popularise *waqf* both in the country, and outside and, following its model, *Awqaf* foundations have been established in Uganda, and two other non-African locations, while training has been provided to individuals from several other African countries interested in reviving the concept. In Kenya, a *waqf* law exists, but it is unclear at present if and to what extent it is being used. There are indications that *waqf* laws may exist in other places, for instance in Morocco, but this is not certain.

## Existing modes of giving

*'The documentation is western but everyday practice is very different, thus how do we write our own narrative. An African narrative. Only then can our African people connect to what we are talking about'*<sup>36</sup>

*'We need to look at how to organically grow indigenous [philanthropy] groups, mobilise and support them as agents of change, and bring the reality of the power they have'*<sup>37</sup>

The role and value of indigenous giving systems have been mentioned by many. At present, none of the infrastructure institutions identified engage specifically with indigenous giving mechanisms,

---

<sup>35</sup> Interview, North Africa

<sup>36</sup> Interview, East Africa

<sup>37</sup> Interview, East Africa

traditions or institutions, but as the narrative of philanthropy expands to recognise this, some are advocating for significant attention to be paid to understanding these, and then developing strategies to support them or learn from them. It must be noted that this is not about turning these mechanisms into formal philanthropy institutions or interfering with mechanisms that have proved very successful in their contexts. For some, there is a question of how to engage with communities to strengthen the narrative, role and impact of indigenous giving. For others, it's about providing means for them to engage collectively, if they choose to, and/or charting the work they do and giving it increased status, looking for ways to increase or facilitate giving or, work with financial and regulatory mechanisms to recognise and support alternative systems of giving.

While there are no specific initiatives in this area, some research and publications exist. *TrustAfrica* recently launched a book reflecting different expressions of philanthropy on the continent; and there is some research on specific mechanisms and countries. *Nedbank* in South Africa has a specific 'stokvel' account and *SGS Consulting* in South Africa wants to bring together different institutions working on stokvels to see how to support the savings aspect and leverage the stokvel giving to include community benefit, and also to explore how to support savings groups that invest in assets.

Likewise, faith-based and diaspora giving are two major areas of African philanthropy. Neither of them has had much engagement with the wider philanthropic community, either in terms of their infrastructure or their on-the-ground institutions. Not only is there an opportunity to do so, but the significant flows of funds and the vital roles that these modes of giving play in local communities, mean they form a critical element in our narrative of African philanthropy and it is imperative that the discourse is broadened to acknowledge this.

## **Next generation philanthropy**

*'Need to look at youth bulge and next generation philanthropy... need a capacity building space for youth on better understanding philanthropy'<sup>38</sup>*

There is rising interest in next generation philanthropy. There is an increasing youth bulge on the continent which presents the opportunity to engage with youth on philanthropy as active citizenship and; there is increasing wealth on the continent, and the opportunity that affords for building and conscientising a more informed and strategic culture and practice of giving among its inheritors. A

---

<sup>38</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

few infrastructure institutions are working on this area. *Synergos* and *SGS Consulting* are collaborating on a youth philanthropy project, the *Maadi Community Foundation* includes a specific programme directed at youth, and *Nexus Africa* is developing a programme of work around youth that come from high net worth families. In addition, outside of the sector per se, there is an increasing interest in the *YouthBank* concept, utilised by a few community foundations, and there is an education programme in South Africa that has included a strong youth philanthropy component.

## **E-giving**

*'The electronic portal is just a means, but need to look at how to support the broader work.'*<sup>39</sup>

While many institutions, individually, have electronic giving platforms on their websites, at a collective level, Kenya and South Africa are the two main areas of activity, with a new platform recently set up in Nigeria. In South Africa, more than one electronic giving portal exists, but these have met with mixed results, the reasons for which await study. In Kenya, mobile money transfers and the potential they offer for e-giving are getting more notice. The *EAAG* has just completed a feasibility study on electronic giving, which it hopes will help it to develop and explore this area in more depth. Clearly some efforts are being made to advance this area of work, but there is still significant space and scope for innovation and development.

Two cautions have been raised on electronic giving. The first is that the electronic portal is only a mechanism to facilitate giving, not the reason *for* giving and that the creation of channels should not be at the expense of work on encouraging giving. The assumption should not thus be, as one respondent remarked, *'create them and the giving will follow'* but to link that platform to the broader philanthropy environment. The second warning is that the quick and easy e-giving may detract from the longer term more substantive giving, and that more interrogation of how to situate electronic giving models within longer term giving strategies is needed.

---

<sup>39</sup> Interview, East Africa

## Resource governance

*'Governance and accountability, it goes beyond governing structures and boards and leaders. It's about practice. About how do we live governance and accountability principles. The value systems of foundations need to be demonstrated in practice'<sup>40</sup>*

*'Does it matter where money comes from? NO. If foundations feel resources can be used for good, and the funding source is not illegal, then it's ok'.<sup>41</sup>*

The topic of resource governance is becoming an increasingly important one for the sector. There are several points of view here.

For some, the focus of transparency and accountability and good governance is to the sole concern of the grant recipient organisations, with several indicating lack of good governance by NPOs as a deterrent to increased giving. Several who focus on good governance of NPOs, however, do not consider the practices of philanthropy agencies as requiring attention.

Some others call for transparency and accountability in how funds are utilised by philanthropic agencies themselves. Many recognise that part of creating trust in the sector needs to include consideration of the accountability and transparency of those who spend the funds. The feeling is that while this conversation is happening globally, the fledgling state of the sector in Africa and a widespread reluctance to disclose financial transactions (for a variety of reasons) has led to a very vague level of accountability and transparency. There are certainly those in the field leading the way but they are a minority.

On the other hand the issue of *'does it matter how the money is made?'* is also being raised. Some are of the view that the source of the money does not matter, as long as it is legal, and being used towards a development purpose, and that applying this kind of scrutiny to African institutions, while not questioning the source of international philanthropy is a double standard. As such, the focus of efforts should be on governance, accountability and transparency in how the money is spent, not on how it is made.

---

<sup>40</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

<sup>41</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

For others, this is a fundamental question and the ethics of how philanthropy money is made (especially if made in an endeavour that disadvantages those it now seeks to support) must be called into question. In a context where African history has seen many in power enriched at the expense of those they have been meant to serve; of entitlements to elites at the expense of public interest and of increasing resource extractive industries and efforts by such industries to establish foundations, there needs to be a discussion about the relationship between business practices and giving. There is a sentiment by some that we need to be more mindful on issues of resource governance -- and in the words of one respondent, guard against the use of philanthropy for *'history laundering'*<sup>42</sup>--and that the philanthropy infrastructure needs to be both aware of the danger of this and proactive in developing systems and benchmarks to guard against it.

*'We need self regulation in the field to hold us to account'*.<sup>43</sup>

The issue of resource governance in philanthropy is not new but is getting increased attention. Up to now, it has been dealt with only in piecemeal fashion, and the sector needs to provide a space to consider it analytically. This can be linked to broader calls in the sector for self-regulation, for development of standards and benchmarks that we hold ourselves accountable to. To date, only one effort at tools development on this has been identified, that is, the creation of an ethical giving index by Allavida in Kenya. While this did not attract much attention at the time, given the increasing focus, such tools may need to be revisited and new ones developed. In addition, Trust Africa and the Southern Africa Trust are collaborating on an initiative looking at the intersections between philanthropy and resource governance.

## **Social justice philanthropy**

*'...eventually this forum is about a social justice agenda and we needed to claim back that space... as a collective, this had been lost.'*<sup>44</sup>

*'We're seeing a greater willingness to support social justice and to try stuff.'*<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Interview, East Africa

<sup>43</sup> Interview, North Africa

<sup>44</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

<sup>45</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

Last but not least, there is an increasing conversation in the infrastructure sector about social justice philanthropy. This is a topic that has been receiving increased attention in discussions, writing and advocacy by several institutions in South Africa, Kenya and Egypt, and some individuals on the continent have been engaging on this through work within the *Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace Working Group*. There is still some variation in how the concept is understood by different infrastructure institutions, but overall there is a progression of conceptual discussions on the topic, increased efforts to build evidence on this approach and some new opportunities for attracting and influencing philanthropists and institutions that have not usually engaged from an analysis of power and structural change. Two particular initiatives have recently emerged that seek to take this issue on much more strategically. The first is the Social Justice Initiative, which is a new effort designed to facilitate philanthropic giving to social justice issues in South Africa – either through existing philanthropic vehicles or directly to non-profit institutions. The second is a new informal network focused on social justice philanthropy in Africa, comprising a small collaborative of institutions who have been informally working together to advance this area of work.

*‘People don’t see connections between starvation and bad governance; they don’t ask why government doesn’t plan for it – and makes the harder social justice work less attractive to support.’<sup>46</sup>*

These efforts acknowledge the imperative of broadening and deepening this agenda, but the difficulties of this approach are also recognised – reactive giving, a focus on tangible outcomes and quick wins, a reluctance to address systemic issues of power have been identified as some of the core issues that need to be addressed in taking this work forward. Nevertheless, there is a strong commitment to advance the work and institutionalise it more broadly and significant energy for developing spaces and opportunities to take this work forward.

---

<sup>46</sup> Interview, East Africa



## ***A NOTE ON NARRATIVES AND VOICE***

*‘One elephant is that in the field there are all those people who think and believe there is nothing called African philanthropy and our job is to prove them wrong.’<sup>47</sup>*

There has been, for some time, a sentiment that external representations of philanthropy are not aligned with the realities of African giving, and, previously, with the absence of an infrastructure to raise such issues, many assumptions have been made about African philanthropy – and many forms of philanthropy, and the impacts thereof, discounted by dominant narratives. With the emergence of an infrastructure sector on the continent, and particular attention to advancing a discourse that reflects the realities of African giving, many assumptions about the nature, scale and impact of philanthropy in Africa are being challenged. Long dominated by external conceptions of philanthropy, African voices are slowly claiming the right to define and conceptualise African narratives of giving and are becoming increasingly vocal on local and international stages; and the last few years has seen considerable efforts to advance our own narratives and agendas for philanthropy in Africa. This is significant not just because it shows a different picture of giving in Africa, but because it goes to the very heart of challenging perceptions of the continent as one that is dependent on external aid and unable to draw on its own resources for development. Systems of giving in Africa have played instrumental development roles, and these narratives now allow for space to build on and reflect evidence on the role and impact of African philanthropy in its totality. While the infrastructure has begun to engage on this, there is significant scope for more depth of analysis and reflection on this impact.

As we take this forward, however, a few cautionary notes need to be sounded:

*‘We do a disservice by providing literature that says philanthropy is only about grantmaking’.<sup>48</sup>*

The first is that Africa does not have one homogenous philanthropic narrative; it has many, some of which are particular to the continent (or parts thereof) and others which resonate with international narratives. There is a caution that we need to guard against the danger of both generalising and of romanticising; and be conscious of being able to deliver different messages but in a collective voice.

---

<sup>47</sup> Interview, West Africa

<sup>48</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

*'See a danger in how we conceptualise philanthropy in Africa. If we are not careful enough in managing the narrative, philanthropy might only be seen as HNW philanthropy, thus [we] need to bring back the African-ness of the solidarity, mutuality, respect'.<sup>49</sup>*

Second, though the less recognised narratives of African giving are slowly moving centre-stage, there is a danger that other more dominant narratives – for instance, philanthropy as high net worth giving or philanthropy as grantmaking- might drown them out because of the external recognition given to this area of philanthropy. The sector needs to ensure that higher-profile forms of giving do not swamp the gains made by forms of philanthropy that draw on notions of solidarity, mutuality and reciprocity.

Third, that there are very divergent views on what is counted as being part of the sector. For some, corporate social investment is seen as part of business, and their view is institutions practising or supporting it should be separate, while for others, corporate giving is very much an accepted part of the sector. Similarly, for some, social entrepreneurship and impact investing are distinct fields from philanthropy, while for others; they are part of the growing philanthropy repertoire, and need to be engaged with. A small minority takes the view that only philanthropy institutions which have their own funds can be counted as African philanthropy and that those whose funding base includes external aid need to be a separate category, while others are of the view that the determining factor is based on where the agency on use of the funds lies. There is increasing polarity in some areas on distinguishing between charity and philanthropy and in other areas on advocating for a holistic approach that recognises the difficulties of our contexts. What is evident from these viewpoints is that there are many polarities. Opportunities for interrogating these will be vital

---

<sup>49</sup> Interview, Southern Africa

## ***A SUMMARY OF THE CRITICAL ISSUES THE SECTOR NEEDS TO ENGAGE WITH***

- " To what extent is the sector open to self-criticism and debate?
- " To what extent does the sector build understanding on the distinct advantages that philanthropic money, power, flexibility and voice provide?
- " To what extent is the move towards income-generating activities detracting from core programmatic work?
- " To what extent is the sector engaging critically in the debate about models of international development aid and their positive and negative effects?
- " To what extent is the prominence of particular narratives drowning out others that are just as relevant, but not as highly publicised?
- " How can the sector begin to collaborate in developing a diverse but shared agenda?
- " How do we connect among ourselves in ways that gives us gravitas and help us influence the field?
- " How do we configure our local, regional and pan-African networks so that they are able to complement each other and not compete?
- " How do we purposefully connect to and engage with the faith-based and diaspora philanthropy sector and infrastructure?
- " Despite recognition of broader African narratives of indigenous giving, how open are we to valuing this adequately so that it becomes a target constituency of the infrastructure sector?
- " To what extent do we recognise and address the issues of power?
- " Are we critical enough about the limitations of our impact?

- " Are we challenging head on the limited capacity and expertise on development issues in many parts of the field?
- " Are we strategically engaging and plugging into continental and global initiatives and conversations on philanthropy that are taking place outside the sector?
- " Are we investing enough in encouraging our constituencies to engage on contentious societal issues, on systemic fault lines, which require longer-term investments and whose impact is not tangible immediately?
- " Do we give enough thought to what an enabling environment for philanthropy looks like, beyond tax laws?
- " Are we critically engaging on tax environments in a way that does not allow tax exemption to become a loophole for tax evasion?
- " Given the lack of critical mass in our networks, have we merged approaches and strategies to such a degree that they become irrelevant to particular constituencies?
- " Are we getting stuck in convenings and conferences without properly aligning them to our everyday work plans?

## ***OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE INFRASTRUCTURE SECTOR***

- " As new networks and formations are developing, and still at an early stage, there is an opportunity to invest more substantially in these initiatives upfront, so that the passion and ideas and momentum that drive these formations can be taken forward with adequate capacity and leadership.
- " Invest in spaces to create debate and conversations with alternative viewpoints that challenge our assumptions.
- " Invest in spaces and formations dedicated to collaboratively move forward a knowledge-building agenda on African philanthropy. These can take a combination of strategies from chairs in philanthropy, curriculum development and institutionalisation at places of higher learning, to a collaborative of infrastructure institutions dedicated to this knowledge building exercise.
- " Invest in building evidence on practice and impact (both positive and negative) in a way that allows for comparative analysis.
- " Explicitly seek areas of innovation and invest in them.
- " Support spaces for reflection, learning and thought leadership on the sector and the field.
- " Explore collective discussion on how to engage on work targeted at the enabling environment and learn from how this has been done in local and global contexts.
- " Create spaces for collective conversations on defining African philanthropies.
- " Invest in the development of tools and models that can catalyse new philanthropic constituencies. From online giving portals, to mobile technologies, to pledge-based systems to financial sector innovations, there are a variety of opportunities for innovation.
- " Engage better with financial intermediaries and asset managers and offer dialogue spaces for building capacity and understanding on philanthropy.

- " Explore and build on strategies to inculcate and encourage next generation philanthropy.
- " In areas of conflict and transition, explore how to move conversation beyond transitions and to longer-term planning in readiness for opportunities that may arise.
- " Engage the capacity of the financial sector in creating alternative financing mechanisms.
- " Invest in research of indigenous and faith based giving systems and explore areas of potential support and intersection.
- " Support spaces for peer learning that allow for both technical and operational issues as well as conceptual, substantive and ideological aspects of philanthropy.
- " Invest in dedicated leadership development for 2<sup>nd</sup> tier leaders.
- " Support spaces and models for citizen-led initiatives to engage in a more sustained manner.

**Appendix A: List of Infrastructure Institutions and Resource people to the field**

<b>Institutions with a program/initiative that contributes to strengthening African Philanthropy</b>		
<b>Focus Region</b>	<b>Infrastructure Institution</b>	<b>Contact Name</b>
South Africa	AWQAF South Africa	Ismail Munshi & Zainul Abidin Cajee
	Centre for Civil Society, University of KwaZulu Natal	Shauna Mottiar
	Citadel Wealth Management	Philip Faure
	Charities Aid Foundation South Africa	Colleen du Toit
	Five Plus Project	Hugh Corder & Anton Fagan
	GivenGain	Collin Habberton
	Gordon Institute for Business Science	Kerryn Krige
	Greater Good	Bridget Evans
	Ikhala Trust	Bernie Dolley
	Inyathelo	Shelagh Gastrow
	Nedbank Private Wealth	Anna Vayanos & Noxolo Hlongwane
	SGS Consulting	Shaun Samuels
	Social Justice Initiative	Audrey Elster & Dugan Fraser
	Southern African Community Grantmakers Leadership Forum	Beulah Fredericks
	Southern Africa Trust	Neville Gabrielle & Bhekinkosi Moyo
Dialogue	Michelle Mathews	
Tshikululu Social Investments	Samantha Braithwaite	
Kenya	Allavida	Justus Macharia
	East Africa Association of Grantmakers	Nicanor Sabula
	Kenya Community Development Foundation	Janet Mawiyoo
	Strathmore University	Daisy Ogembo
	Ufadhili	Mumo Kivuito
Egypt	Gerhart Centre	Barbara Ibrahim & Heba Abou Shnief
	Maadi Community Foundation	Marwa el Daly
	Arab Foundations Forum	Ms. Naila Farouky
	SAANED	Atallah Kuttub
	Naseej	Hania Aswad
	Pro-Natura	Nike Olaoye
	Tony Elumelu Foundation	Wiebe Boer
	234gives	

<b>Institutions with a program/initiative that contributes to strengthening African Philanthropy (...cont)</b>		
<b>Focus Region</b>	<b>Infrastructure Institution</b>	<b>Contact Name</b>
<b>Pan African</b>	African Grantmakers Network	Adern Nkandela
	African Philanthropy Forum	Pearl K. Darko
	Africa Social Justice Philanthropy Group	Halima Mahomed / Chandrika Sahai
	Global Fund for Community Foundations	Jenny Hodgson
	International Society for Third Sector Research - Africa	Jacob Mati
	Nexus Africa	Cedza Dlamini
	Synergos	Tanya Le Cruz
	Trust Africa	Akwasi Aidoo & Halima Mahomed

<b>Institutions that do not have a specific infrastructure program/initiative but have long played a leadership role in the infrastructure sector</b>		
Ghana	African Women's Development Fund	Theo Sowa
Kenya	Akiba Uhaki	Ezra Mbogori
Tanzania	Foundation for Civil Society	John Ulanga
South Africa	Nelson Mandela Children's Fund	Sibongile Mkhabela



<b>Additional Resource People</b>	
Abdul Kadir Hashim	Independent
Adhiambo Odaga	Aliko Dangote Foundation
Alan Fowler	Independent
Alice L. Brown	Independent
Bev Russell	Social Surveys
Connie Ngondi - Houghton	Independent
Gérard Tchouassi	University of Yaoundé
James Mwangi	Dalberg
Joyce Malombe	Independent
Kaari Betty Murungi	Independent
Kayode Samuels	Independent
Kepta Ombati	Akiba Uhaki
Mamo Mohapi	Mott Foundation, South Africa
Molly Schultz Hafid	Unitarian Universalist Veatch Program
Mwihaki Kimura Muraguri	Rockefeller Foundation, Africa Regional Office
Said Tbel	Espace Associatif
Sarah Mukasa	African Women's Development Fund
Sherine El Taraboulsi	Independent
Susan Wilkinson Maposa	Independent
Tade Aina	Carnegie Corporation of New York
Tamzin Ratcliffe	Impact Trust
Vuyiswa Sidzumo	Mott Foundation, South Africa
Wairimu Kagondu	Rockefeller Foundation, Africa Regional Office