

**PHILANTHROPIC INFRASTRUCTURE IN EMERGING
MARKETS**

Andrew Milner

January 2012

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Content and structure	3
Some general remarks	4
COUNTRIES AND REGIONS:	
East Asia	9
China	10
Vietnam	11
Hong Kong	13
Philippines	14
India	15
Middle East and North Africa	19
Sub-Saharan Africa (excluding South Africa)	20
South Africa	22
Turkey	26
Central and Eastern Europe	27
Russia	28
Central America	30
South America	32
Brazil	33
Annex 1: Names of those consulted in the research	36
Annex 2: List of websites of featured organizations	37

Acknowledgements

Apart from the people who contributed to this report, who are listed at the end, I am especially indebted to Helena Monteiro and Ana Pinho of WINGS and to Barry Knight, Allan Sked and Monica Lenehan of CENTRIS, who coordinated and administered the survey of WINGS members on which the research is partly based.

Introduction

This report explores the state of the infrastructure of philanthropy in emerging markets. Both terms require some explanation. I have construed philanthropy infrastructure quite broadly to include both the agents supporting philanthropy (grantmaker and other donor network organizations, CSR consultants, specialist philanthropy advisers, advisers to the wealthy, and community philanthropy organizations) and the conditions in which it takes place (the cultural climate and the regulatory restrictions). I have also considered the recipient side. Donors, after all, need someone to give their money to, and the need for an NGO sector that is more professional, better trained and better able to demonstrate its work to potential donors was mentioned by several respondents as an important component of philanthropic infrastructure.

The term emerging markets presents more difficulties. It doesn't necessarily mean emerging economies (though it sometimes does), nor does it mean places with little or no previous philanthropic tradition for, as far as I have been able to discover, there is no such place. I have interpreted it to mean those places where philanthropy is beginning to identify itself as a sector and, consistent with that identity, to see itself as an instrument for serving a larger social purpose. For practical purposes, this means many developing countries, countries with a long-standing but often piecemeal or localized tradition of giving, and the post-Communist states of Central and Eastern Europe.

Content and structure

This is not a vast Bellagio-like endeavour. Its sources of information are the network of contacts of the people commissioning and carrying out the research, already published papers and articles bearing on the topic, and a survey of members of the Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support (WINGS) network in the relevant countries. Because of the very partial nature of these sources, there are gaps. There is a good deal of information for some countries and almost none for others. It would be dangerous to assume, however, that because I haven't found any information, there is none to find or that a country which barely features in the report doesn't have a thriving philanthropic ecosystem. On the other hand, philanthropy often follows the economy. A sophisticated economy is more likely to have a correspondingly sophisticated philanthropy infrastructure and it is suggestive that the most developed economies of those featured tend to have the biggest entries in the report.

Having gathered the material, the next question was how to organize it. It quickly became apparent that the only sensible way to do this was geographically. Very different local circumstances mean it would have been impossible to fit information into any thematic template without extreme contrivance. In effect it would have meant breaking the thematic divisions into country or regional sections anyway to take account of distinctive local features, which would have resulted in a fragmented and very unsatisfactory read.

That said, I have included a general survey at the beginning for two reasons. First, a number of informants spoke from an experience that was wider than that of a country

or region. Second, pronounced local differences notwithstanding, there was some consonance among elements of philanthropic infrastructure across different parts of the world which are worth bringing out.

Lastly, and on a technical note, I have not identified the people who contributed directly to the research by name. They are listed along with others whom I contacted but who did not respond in an annex at the end. In the body of the text, I refer to them by the unlovely but serviceable term ‘informant’. Where names do appear in the text, they are cited from sources already in the public domain. Reason for this?

Some general remarks

It might be tempting to read these as a set of conclusions. They aren’t. They are the more general observations of local informants, combined with the views of observers who work in the philanthropy support field but whose exclusive focus is not one geographic area. I have supplemented these in places with local views where they either bear on, or offer a corrective to, what is being suggested. Rather than as a synthesis of the findings of the research, this section should be seen as providing a cross-bearing on the more specific local views in the next sections.

A role for the specialist adviser

Informants saw a number of ways in which specialist advisers could help to promote philanthropy. They could provide information and practical advice to philanthropists on a matters such as existing best practice in addressing specific problems, assessing the impact of their investments, or convening meetings of philanthropists to provide a forum for learning and support. Another pointed out that they could also do things as basic as providing material in the language of the country. They could also work with the beneficiaries of philanthropic gifts – NGOs and individuals – to help them improve their performance. Finally, they could document their experience in working with individual donors and share it within and outside their professional community.

Another informant saw a very proactive role for them, in making the case for engaging in philanthropy, where it has yet to be made – not waiting, in other words, ‘for clients to knock on his or her door’.

Supply and demand, demand and supply

Generally speaking, the demand for specialist philanthropy advice services is limited in emerging markets. According to one informant, where new players, of whatever stripe, are entering the philanthropy support field, it tends to be in the rapidly developing or so-called BRIC economies. Informants saw a number of reasons for this: the majority of philanthropists view their philanthropic activity as something low-key, spontaneous and temporary. They don’t think of it as a professional field that requires specific knowledge and expertise.

Second, most philanthropists give according to their values and emotional reactions, of which they naturally think that they are the best judges. In addition, donors are more likely to respond to peer pressure or the prevailing climate of opinion than to act on ideas or theories coming from within the professional philanthropy field.

Another factor which all the informants to this section noted is that it may be that some philanthropists in emerging markets look for philanthropy advice from outside their own countries, from more sophisticated markets where they have assets or business interests. There appears to be a corresponding interest among multinational wealth/philanthropy advisers in the emerging markets.

On the face of it, it might look as though, in many cases, there are no consultants or infrastructure organizations that can provide high quality, tailored services to donors because the donors don't want it. However, several informants pointed out that it's possible to see the matter the other way round. A number wondered whether, for philanthropy infrastructure to develop, supply might have to precede demand. As one informant put it: 'Since we are in the professional field and face the need perhaps we are the ones who should form the demand?'

Redirecting the impulse to give

Many informants and survey respondents spoke of the need for greater awareness of the notion of strategic giving among donors in emerging markets. For one, the task of philanthropy advice and support is 'creating a mindshift in regard to giving. It is about taking responsibility for local, regional, national and international issues. It is about understanding that philanthropy is part of the culture, that it needs to be impact driven and passionate.'

The same informant argued that: 'Philanthropy is not always the solution to a problem or a need. It is important that donors understand where their giving makes sense. ... The other key point is that donors know about current trends in "philanthropy land" like impact investing. I could imagine that in some countries we will experience leaps – meaning they may never do traditional brick and mortar philanthropy but move right away to progressive or innovative forms of giving.'

Specifically, advisers and support organizations can play a vital role in organizing groups of donors on the Giving Circle model and translating and disseminating experience from more sophisticated philanthropic cultures. Generally speaking, said one informant, 'they could help donors understand causes rather than symptoms, and opportunities rather than problems.' All of this, as the informant pointed out, depends on the willingness of philanthropists 'to be brought around' to this view of giving.

Support organizations can also work hand in hand with specialist philanthropy advisers, said one, training them to work with various sectors – non-profit, banking, legal, professional business associations – and providing them with continuous practical support. In addition, support organizations could pilot various giving mechanisms, adapt them to the local context and promote them as a means of philanthropic engagement.

Raising the profile of philanthropy through role models

Whether role models – large-scale and highly publicized philanthropists out of the Bill Gates mould – help to promote philanthropy remains debatable. Some informants felt that they did. Others thought that the super-rich were so far removed from the world of ordinary individual donors that they could not identify with them. Again, felt some, rivalries and jealousies are as common as admiration and peer pressure and singling out one donor as a model could be counter-productive. Some wondered

whether it might adversely affect the public view of philanthropy if such well-publicized donors were simply felt to be using philanthropy to whitewash their dubiously acquired wealth.

The legal and fiscal framework

Again, opinions on this differed. Generally speaking, where legal conditions for either donors or non-profits are onerous, regulation becomes an important consideration. Where the regime is more relaxed, it doesn't.

The regulatory environment can facilitate philanthropy development, thought one informant, where, for example, it opens whole new categories of opportunity (endowments, for instance) that have previously not been defined or regulated.

For another, the regulatory environment was 'key for donors that still have a strong affiliation with their home country'. Donor education was important here, felt the same informant. If donors were informed on best practice in philanthropy, they could use such best practice 'as drivers in national systems'.

In terms of the fiscal regime, while some saw the lack of tax incentives (or the administrative difficulties involved in taking advantage of them) as a drawback, most felt that they were of only minor importance in the promotion of philanthropy. They were significant for very large donors but probably made little difference to those of more modest means. However, perhaps surprisingly, most of the respondents to the WINGS survey felt that tax incentives were critical in developing support for philanthropy in their country or region, 14 out of 21 describing them as 'very important' and a further five as 'important'.

The recipients – civil society organizations

It is clear from the research that the absence of a capable, trustworthy and effective NGO sector can act as a deterrent to philanthropy. As one informant remarked, in emerging markets, where civil society as well as philanthropy is developing, 'it's very hard to talk about philanthropy without talking about civil society'. An NGO sector which lacks significant absorptive capacity means that donors have to look for other ways to make their philanthropy effective.

This was corroborated by respondents to the WINGS survey. Most saw both training for NGOs in fundraising and a reliable standard of transparency for NGOs as either important or very important (for the first, 8 out of 21 saw it as important, 10 as very important; for the second, the respective figures were 8 and 12).

Again, as a recent report on philanthropy in Asia remarks: 'Systemic factors also impact levels of giving, such as under-development and corruption in some NGOs, which engender widespread mistrust of charities among potential donors.'¹

This being the case, organizations supporting the development of NGOs become a crucial part of the philanthropic infrastructure and, in some cases, these were more plentiful than organizations catering to donors.

¹ *Something's Gotta Give: The State of Philanthropy in Asia*, Economist Intelligence Unit, 2011.

Community philanthropy organizations

Where these exist, they were seen as having an important contribution to make to the development of the philanthropic ecosystem: in popularizing the practice of philanthropy and removing it from the province of the wealthy; formalizing the kind of modest, piecemeal, local giving that exists in very many places; and relating philanthropy in a direct way to local development.

Support organizations have an important part to play in stimulating the growth of such organizations. According to the 2010 *Global Status Report on Community Foundations* published by WINGS, the best predictor of in-country growth of community foundations across the world between 2008 and 2010 is the number of organizations offering support to community foundations in 2003.

The same report also says: ‘The presence of support organizations, such as an association of grantmakers, is strongly correlated with a good legal and fiscal environment for community philanthropy, a higher prevalence of donors, and higher claimed impact of the work.’ In the emerging markets, however, there is some way to go in this connection: support services to community foundations, while ‘highly available’ in North America and ‘quite available’ in Europe, are much less so in Latin America and the Caribbean, Asia and Africa.

Principal needs

Many of these will be apparent from what has gone before. They include:

- ♦ providing individual, tailored services to philanthropists – exchanges with peers, exposure to successful development projects, practical support and debriefing for the initiatives they undertake;
- ♦ organizing high-level discussions on the role of philanthropy with philanthropists and politicians to increase visibility and recognition for philanthropy;
- ♦ developing a ‘mass’ giving culture;
- ♦ supporting the development of local philanthropic institutions;
- ♦ supporting research and publications on philanthropy.

It’s worth stressing that some of the needs might be quite basic. Lack of understanding of philanthropy, for instance, constitutes a barrier to giving in Asia, according to the report cited above: ‘many of Asia’s wealthy are only newly rich, and have only recently become exposed to the idea of philanthropy.’ Again, as more than one informant suggested, where organized or more considered forms of philanthropy are just finding their feet, material from places where matters are further advanced, translated into the local language, might be of great value.

Results of the WINGS Survey

Much of the material from this survey is distributed through the regional sections which follow. However, it's worth presenting here what respondents identified as the most important areas for development in the philanthropy infrastructure in their country. They were asked to grade a number of general areas according to importance. The results are given in the table below. Again, a caveat should be entered. First, the sample is a very small one. Only 21 people responded fully to the survey, making it too small to be statistically reliable. What it does do, however, is provide an indication of the views of those working in the support field of what is needed.

Table: What are the most important steps to take in developing support for philanthropy?

	Very important	Important	Moderately important	Unimportant
<i>Bridging the gap between the traditional philanthropic community and emerging market philanthropy</i>	9	6	5	1
<i>Training for NGOs in local fundraising</i>	10	8	3	-
<i>A reliable standard of transparency for NGOs</i>	12	8	1	-
<i>Tax incentives</i>	14	5	2	-
<i>Easing of legislation governing the setting up of philanthropic funds</i>	11	6	4	-

Perhaps the most noticeable and surprising of these results is the importance attributed to tax incentives, something which contradicts the impression given by many of the local informants.

It's also worth noting here other areas of need that respondents identified. An Argentine respondent pointed to the need for coordination between donors and NGOs. Someone from Brazil saw the need for the development of networks and partnerships (both public-private partnerships and private ones) and of communities for learning. The same respondent also highlighted the need to change the culture of giving from charity to social investment and development. This was also mentioned by a respondent from Singapore. This similarity of view is the more striking in that respondents weren't prompted by a specific question on the subject.

A respondent from Pakistan highlighted the importance of reliable information about the sector (this surfaced a number of times during the research). One from South Africa wanted to see debates around philanthropy at national and international levels, which would bring in good examples from other countries.

COUNTRIES AND REGIONS

East Asia

For the rest of East Asia, information is sketchy. Cynthia D'Anjou-Brown of HSBC Private Bank sees 'a rising number of people keen to give from the wealth they've achieved',² it's not always clear that this has been matched by corresponding developments in the philanthropic infrastructure.

Singapore, however, is home to the Centre for Asian Philanthropy, set up in 2008 in response to growing demand for such infrastructure. Its Director, Leo Chen Ian, believes that while Singapore is still largely at the 'chequebook philanthropy' stage, 'there is now more interest both among big-time givers and the man on the street to learn about structured and professionalized giving.' Singapore also has the Centre of Social Entrepreneurship and Philanthropy at its National University which has recently undertaken a study on grant-giving entities in Singapore. A further mark of the island's growing philanthropic sophistication is the fact that it is home to the Impact Investment Exchange Asia (IIX), which describes itself as Asia's first private and public platforms for social enterprises (SEs) to raise capital efficiently.

In Cambodia, the Pari Project provides what it calls 'best practice and creative consulting services exclusively to NGOs and social enterprises'.

There are of course a number of pan-Asian and a potentially significant recent development is the merger of Give2Asia with the Asia Pacific Philanthropy Consortium (APPC). This brings together the grantmaking and philanthropy advice of the former and APPC's research and advocacy work and extends Give2Asia's reach in and knowledge of the region, which is already considerable. One observer, however, has a rather different perspective on the merger. A blog on the Asian Philanthropy Forum's website suggests that 'the usefulness of the APPC research is questionable since much of the information is now outdated. Since the conference on diaspora philanthropy in Hanoi in 2008, APPC has been inactive.' The blogger sees what he calls the 'quiet demise of APPC's leadership status as the preferred philanthropic research engine' as symptomatic of the lack of interest in funding research, even though donors realize that it 'helps build non-profit capacity and the field of philanthropy'. This is something to ponder when it comes to developing the region's philanthropy infrastructure. Give2Asia also runs the Asian Philanthropy Advisory Network, which provides research into, and information on, new trends in the region's giving.

Elsewhere, the recently launched Asia Venture Philanthropy Network will – as its name suggests – provide a platform for venture philanthropy funds in the region. As such, its influence and operation is likely to be limited mainly to the more sophisticated financial and philanthropic markets where venture philanthropy has more appeal.

² Taken from *Business Times*, 28 August 2010.

One informant believes that, in terms of advice and support, apart from the private banks, the market is very undeveloped. UBS is the most advanced, he believes, though all are now entering the sector at some level. A number of international advisory organizations are attempting to find a toehold – he mentioned Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors, The Philanthropic Initiative and FSG – but he understands they are ‘having a hard time finding customers’. Most donors, he feels, are unwilling to pay. What’s missing? Most things, he says.

China

Support organizations are on the rise in China as new wealth emerges, as practitioners discover the need for capacity building and the public calls for greater transparency of the whole sector.

Who is involved?

Perhaps the most notable recent event is the establishment of the China Foundation Centre in 2010 which, according to a press release on Harvard’s Hauser Centre website, ‘represents a milestone in the evolution of the private foundation community in China, and makes it almost a default norm for the rich to consider giving.’ Another notable addition to the support scene is the China Private Foundation Forum (the URLs of many of the organizations mentioned in the text are listed in Annex 2). These two serve as what the informant for this section describes as a hub for foundations in China. In addition, the Ministry of Civil Affairs and the Narada Foundation jointly head a series of training sessions for foundation leaders this year, the third year this has happened.

Recently, too, a philanthropy institute at Beijing Normal University has been set up by former head of charity and philanthropy at the Ministry of Civil Affairs, Wang Zhenyao.

When it comes to increasing the capacity of NPOs, some established organizations and some emerging ones are involved. The old ones include the Shaanxi Research Association for Women and Family and the Huizeren Volunteer Development Center. The new ones include NPI (Non-profit Incubator), China Foundation Center (CFC), etc. Some international organizations also provide training for non-profits such as Mercy Corps China. Some leading foundations also make grants to this kind of support such as One Foundation, Narada Foundation. One Foundation has established its own research school in the Beijing Normal University while Narada Foundation has set leadership talent and organizational support as its strategic programme in order to foster the sector.

Type of support

One of the problems for Chinese philanthropy has been transparency (and still is, as recent developments show – see the section below on the NGO sector) and this is among the areas the CFC has been specifically set up to address. It aims to become a portal through which detailed financial and programme information of all foundations (and non-profits) in China is disclosed. This will be especially important for the public fundraising foundations in China, which are mostly GONGOs, like the China Charity Federation and the China Red Cross Foundation, and which are the

government-designated recipients of public donations from home and abroad in times of disaster. Public distrust of such GONGOs is alive and well and last summer's hoax concerning the Chinese Red Cross did nothing to allay it.

The scope of support to NGOs is broad and includes general capacity building, accounting and finance training, fundraising, NPO leadership training, information disclosure guidelines, evaluations, etc. Independent consultancy is emerging in the field of corporate social responsibility and, to a lesser extent, foundations and NPOs use those services, too.

Legal and fiscal framework

There is a general consensus among sector experts that legislation is the biggest bottleneck to the sector's development. The tax problem is the most restrictive factor for emerging private foundations here. There are, for example, restrictions on the level of salary in foundations if a foundation wants to keep its tax-exempt status.

Donor awareness and public attitudes

Donor education is a big issue for both individuals and foundations, as is public education about philanthropy and the non-profit sector generally, believes our informant. This is compounded by mistrust following this summer's happenings. There is little idea of any notion of philanthropy beyond the more traditional areas of giving.

The NGO sector

Life has become a little easier for Chinese NGOs following the easing of the dual management system and some local governments have begun to purchase the services of NGOs (our informant mentioned Shanghai, Shenzhen and Beijing as examples of where this was happening). However, if the official attitude seems to have softened to some extent, problems of communication and public trust remain. A series of scandals last summer, which began with an internet hoax that showed an alleged officer of the Chinese Red Cross flaunting the trappings of a lavish lifestyle, has greatly harmed the whole sector, believes our informant.

Needs

While there is support, many areas of the philanthropic infrastructure need to be strengthened, feels our informant, including legislation (especially that related to the tax treatment of the sector), donor advice and public education.

There is, he says, a desire on the part of the wealthy to give but they lack a real role model. There remains very little support for individual donors and this is the area of possibly greatest need for potential donors have no idea of what he calls 'the essence of philanthropy' nor of the best way to contribute to society by means of it.

Vietnam

Philanthropy in Vietnam, and therefore the work of organizations attempting to stimulate and support it, remains a challenge.

Who is involved?

The only organization I came across is the LIN Center for Community Development, which serves grassroots not-for-profit organizations and individual and corporate philanthropists in and around Ho Chi Minh City. One informant said that Give2Asia established an office in Hanoi last year and that they are expanding their donor advisory services in the region; however, she adds, it is not yet clear what type of support they will provide in Vietnam. Likewise, CAF Southeast Asia appears to want to expand its donor advisory work in Vietnam, though there is no suggestion it will establish a local presence. In both cases, it's uncertain whether the organizations plan to help donors in Vietnam or only foreign donors who want to invest in Vietnam.

The country's non-profit sector, according to one informant, is roughly divided into three types of organization: local NGOs, mass organizations (youth unions, women's unions, veteran's associations, etc) and private or state-owned welfare agencies like orphanages and centres for the elderly and disabled or for people with illnesses like HIV/AIDS. At the moment, international donors (multilateral and bilateral) are the major supporters of local NGOs. Government plays an important role in supporting mass organizations, while individual philanthropists support the welfare agencies. Corporate philanthropy is emerging, though mostly in the south, and it tends to support local NGOs and social welfare organizations.

What kinds of support?

LIN's donor advisory services include partner due diligence, development of grantmaking strategies, contract development, corporate volunteer programme design, monitoring and evaluation, communications, reporting and capacity building services for their NGO partners. LIN also conducts research into philanthropic practices in Vietnam. Among these efforts is a report on corporate philanthropy in Ho Chi Minh City, in 2009. The fact that this has been extensively quoted, says one informant, is symptomatic of one of the problems the country faces: the absence of information of this type.

Elsewhere, it is international donors who provide strategic support to NGOs: programme grants and support for capacity building, policy advocacy and communication. Some international NGOs provide capacity building support to local NGOs, though most do so only for their designated partner organizations. Some regional organizations offer training, as do a few local ones (though our informant could not vouch for the quality of the latter) but, in general, most regional-level training is too expensive for local Vietnamese organizations. Corporate philanthropy involves mostly money and human resources (most provide volunteers for community-based activities), though some are starting to provide more technical/strategic support like coaching, mentoring and advising.

What is missing from the country's philanthropic infrastructure?

The Vietnamese have a culture of giving, but that giving tends to be to their own community and peers. Many people give a lot of money for religious reasons. Strategic giving is not a common practice in Vietnam.

The legal and fiscal framework

Legislation is improving, thinks one respondent. However, there is much room for improvement. In terms of legislation to support not-for-profit organizations, there have been improvements to the legal structure, but current legislation remains

restrictive. When it comes to setting up, there is no one NGO law. Instead, several different decrees that allow for the establishment of different types of specific organization (for example, charitable funds, social relief establishments, associations), nor is the application process very clear. In terms of NGO operation, the current laws restrict public fundraising and hosting of the kinds of public event which would be quite common among NGOs in most other countries (and which are critical to ensuring an NGO's sustainability).

Since philanthropy is barely an idea, there are very limited tax incentives for giving. Only giving through the government's controlled agencies such as Fatherland Front or to state charity programmes is acknowledged and encouraged. There is a policy for tax reduction for corporate donations to certain welfare activities. However, according to our informant, many companies say that it is too complicated to claim and, says another, there are regular reports of the tax authorities creating difficulties for anyone trying to access either individual or corporate deductions.

External foundations need to register with the government, which provides an annual licence for them to 'operate'; full transparency on grants etc is required. NGOs must register under the auspices of a government agency, which has considerable control over their operations, to the extent that their board of directors has only an advisory role, legal authority being vested in the government agency. Funds received over a certain amount must be authorized by this authority. Against this, it should be noted that Swiss-based organization wise Philanthropy Advisers has recently announced that it is to open an office in Ho Chi Minh City to take advantage of what wise's Etienne Eichenberger sees as the region's 'very strong potential'. If one adviser doesn't make a market, it will at least raise the profile of philanthropy in East Asia.

Finally, there is little reliable information/advice for philanthropists about Vietnam (on the legal environment, case studies, local partners – you name it!). Among the oases in this desert are the 2009 LIN report on corporate philanthropy mentioned above and a 2011 Asia Foundation report on philanthropy in Vietnam. Much more is needed, says one informant, 'especially information that helps donors give well'. The problem, she adds, remains that the lack of people and organizations willing to pay for such information and advice.

Hong Kong

Who is involved?

In Hong Kong, informants see both a rise in giving and a growing demand for support organizations. One sees advice and support as coming mainly from banks and lawyers with a few specialist consultancies involved. Among these is Asia Value Advisors, set up as recently as May 2011 to provide bespoke philanthropy advisory services to philanthropic funders, intermediaries, and social purpose organizations in Asia. Mostly, this involves advising family offices. It also has a research component and, among other efforts, contributed a paper on impact investing in Asia to the Bellagio initiative³. Another is independent consultant Paul Angwin, whose LinkedIn profile describes him as designing 'bespoke philanthropy programs'. His main sphere of

³ *The Future of Philanthropy and Development in the Pursuit of Human Wellbeing*, the Bellagio Initiative, September 2011.

activity, according to one informant, is corporate social responsibility, rather than advice to individual donors or dedicated donor institutions.

The same informant describes the philanthropy scene as very fragmented. Institutional philanthropy and that which passes through family offices is fairly sophisticated and its needs correspondingly so. On the other hand, for the great majority of donors, he thinks, the demand for information is very basic and goes no further than questioning the probity and trustworthiness of recipient charities.

The legal and fiscal framework

He also describes the regulatory framework as outdated. It was devised by, and meant for, the previous regime whose orientation was more towards traditional charity. Tax incentives, he believes, are neither here nor there. He argues that Hong Kong already has a very favourable tax regime and introducing incentives for philanthropy would be merely ‘the icing on the cake’.

Problems and needs

Our other informants cite as the key problem for the growth of philanthropy the absence of strategic giving among donors: ‘there are lots of rich people in Hong Kong but few are giving with real impact.’

There *is* interest in new forms of funding such as impact investing and it may well be, as one of our informants suggests above, that the market will develop more towards investing than giving. In terms of infrastructure, feels our other informant, what is mainly absent is a trustworthy, well informed and well publicized source of information. Donors and funders, he believes, are having a difficult time finding suitable organizations to invest in. From the other side, there is no means of exchange and support for social enterprises, no community of peers from which they can learn and benefit.

The Philippines

Who is involved?

According to a local informant, individual donors, when they seek advice, do so from investment bankers and, again, the usual players like UBS are active here. However, she also says Philippine banks are beginning to be active in giving philanthropy advice to their clients.

For corporate donors, Philippines Business for Social Progress (PBSP) has proven to be a sustained and reliable vehicle for chief executives of some of the largest companies to express their social responsibility in a strategic way.

In so far as NGOs are concerned, there are few individual consultants that provide technical advice. To my informant’s knowledge, Venture for Fundraising is the only Filipino organization which provides the full spectrum of research, training and mentoring.

The Philippines also has a long-established NGO certification process which constitutes a passive form of guidance for donors. It is mainly concerned, though,

with accountability and transparency, rather than with organizational effectiveness. How widely used and how effective a screen it provides are other questions.

Technical support

She also points out that means of giving have improved and simplified over the last five years. Formerly, Filipino NGOs needed to set aside US\$10,000 in order to be accredited to process credit card donations. Now, Union Bank of the Philippines and Banco de Oro and other large national banks provide this at substantially less cost. Cell phone companies (Globe and Smart) have also provided their systems to collect donations using cell phones.

In addition, Give2Asia and the Philippine Development Foundation can issue tax deductible certificates for US-based donors (the first covers all of Asia, the second the Philippines only).

The legal and fiscal framework

While there are tax exemptions, says our informant, these are limited as far as individuals are concerned and are rather outdated (the current tax code dates back some 50 years). She says that there has been some talk in political circles, though so far no action, of reviewing the code with a view to providing more incentives for individuals to give.

Research and information

A definite need, thinks our informant. As an indication of this, she says Venture for Fundraising undertook a giving survey in 2006 which was still being cited in a newspaper editorial of December 2011.

India

The Bellagio report finds a general trend of a rising middle class, significant increase in the numbers of HNWIs and a move away from the localism which has previously dominated Indian giving, though this is still a factor. One practitioner of an intermediary organization and fundraising consultancy operating in India reported that: 'I still struggle a lot with funders saying "I only want to fund a women's organization in that particular village".'

Who is involved?

Indian support organizations, says one informant, are focused more on building the capacity of NGOs and foundations to communicate, raise funds and function in a transparent fashion than on educating donors.

Some of the better-known ones, she says, are Murray Culshaw Consulting, Mahiti, New Concept and the Centre for Advancement of Philanthropy. Credibility Alliance provides NGOs with a checklist of legal compliances and processes which helps make them more credible and transparent. Organizations such as Account Aid and the Financial Management Service Foundation are providing support in the financial management of foundations and NGOs. Another informant added to this list; academic institutions such as IITs and business schools, UnLtd India, Dasra, Villgro, EdelGive (the philanthropic arm of the Edelweiss Group, one of India's leading financial services firms) and iVolunteers.

CAF India is conspicuous among those organizations that provide a range of services to both donors and NGOs. CSO Partners helps build the capacity of NGOs and also educates corporate and individual donors. The Centre for Advancement of Philanthropy also supports NGOs on legal and regulatory matters and provides guidance to a range of donors.

Online giving portals are also beginning to gain visibility (and users). GiveIndia makes it mandatory for the NGOs listed with them and receiving funds to provide feedback on how the money was used and what was the impact. A similar portal is Samhita.

There are also a small number of organizations which effectively provide a bridge between larger donors and small, often community-based recipients. Prominent among these is iPartner India, which seeks to support and strengthen community initiatives and to help donors who want to contribute to their community. The Dalit Foundation and Nirnaya Trust are also intermediaries between larger donors and grassroots organizations. While most of their current funding is from abroad, says one informant, they also attempt to raise funds from local foundations and from individual Indian and foreign donors. Other community philanthropy organizations include NAVAM and Bombay Community Public Trust.

Though the number of India's wealthy is increasing, very few organizations provide support and advice to high net worth individuals. The most notable is probably Dasra, especially through its Indian Philanthropy Forum, launched in 2010, which serves as a peer support group to help donors maximize the impact of their donations.

One informant also cited the online presence, Asian Philanthropy Forum (though APF seems to be more focused on east and south-east Asia) and Pro Poor as resource providers but doubted whether a first-time philanthropist would be aware of them.

What kinds of support?

For philanthropists, says another informant, the support tends to fall into two main areas. Firstly, support organizations provide awareness of the social sector and education about issues through in-depth research and due diligence reporting. Secondly, they are introducing philanthropists to best practice in grant giving/investing, introducing strategic giving opportunities and identifying non-profit organizations operating in specific geographical and thematic areas.

Within the non-profit sector the focus of the support is on business planning, capacity building, and incubation for start-ups, financial support and mentorship. The level of support for both non-profits and the growing number of social enterprises ranges from intensive coaching to organizations for a fixed period to professional development courses for a larger number of social entrepreneurs (the Dasra Social Impact programme comes under this head). Leading international business consultancies, including Bain and Deloitte, are beginning to play an active role in the mentorship of social entrepreneurs. However, says one informant, the scale of effective support is still limited.

Donor awareness and role models

A second informant believes a new generation of Indian entrepreneurs, and the Indian Diaspora who are looking at philanthropic giving, are demanding higher levels of professionalism and visible impact. Consequently, increased services from support organizations will be required from both ends of the spectrum - donors as well as receivers.

Elsewhere, the rapid growth in the number of India's wealthy is having an extremely positive impact on the sector, according to another informant who quoted Bain's recent report on Indian philanthropy⁴: 'With more money flowing from foundations and support networks and a greater awareness about philanthropy, the growth of grassroots organizations, volunteerism and NGOs is accelerating at an unprecedented pace.'

A number of recent forums and debates indicate the growing debate about, and greater public consciousness of, philanthropy (the Bain report itself is one of these of course). The last 12 months has also seen a Philanthropy Leadership Confluence organized by the Centre for the Advancement of Philanthropy and Samhita (a putative network for individual donors, foundations and sector intermediaries), a meeting of community philanthropy practitioners in South Asia organized by the Global Fund for Community Foundations in March 2011, and a roundtable on community philanthropy organized by the Aga Khan Foundation and the Mott Foundation in September. In addition, the visit of Bill Gates and Warren Buffett has helped to raise the consciousness of philanthropy among Indians.

Mention of Gates inevitably raises the question of the importance of large individual donors. Private foundations established by the likes of the Tatas, Azim Premji and Sunil Mittal do exist and are doing substantial work, believes one informant. However, they don't really serve as role models. They are not inclined to publicize their giving and, generally speaking, she says, 'the Indian mindset has to adjust to this kind of giving'.

A giving culture

Indian giving, though strong (according to the *International Journal of Not for Profit Law*, India has registered the highest growth of donors anywhere in the world⁵), is 'mainly religious or welfare-based', adds our informant. Terms such as social justice are scarcely current and she sees 'a long, long way to go before Indian philanthropy can appear to be making a significant contribution to the field of social development and social justice'.

There needs to be greater awareness about structural injustices such as caste and gender and the conversations that are taking place within the organized philanthropy sector need to get out and find resonance with potential philanthropists. 'For this,' she argues, 'there need to be role models, greater awareness about social issues and exposure to different approaches to philanthropy.'

⁴ *India Philanthropy Report 2011*, Bain & Co.

⁵ *Legal Framework for Global Philanthropy: Barriers and Opportunities*, prepared by ICNL for Council on Foundations, 2010

(www.icnl.org/research/resources/dcs/Legal_Framework_for_Global_Philanthropy.pdf)

The role of community organizations

In addition, ‘at the grassroots level, where the majority of the population lives in poverty, another kind of philanthropy of giving needs to be promoted which does not depend on money, but on intangibles such as mutual respect and understanding, mutual reliance, trust between different communities in order to build peace, volunteerism, community ownership of local issues’ so that local solutions to them can be found. Here community-based organizations can play a great role and these are growing in number. Larger donors can help to build the capacity of these institutions but the intangible capital on which grassroots community philanthropy is based is crucial, she feels, to transform structural injustices and bring about sustainable peace and development.

The legal and fiscal framework

More than 60 per cent of those surveyed by the Bain report singled out tax laws that deter giving as one of the two biggest constraints to philanthropy in India.

One informant said that while there are tax benefits for both donors and recipients, the process of registering a not-for-profit organization and complying with the legal demands, especially in connection with receipt of foreign funds, is tedious and time-consuming. A recent amendment to the Foreign Charities Registration Act now requires that registration be renewed every five years, where previously it was a once-for-all registration. While the intention behind this is not obstructive – it was done to reduce fraud and misuse of funds – the effect certainly is.

The NGO sector

The other significant constraint identified by respondents to the Bain survey was ‘lack of accountability and transparency in some charitable organizations’. One of our informants agrees that well-publicized cases of NGOs implicated in fraud and misappropriation of funds have had a disproportionately negative effect on their public perception. More significant, she feels, is NGOs’ lack of professional skills to function in a transparent and credible manner. This, combined with what she sees as donors’ often superficial understanding of the questions at issue, creates a gulf between donors and recipients. Organizations need to be more vocal about the issues they are tackling and engage with donors to inform them about those issues. Support organizations, she feels, can play a very important role not only in linking donors to recipients but also in helping NGOs meet legal compliance and function in a credible and transparent manner.

Principal needs

India still has a long way to go, feel both informants – the pool of home-grown strategic philanthropists remains small and there is an abiding mistrust of the non-profit sector due to a traditional lack of transparency and accountability. Major cultural and systemic factors restrain philanthropic growth, including a tradition of giving to religious institutions and of giving one-off donations to meet an immediate need. In terms of the role of support organizations, the main needs are:

- ♦ To create greater awareness of the issues and to educate donors on strategic giving and on social justice and peace as an approach to philanthropy. This will require the promotion of ‘patient philanthropy’ and the development of indicators to measure, and ways to communicate, ‘soft’ outcomes.

- ♦ Although there is a growth of capacity building support for non-profits, this needs to be greatly increased to enable the adoption of effective solutions on a large scale. In general, there is a need for greater professionalization of the sector.
- ♦ Systematic research of both issues and organizations, along with a standardization of impact reporting.
- ♦ Reform of unfriendly laws limiting a non-profit organization's ability to become financially sustainable either from commercial activities or through keeping a larger amount of funds in reserve.

As for the rest of South Asia, for Pakistan, the only source of information I have is a respondent to the WINGS survey who remarked that 'the Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy is the only centre providing support services to promote volume and effectiveness of philanthropy in the country'.

The Middle East and North Africa

The usual cautions about generalizing across a region apply here, though according to our informants in the region, philanthropy support is limited to three organizations: the Arab Foundations Forum (AFF), the Gerhart Center at the American University of Cairo and the recently formed SAANED. Most governments in the region provide infrastructural support for NGOs, according to one informant, though she was unsure about the level or quality.

What kind of support?

The Gerhart Center was first in the field. Its work on mapping philanthropic practice revealed big capacity needs, which led to its involvement in founding the AFF as a membership organization for the region's foundations. The Center also offers courses to grantmakers, has a number of online resources on the nuts and bolts of grantmaking and has translated much material from English into Arabic (the Arab Encyclopedia of Philanthropy). It also addresses issues such as board governance and has recently moved into corporate philanthropy, which it identified as an area of need and of considerable potential. In terms of offering advice in individual cases, it will respond to requests, but on the whole its engagement with individual donors is limited, though it does provide its library of resources

SAANED provides advice on regulations governing foundations and social enterprises, on the best way for donors to give, and on best practice and evaluation for the sector as a whole, while the Gerhart Center at the American University of Cairo, which bills itself as the leading provider of knowledge and resources for strengthening philanthropic practice in the Arab region. One informant thought that there is also a fair amount of informal advice, the nature and quality of which is impossible to determine, provided by lawyers and banks.

Donor awareness and education

As with many other areas, giving in one form or another is deeply entrenched. The main challenge for one informant, here as elsewhere, is to try to develop a culture of more strategic giving, to move donors away from what he called 'religious charity' (this was corroborated by another informant, who remarked that 'philanthropy in Egypt is very much in charity mode') and to persuade them to engage with people and with trends in other regions. However, he also spoke of the need to make use of the

region's resources and traditions to do this and not simply to adopt what he called 'Anglo-Saxon' models.

NGOs

One informant talked of a 'trust deficit' between NGOs and donors. Many NGOs, she feels, see philanthropists as 'lacking transparency, while donors don't feel that NGOs are very good at keeping their books'. Reliable standards and certification for NGOs are needed to address this, she feels.

Community philanthropy organizations

At the moment, there is little to say here. There are the beginnings of an experiment to introduce the community foundation model into the region – there are three in Egypt in a very fledgling state – to try to build on the neighbourhood committees that sprang up during the revolution, but which folded because they lacked any real structure. To this might be added that the Gerhart Center has apparently conducted a number of recent focus groups among beneficiary organizations on the benefits of local philanthropy and found that the participants were very much in favour of it.

The legal and fiscal framework

The regulatory environment for philanthropy in the region is what one informant called the Achilles' heel. People, he thinks, give despite the laws which 'criminalize giving if it is not done to the whims of governments'. Another thinks that, though tax incentives exist in most countries, in practice the rules governing them are so opaque that few make use of them. She also notes the significance of the Islamic tradition here. Giving in Islam is supposed to be 'unheralded' and done principally for the spiritual benefit that accrues to the donor. As a result, donors aren't interested in tax breaks since these detract from their spiritual gain.

As to laws governing NGOs, she points out that much of the region is undergoing transition so it is premature to talk about legislation whose fate is uncertain. The three principal players in the region's philanthropy infrastructure all have what she calls a 'watching brief' in this area.

Needs

Philanthropy is a nascent field, says one informant, and most of the props of its infrastructure are still to be put in place. Among other things, there is a need to develop a local discourse on philanthropy; there is little in the way of coordinated information about giving; and there is very little networking with other regions (see also the case of Brazil, below) which could expose the region's philanthropists to outside experience. Another informant talked of the need for a reliable standard for NGOs and, in the case of Egypt in particular, if the present tax laws remain in force under the new regime, a campaign.

Sub-Saharan Africa

There is very little readily available information on the situation in the rest of Africa. A few pieces of what remains a puzzle will have to suffice. Within the limits of what I was able to ascertain, there seems very little in the way of philanthropic infrastructure in most of the continent. One East African respondent to the WINGS survey remarked that 'the organized philanthropy sector is still young and growing in this region and

therefore is yet to attract specialized attention. Most organizations rely on foreign/external capacity building support especially those with external connections.’ Another, in Zimbabwe, says that, as far as they are aware, there are no organizations providing advice or support. It is noticeable that of all the survey respondents, these two from Africa are the only ones unable to identify any organizations providing specialist philanthropy support to either institutions or individuals.

The Zimbabwean respondent says that ‘while giving exists among or for families and communities and for sports and political campaigns ... there is a lack of technical support to take these forms of giving to scale. Technical support from advisers would be welcome.’ What support *is* available is apt to be expensive: ‘If there is a workshop on fund-raising in the country or region ... people are expected to pay a lot of money to attend and non-funded institutions or individuals will just stay away.’

There are some community foundations scattered throughout Africa, though these are still only a handful. They may nonetheless be making a significant contribution to support for local philanthropy. Among its other activities, the Kenya Community Development Foundation (KCDF), for example, acts as a fundholder and encourages communities to mobilize resources, while KCDF ‘matches whatever the communities would have raised. KCDF currently houses 20 community funds amounting to \$1 million from ordinary people, most of which are hometown associations. These communities decide how they want to use their resources and which areas they want to address.’⁶ Among the defects of Kenyan philanthropy which a stronger infrastructure might address are, as the 2010 WINGS report on global trends⁷ puts it, ‘the process of claiming tax exemption is rigorous, burdensome and time-consuming for the donor.’ Added to this, there is no centralized documentation on philanthropy, leading to lack of accountability and duplication of activity, and a widespread view of NGOs as corrupt.

In Nigeria, the T Y Danjuma Foundation has been the moving spirit behind a philanthropy forum which will be held annually to address the country’s philanthropic landscape. In the inaugural session, held last year, the country’s president, Goodluck Jonathan, committed the government to setting up a commission that would look into the regulatory framework for philanthropy in Nigeria.

There are a number of pan-African initiatives worth noting. First, TrustAfrica was set up in 2006 with the purpose of strengthening African institutions to help create the conditions for democracy, prosperity and development. It works across sectors and provides a platform for philanthropy to influence policy and to raise its own profile. Second, the African Grantmakers Network (AGN), set up in 2009, will, says the Bellagio report on philanthropy in Africa⁸, ‘collate views and ideas; amplify African perspectives and methodologies; conduct mapping studies to understand the terrain; hold dialogues and convenings to catalyse ideas and collectively identify needs and strategies to address them.’ Most recently, the Ikoyi Initiative was launched by a

⁶ Taken from an interview with Janet Mawiyoo, CEO of KCDF, quoted in *Transformative Innovations in African Philanthropy*, Bhekinkosi Moyo for the Bellagio Initiative, 2011. As a matter of clarification, this was one of a number of papers commissioned for the Bellagio initiative research. They are distinct from the Bellagio report mentioned elsewhere, but were used to inform it.

⁷ *Global Institutional Philanthropy*, WINGS, 2010

⁸ See note 6.

number of foundations from across Sub-Saharan Africa. This will provide a means for foundation collaboration; its whose ultimate goal, according to one participant, is ‘the institutionalization and strengthening of organized giving in Africa’.

In East Africa, the profile of philanthropy will be raised by the East Africa Association of Grantmakers’ launch of the East Africa Philanthropy Awards, which recognize and celebrate individuals and organizations involved in philanthropic work and those who support and promote philanthropy in their countries. These will be presented for the first time in June 2012.

Needs and challenges

In terms of needs, the East African respondent sees the following as critical: ‘training of NGOs in local fundraising ... and bridging the gap between the traditional philanthropic community and emerging market philanthropy in order to bring philanthropy to scale.’

The main challenge, says the Bellagio report on African philanthropy is that ‘in most of the African countries, there is no legal and institutional framework for philanthropic practice.’ He goes on: ‘Perhaps the African Grantmakers Network’s real relevance would be to cultivate the culture of philanthropy for social justice and other forms of development ... among policymakers by establishing the necessary policy frameworks as well as motivating African citizens – individually or collectively – to give towards the wellbeing of societies and their peoples.’

South Africa

‘While traditional forms of giving are common in South Africa,’ says the Bellagio report, ‘new money is not given away easily.’ Certainly, the general picture is one of great potential only partially realized. Most giving remains untracked and most of it is in response to a need or to a particular cause rather than as part of a considered view of effecting social change. South African donors remain very shy about, for example, giving to human rights or advocacy work, with the result that there are a large number of South African NGOs working in the area of rights who remain mainly dependent on international donors. Another informant sees a lot of ‘moving parts’ and a lot of opportunity but, at the moment, the various pieces don’t fit together to make a satisfactory whole. She has spoken to a number of private philanthropists who are trying to go it alone because of frustration that the process for giving money effectively is not clear.

Who is involved?

Much of the giving of individuals, who have both ‘old’ and ‘new’ money, remains largely personal and unstructured, feel respondents, and it remains hard to tell to what extent they seek advice or from whom. Certainly, most of the main banks now offer philanthropy advice to some degree or another. Of these, the longest-established philanthropy advisory service (and probably the best, it was felt) is BoE, which has some 4 billion Rand in philanthropic investments. The others - Absa, Standard, First National and MedBank – all offer advisory services but, thinks one informant, probably as part of a suite of services for wealthy clients rather than as a dedicated philanthropy advice service.

Greater Good South Africa, which is principally an online giving brokerage, will also give advice, think our informants. All in all, though, the demand for private philanthropy advisers is still limited, since most South Africa's rich don't have foundations and their giving tends to be piecemeal.

Most major corporations have either CSI programmes or foundations and tend to buy in advice from consultants. There is, herefore, a whole range of consultants who will advise on CSI and probably on philanthropy as well. Of particular significance in the institutional giving field are CAF Southern Africa, Inyathelo and Tshikululu. These last two organizations are seen by two informants as very significant players and more will be said about them below.

There is also the National Business Initiative, an umbrella organization mainly for bigger corporations which provides a range of support on issues like CSI and sustainable development. There is also the Southern African Trust, originally set up by the UK's Department for International Development, which has evolved into a regional grantmaker which also provides a range of non-financial support such as research and advocacy, particularly on pro-poor policies in the region.

In terms of community philanthropy (see below for more on this), there is the Community Grantmakers Leadership Forum, which grew out of the Synergos-sponsored Southern African Community Grantmakers Leadership Cooperative and which was launched in 2010. SACGLF will provide information and capacity building for grantmakers focused on community development and will also advocate for favourable conditions for such grantmaking.

Creating greater donor awareness

South Africa is a nation of givers without, however, any tradition of institutional giving. Most giving, as one informant remarks, remains 'highly discretionary and not very programmed'.

The same respondents single out two organizations as having an important role to play in this regard, Inyathelo and Tshikululu. Inyathelo has evolved into what he calls 'the de facto centre for South African philanthropy'. Raising donor awareness is part of its mission (it hosts an annual awards programme which helps to publicize what it regards as exemplary giving) and also convenes the South African Philanthropy Circle, which helps new donors get access to the experience and practices of more established donors.

Tshikululu is mainly a broker/manager for corporate social investment (CSI) funds but will provide a range of advice to corporations and is consciously engaged in promoting donor awareness. Together, thinks this informant, the two are potentially the biggest players in raising the profile of philanthropy.

Synergos, too, is involved in this area, though its Global Philanthropy Circle is for the very wealthy and only has 4-5 members in SA. Its Senior Fellows programme is also a minor force in this regard. The Southern Africa Trust, too, in conjunction with the progressive weekly the *Mail and Guardian*, runs investing in the future awards. It also has a scheme called Change For Ever which is about raising money from the broader public and giving for social change.

The result of all these efforts is that things are slowly beginning to change, feels at least one informant. Slowly organizations like Synergos and South Africa Philanthropy Circle are helping to build up a critical mass for engagement in wider issues and a more systemic approach and highlighting the lack of funding for social justice initiatives.

Role models and champions

These are beginning to come through – the likes of Cyril Ramaphosa and Jay Naidoo who have come to philanthropy through successful careers in politics and business are beginning to enter the public consciousness. The likes of Graca Machel and Desmond Tutu can also act as champions for the non-profit sector in general, supplying moral leadership. One informant, however, feels that big givers aren't generally important as role models – the kinds of wealth they dispose of make them seem too remote. However, they might influence other large donors. The Donald Gordon Foundation, for instance, set up by the Appelbaums, could influence other CSI to think beyond the public relations benefits of CSR.

Against this, Sheila Gastrow of Inyathelo argues that part of the reason why increasing wealth has not been matched by a corresponding increase in philanthropy is that much giving shuns the limelight. 'If old money is coy about philanthropy, why should new money get involved? Where is the learning opportunity?'⁹ Finally, a South African respondent to the WINGS survey gives 'strong public leadership and role modelling by existing high-net worth donors' as an important element in developing support for philanthropy in the country.

Redirecting an existing culture of giving: the role of local organizations

South Africa, in common with most African countries, has a strong tradition of mutual aid and giving among families and local communities. If this could be tapped, think our informants, and the values that underpin it extended to more formal giving with more consciousness of social change behind it, it would make a huge difference to South African philanthropy.

Who will do this? One informant feels it requires a joint effort between media, civil society and especially local philanthropic institutions. (One party she specifically excludes is was the government. Government, she believes, is inclined to see giving in terms of its own agenda and civil society as an extension of the state – an idea which will be far from alien to observers in many parts of the world, developed or developing).

Community philanthropy organizations

All informants concur on the importance of community philanthropy organizations, which include the handful of fledgling community foundations and organizations like the Kagiso Trust in Johannesburg. They are a great bridge to local communities, making them feel a degree of ownership of local development, and increasing the profile of giving and what it does. The most important thing, feels one informant, is that philanthropy should be tied, and be seen to be tied, to local development. Hence the importance of local organizations raising local money for local projects.

⁹ Taken from *Financial Mail*, 23 December 2010.

Community philanthropy organizations can also act as an intermediary between bigger donors, NGOs working in the community and the community itself. Corporate donors often want to do it on their own because of the ‘cultural divide’ from NGOs, while new donors have money but often distrust NGOs. Community philanthropy organizations can effectively say, ‘how can we look together at the place we live?’

A role for the professional adviser?

Professional advisers have nice offices, they make people feel that they are just that – professional. Donors want to feel that someone understands them and that they have problems, too, and this is one of the functions of professional advisers. But what is needed, feels one informant, is someone or some institution who can straddle the gulf between the donors and their advisers of whatever stripe and groups and organizations in the community, someone who understands the donor’s point of view and the community’s as well.

NGOs

At the other end of the spectrum, local NGOs and CBOs are on whole trusted, feels one informant, while another speaks of ‘mistrust’ among donors for NGOs. This is more likely lack of understanding of their purpose than suspicion of their probity. Local NGOs do a lot of fundraising but, says one, they are often focused on their own purposes and don’t always connect this with building a philanthropic culture. The NGO sector needs to increase and refine its local fundraising and to improve the way it communicates what it does (a sentiment that echoes through what most informants say, no matter where they are from).

The legal and fiscal framework

Tax inducements are only an incentive if you have a big tax burden, thinks one informant. For small givers, tax relief is not a material consideration. This poses an opposite problem of how to incentivize them to give. While South Africa is good compared to most of Africa, it could be better, she feels. The tax regime for NGOs also has incentives but, again, could be better.

Challenges and needs

A number of things stand out for the informants:

Changing the way that philanthropy is seen and profiled is a long first step. Creating a cultural of institutional giving that is more oriented towards thinking structurally is another. In this light, one informant mentions the large amount of money given that is unaccounted for. She mentions in particular religious organizations, through whom a lot of giving is done. There is a need to engage them and to get them to think about good practice and the bigger picture.

Those involved should continue to build on the existing donor education initiatives and also develop a culture within the non-profit sector of engaging more with local philanthropy and seeking out local funding (communications and relationship building). More champions are needed, thinks one, not only to serve as role models for giving but among people who have the moral gravitas to speak up for philanthropy and the non-profit sector.

Research and information is also needed - better analysis of the players involved, of the blocks in the system, and of how to shift mindsets.

Another sees a real demand for advice and support for new donors who want to know how to do it and don't know. What is needed are intermediaries who can meet donors where they are and make them feel comfortable with giving, then push them to go a bit further, to engage with the issues in a way they haven't previously done but would be prepared to do in a relationship in which trust has developed. Echoing this, another feels a larger pool of appropriately skilled and values-oriented philanthropy advisers is needed. At the moment, he feels, there are advisers who may be proficient at the technical side, devising a programme, etc, but what's needed more is to devise appropriate ways to guide donors to making greater impact. It's not a matter of telling them how, it's a matter of working with them.

Generally, there is a need to get people to come together and to see who else is working in philanthropy. What is needed is a local institution (it would have to be local) to bring the pieces together. SAGA tried to do this but dependence on foreign funding restricted its credibility with local philanthropy organizations who didn't feel vested in it.

Turkey

Who is doing what?

Our Turkish informant reports very little activity in the country. There are no organizations providing advice, she says, no institutions that train NGOs in relevant skills like fundraising and communications (she sees the demand side of NGOs as part and parcel of the whole question of philanthropy support). There are no specialist donor advisers. There may be some banks that offer philanthropy advice, but the principal source of support and advice for donors, whether institutional or individual, is their peers. However, again, most Turkish foundations, she points out, are operating rather than grantmaking foundations, therefore not equipped to advise donors.

Demand

At present, she thinks, there is no demand for support from donors, but there is from civil society, for one-to-one support and advice. TUSEV, the country's third sector umbrella organization would be the logical source for this, but, she feels, it does not have the capacity to undertake this alongside its advocacy role.

Community philanthropy organizations

The development of the community foundation model in Turkey could accomplish three things, she believes. Community foundations would bring together communities, civil society organizations, donors and decision-makers; they would help guide donors to those CSOs; and they would, over a period of time, generate information about communities.

Needs

Almost all areas of philanthropy support in Turkey need attention, she feels. These needs include expert guidance, missionaries or champions, a better tax and legal

framework, more corporate giving, more research on giving and better use of technology.

‘We need a CAF,’ she said.

There is a fast-growing cadre of CSOs doing good work and she would like to see a meeting of representatives from countries in circumstances where there is a developing economy and a growing civil society but with challenges in terms of capacity – she mentioned Brazil and India. She feels that these countries might have more to learn from each other in terms of what the missing pieces of philanthropy infrastructure are and what they are doing to address them than they would from US and European counterparts who are working under very different circumstances.

Central and Eastern Europe

Information in this section is drawn principally from the WINGS survey and from the *Alliance* report of September 2010 (www.alliancemagazine.org/en/content/philanthropy-advice-emerging-markets).

In Hungary, the Hungarian Donors Forum provides specialist philanthropy advice to institutions, while The Nonprofit Information and Training Centre Foundation (NIOK), its name notwithstanding, provides information and legal advice to both individuals and foundations.

In Bulgaria, again, the country’s Donors’ Forum, the Bulgarian Charities Aid Foundation and the Workshop for Civic Initiatives Foundation (WCIF) provide philanthropy advice and donor education; WCIF also provides support to community foundations. The survey respondent identifies a gap, however – indeed, the main gap in philanthropy support in the country: the absence of advice for individual donors. However, she also has a prescription for all the agents involved in creating the philanthropy infrastructure. For the state: equalize the tax incentives for donors (currently donors who support state funds receive five times the tax incentives of those who donate to NGOs); lift the VAT from charitable text messaging; change the law which does not allow the reporting of names of donors when covering an event. For the NGO community: press government to improve the environment for philanthropy and introduce self-regulation to improve transparency in regard to use of funds. For wealthy donors: set personal examples of giving, while also setting corporate standards which stimulate the giving of employees and owners.

Slovakia has its own Donors’ Forum and respondents also mention the Centre for Philanthropy, the Pontis Foundation and the country’s community foundations as philanthropy support organizations. In fact, one respondent says that most large Slovakian foundations also provide philanthropic advice and services to donors. A Slovakian contributor to the *Alliance* survey of September 2010 knew of two private banks offering services in the field of philanthropy, but suggested that their knowledge is probably basic.

The main problem, thinks one respondent, is not lack of capacity but limited demand. As he puts it, providers ‘are more advanced in their thinking than their target audience - prospective donors’. He adds that the concepts of philanthropy and corporate social

responsibility have been slow to develop in Slovakia, partly because of the prevalence of traditional forms of charity and an unfavourable regulatory climate. Another points to the lack of independent funding to develop the research and lobbying capacity of the sector's support organizations to change, for instance, the legal and fiscal framework. The same respondent also feels there is too much emphasis on corporate donors, not enough on individuals.

Both he and another respondent urge greater efforts among NGOs to increase their visibility and demonstrate their trustworthiness – voluntary codes of conduct, publicizing of activities. The sector suffers from a long-standing negative image (which official hostility has done nothing to counteract). Alongside this goes the easing of the government's attitude through enabling legislation and the provision of tax incentives. Political, business and intellectual elites should be part of the movement to promote giving. Currently they are not there, which makes the efforts of existing philanthropic actors less bold and influential.

In the Czech Republic, too, not only the Donors' Forum but also several large foundations offer advice.

Russia

The situation in Russia offers a number of positive developments. One informant reports new private foundations being set up and existing ones become more focused and strategic. The Public Chamber's Commission of Philanthropy is beginning to make progress, not only in terms of legislation but, as one of its members remarks, 'in changing the attitude of government'.¹⁰

Who is involved?

CAF Russia is perhaps the only organization qualified to provide a wide range of support to donors and recipients, thinks one of the Russian informants – from consultations on how to build coherent philanthropic activity to specific tools that channel money from donors to charities. CAF lawyers are also perhaps the only legal experts who can consult on a whole range of legal issues – from the choice of legal entities and governing structures to composition of funds.

The Russian Donors Forum, says the same informant, provides a platform for exchange and some learning and one-to-one consultations to private and corporate donors, though with a fairly limited range and depth of topic.

These two also provide the same kinds of service for corporate donors. In the CSR field, there are what another informant describes as 'a couple of CSR-specialized NGOs, some PR agencies, big consulting firms and freelance consultants.

In terms of training for NGOs, one informant points to support centres and community foundations in the regions, some umbrella organizations (by cause mostly), a few freelance fundraisers and trainers, and some universities (training only; although another says that, to her knowledge the now-defunct NGO School was the only organization that provided training for charities in fundraising and management).

¹⁰ Quoted in *Alliance*, Vol 15, No 3, September 2010.

However, the field does not seem to be an expanding one. As one informant points out, 'support infrastructure cannot sustain itself on fees only, and getting other funds is very difficult. NGO resource centres in the regions are at the edge of survival all the time, and bigger players only exist thanks to a diversified funding structure.'

Banks

One informant reports 'a slight growing interest' among banks, but another thinks this is confined to western private banks and private bankers who are looking for a way into the Russian philanthropic market - how to approach it, who are the players and prospective partners, etc.

Demand

If the field is not expanding, neither is it encountering a great demand. As one informant puts it, 'it is the professional community that believes in the necessity of such services. On the other side, NGOs, thinks one informant, may generate a bigger demand but this is not supported by an ability to pay for the services.

Another feels that those who are starting in philanthropy need very basic advice – how to set up an organization, how to format agreements with grantees – but, she suggests, perhaps don't realize at the outset that they need more serious support.

Donor awareness and a culture of giving

'The idea of giving is very slowly turning into an accepted one,' believes one informant. It is gaining ground not only among the wealthy but among the rising middle class. Big name donors, celebrities and politicians are all engaged to various extents, thinks another, and the media is very supportive so more people are beginning to look on giving and volunteering as normal things to do. However, the same informant still sees work to do in the creation of a giving culture – raising awareness among people about the major issues and the NGOs involved in dealing with them and creating very practical ways for people to help. Another speaks of a 'lack of leadership among donors in general,.

Getting donors to think more strategically

For those who are already involved in volunteering or giving, says one informant, it is important to make them understand what they are doing and what the process is they are contributing to. 'If one engages in philanthropy and establishes an institution or is looking for some substantial feedback from society ... one has to get strategic about it,' agrees another.

The legal and fiscal framework

This is 'not bad at all,' feels one informant, with many new improvements recently adopted and more hopefully to follow. A new law which entered into force at the start of this year now provides for up to 25 per cent tax benefit to private donors, though, says another informant, there are still no incentives for companies.

The effect of the new law remains to be seen. Two of the informants for this section (as others have done elsewhere) express doubt as to whether tax incentives are really a major stimulus to giving. However, there are other things government might do to promote philanthropy, argues one, citing the recent law on endowed foundations

which has led to the establishment of a cluster of new organizations.

The view of NGOs

Distrust of NGOs – both among donors, who occasionally see them as dishonest, and by governments, who sometimes view them as loci of external ideas – is still an issue, but not necessarily more so than in other countries. One informant thinks the situation has improved considerably in the last few years.

Principal needs

Informants set out a number of areas for development:

- ♦ Greater public and state recognition of philanthropic effort in general with philanthropy recognized as a field of professional activity that is both powerful and sophisticated.
- ♦ Greater donor awareness.
- ♦ The creation of easier and more accessible donor mechanisms
- ♦ The strengthening of charities institutionally and professionally.

In general, feels one, more information should be available to donors, including inspirational stories and cases. Awareness in general is the key, she thinks, and the vision to move beyond the prevalent simplistic and conservative idea of giving. Support organizations can play a role both in helping to create a favourable environment for philanthropy and by publicizing the role and achievements of philanthropy throughout society.

Having helped to create a culture of giving, they, together with independent advisers and consultants, also have a role in guiding novices and established philanthropists alike to give more thoughtfully.

Central America

Because of the patchiness of the information available, this section concentrates principally on two countries of the region, Nicaragua and Mexico, with some supplementary information provided by respondents to the WINGS survey. The information on Mexico is drawn principally from the *Alliance* survey conducted in 2010.

Who is involved?

As far as an informant in Nicaragua is aware, there is no organization providing advice or support services in Central America, certainly not in Nicaragua itself. Any advice or support tends to be informally sought and informally given. Most foundations in Central America are either based outside of the region or are non-grantmaking foundations and, in either event, they don't seek advice locally. The only exception mentioned was the Fondo Centroamericano de Mujeres, which does give some training to its grantees on fundraising and management.

On the face of it, the position in Mexico is similar. The 2010 survey reported that it was not common for individual philanthropists and family foundations to take advice on their donations: 'Most often, they donate in an informal manner and receive advice in the same way. Usually, individuals give to organizations their families have a tradition of supporting, or to organizations led by people they know.'

However, a number of Mexican respondents also reported a developing advice and support field, though, as with most of Latin America, principally focused on corporate donors and CSR. Alternativas y Capacidades, for example, provides training workshops such as the Seminar in Corporate Philanthropy and Social Investment and produces a grantmakers' handbook, aimed primarily at corporate grantmakers. FUNDEMEX (Mexico Business Foundation) is an umbrella body of businesses all over the country which, among other functions, allows them to make small donations to different social or grantmaking programmes. Vivian Blair y Asociados offers both CSR advice and help for individuals.

There is also of course the Mexican Center for Philanthropy (CEMEFI), which provides a central point of contact for Mexican donors and a source of information and research. Its website includes a list of ten consultants with varying degrees of expertise on areas related to philanthropy including social investment and workforce volunteering.

A Colombian respondent to the WINGS survey pointed to his own organization, Fundación DIS, and Compartamos con Colombia. DIS provides 'personal and institutional advice, training, support for designing institutions and programs, institutional and network assessment, strategic planning, board development and governance, support for developing learning communities, information, etc.'

Demand

In Nicaragua, there is some demand for legal advice on the structures and requirements for NGOs and for fundraising or management training to NGOs. There is not much demand among banks for advice to high-net-worth clients nor for donor education for either individuals or organizations because there is no real philanthropic culture in the region. Most giving has its basis in religion: it is either to or through religious institutions and has to do with assistance to the needy on the one hand and alleviating the guilt of the giver on the other.

Role models

These are almost non-existent and, to judge by the example of one of the few very wealthy figures in the region involved in philanthropy, Carlos Slim, their value as a stimulus for more and more thoughtful giving is debatable. Slim, famously, does not believe in philanthropy, despite his activities as a donor, and he has an ambivalent reputation.

The legal and fiscal framework

The legal environment is not favourable at all, says the Nicaraguan informant. While there is a limited tax exemption in Nicaragua (she mentions a figure of 10 per cent relief on donations), it is rarely used. She believes that the laws and procedures which regulate non-profits are made mostly to allow more control of the NGO sector from the government. In Nicaragua, the non-profit law is old but no one wants to touch it in case any revisions make it more onerous.

Needs

For one Colombian respondent to the WINGS survey, 'there is not an evaluation (or at least a good conversation) about the effectiveness of the different types of

methodologies for supporting philanthropy and capacity building efforts.’ For him, philanthropy in Colombia needs to develop ‘better skills for thinking and act strategically, create partnerships and influencing public policy’.

A respondent from the Dominican Republic sees an important want as the lack of professional advice and support. At the moment, ‘it isn’t well organized, it is more like peer to peer support.’

In Nicaragua, our informant points to three major needs:

First, to change the popular attitude towards giving so that it goes beyond giving money to a traditional cause and becomes more to do with participation in development. No one organization can do that, says our informant. The Central American Women’s Fund is trying to encourage more local giving and set out with the belief that communicating their successes and those of their grantees would achieve this. They have been proved wrong, however; changing the public mind will require several organizations working together.

Second, and in parallel, there is a need to advocate for changes in non-profit laws in the whole region to incentivize philanthropists through tax exemption for their gifts.

Finally, she points to the need to train existing funds and NGOs in Central America on how to strengthen relationships with potential individual donors. Most NGOs in the region, she says, are used to dealing with international aid agencies and are not set up to deal with individual donors.

All of these things will require collective effort and better communications of aims and achievements from organizations at all points on the philanthropy spectrum. At the moment no forum exists through which this might happen. She mentions an organization called Puntos Encuentro which specializes in communications on issues like women’s rights and youth rights and offers a possible point of departure, but at the moment it has no involvement with philanthropy.

South America

Institutional philanthropy in both Central and South America has tended to be dominated by corporate foundations and corporate social investment. Most of the infrastructure, therefore, is in that area, though there are signs that, in parts of the region at least, this is starting to change. Most of the information in this section is drawn from the WINGS survey.

In Colombia, a respondent identifies Compartamos con Colombia and Fundación DIS, which provide a range of services for both individuals and institutions. The main weakness, he says, is that there is very little thought or discussion about the effectiveness of the different ways of supporting philanthropy and building the capacity of third sector organizations. There is also the Asociación de Fundaciones Empresariales (Association of Corporate Foundations), an umbrella body for the country’s corporate foundations.

Elsewhere, CERES in Ecuador is a network of businesses and organizations which promote the idea of socially responsible practices. The attention of the Instituto de Comunicación y Desarrollo (ICD) in Uruguay is focused principally on the NGO side. Among other activities, it produces an e-newsletter, *La sociedad civil en línea*. Among its areas of work are research on civil society, social responsibility, transparency and accountability, and volunteering.

Apart from Brazil (see separate section), Argentina is probably the best-served country of the region for philanthropy support organizations. Fundación Compromiso provides donor training, says one respondent; another mentions Grupo de Fundaciones y Empresas (GDFE), which provides philanthropy advice, undertakes research and donor training, publishes e-newsletters and organizes an annual meeting. Instituto Argentina de Responsabilidad Social Empresaria (IARSE) provides donor education in the corporate social responsibility sphere, runs training workshops and publishes an online newsletter.

Respondents were able, however, to identify a number of wants: the coordination of the various philanthropic efforts, a global perspective, and a wider view of philanthropy. In addition, one remarks that contributions from domestic foundations are very low compared to those from international sources.

There are also a number of regional initiatives which, again, are mostly focused on corporate giving and volunteering. RedEAmerica (Red Interamericana de Fundaciones y Acciones Empresariales para el Desarrollo del Base) is a network which aims to provide a focal point for philanthropic efforts to reduce poverty on the continent and has members across South and Central America. The recently launched Voluntare is designed to encourage corporate volunteering, providing a source of knowledge for all organizations and individuals interested in corporate volunteering.

From the NGO point of view, Rendir Cuentas is a regional platform for the promotion of transparency and accountability among civil society organizations in Latin America.

One instrument which attempts to bring both donors and NGOs together is the Latin American Donor Index launched by the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) and Fundación AVINA. The Index, which currently lists 548 donor organizations to the region, is intended to help donors and NGOs identify likely partners and supporters.

Brazil

Brazil boasts possibly the most mature foundation and NGO sector in Latin America and the boom in NGO growth between 1996 and 2005 has been accompanied by some corresponding development in intermediary organizations¹¹ – ABONG (though this actually dates back to 1991), GIFE and the Ethos Institute. To these can be added the Institute for the Development of Social Investment (IDIS) which offers, according to one informant, the widest range of services to donors, both individual and

¹¹ From Fernando Rossetti, 'Brazil: From Philanthropy to Private Social Investment', in *Global Philanthropy*, Norine MacDonald and Luc Tayart de Borms (eds), Mercator Fund, 2010.

institutional. Since 2008, the UK-based Charities Aid Foundation (CAF) has been delivering services to wealthy families through IDIS.

Another informant identifies three organizations that are involved in providing, to some degree or other, advice to donors: PRAGMA, a wealth management firm that provides advice to successful business owners and foundations; law firm Mattos Filho, Mattos Filho, Veiga Filho, Marrey Jr & Quiroga Advogados; and Instituto Geração (Generation Institute), which supports 'privileged youth' in their philanthropy.

J P Morgan and Deutsche Bank made a foray into philanthropy advice for the rich, based on training and a guide to helping HNWI's prepared for them by IDIS, but the economic crisis has apparently put paid to that. Testament to the fact that these organizations have made themselves felt is offered by one informant in the following terms: 'the easy, "spread and pray" money that flowed out from businesses and their foundations in the 1990s is now much more strategic, professional and focused – an important achievement for intermediary organizations such as GIFE and Ethos.'

Corporate philanthropy remains the dominant form of institutional giving and, says one informant, even under its most sophisticated and social justice-oriented incarnation, it 'has a very palpable limit: the brand. It is rare for a corporation to get involved in polemic causes or in social actions that might generate any conflict. So the main tendency is to invest in consensual fields, such as education and culture, rather than in potentially riskier themes such as human rights, corruption control or rural land property.'

On the question of the rise, or not, of the specialist philanthropy adviser, opinion among informants is divided. One says there are none, two others think there are at least a few. According to one, developments in this areas are 'not of the same kind of the US and Europe, but there has been growth'.

What kind of services?

In general, thinks one, Brazil lacks organizations that provide advice to both donors and recipients and 'it is easier to find advice to recipients than to donors'. GIFE concentrates on what has come to be termed private social investment (a more intelligible term than philanthropy in Brazil) while Ethos's area of expertise is in business and social responsibility. However, feels one informant, IDIS is at the moment the only organization dedicated to donors. There *are* a limited number of individual advisers to donors and non-corporate foundations but he believes they are not philanthropy specialists, but work in family offices and give advice on philanthropy if and as requested.

According to another informant, in the first instance, GIFE provides tools to foundations and businesses to evaluate the effectiveness of their programmes.

Demand

The same informant feels that the effect of the financial crisis is important here. The Brazilian economy is growing less rapidly this year and, he points out, much of Brazilian philanthropy still comes through business – 'less business, less philanthropy', as he puts it. He also argues that the contraction of philanthropy means

that its focus once more shifts from social change to charity and ‘charity does not require the same level of advising as private social investment for development’.

The legal and fiscal framework

Only the highest-earning companies and individuals benefit from tax exemptions on giving, which reduces the amount of endowed funds, which means in turn that philanthropic spending is unpredictable and concentrated in a few hands. For one informant, this absence of incentive for most of the rich to give has a knock-on effect in that it prevents philanthropy enjoying a higher profile in the country.

Needs

Not for the first time in this research, one informant replies: ‘everything - wide access to information, donor advice, research, enabling legislation, data’. Another feels that a major problem is isolation and the resulting lack of wider influence on Brazilian philanthropy. Brazilian philanthropy, he feels, is unknown outside of Brazil. Foreign foundations which formerly had a strong presence in Brazil, such as Kellogg, have left and, conversely, few Brazilians go to events such as the annual EFC and Council on Foundations conferences. More positively, WINGS has moved its office to Brazil and IDIS has established strong links with CAF, Resource Alliance and, very recently, the Global Philanthropy Forum to promote Brazilian philanthropy. This, he feels, will expose Brazilian philanthropy to other viewpoints and will reverse the trend towards isolation.

ANNEX 1

The following is a list of those approached for information for this report. Not all of them were able to comply (my warmest thanks to those who did). Nevertheless, their names are given here as possible contacts for those wanting further information on the issues raised in the text:

Akwasi Aidoo, TrustAfrica
Alison Bukhari, Dasra, India
Amita Puri, CAF India
Ana Criquillion, Central American Women's Fund, Nicaragua
Atallah Kuttub, SAANED, Jordan
Barbara Ibrahim, John D Gerhart Center, American University of Cairo
Barry Smith, Citizen Smith Consulting, South Africa
Chandrikai Sahai, independent consultant, India
Charles Yusheng Li, Narada Foundation, China
Dana Doan, LIN Centre, Vietnam
Deval Sanghavi, Dasra, India
Dien Yuan, Give2Asia, USA
Douglas Miller, Asian Venture Philanthropy Network, Singapore
Emilienne De Leon, Semillas, Mexico
Fernando Rossetti, GIFE, Brazil
Filiz Bikmen, Sabanci Foundation, Turkey
Halima Mohamed, independent philanthropy consultant, South Africa
Helena Monteiro, WINGS, Brazil
Inga Pagava, CAF Russia
Janet Mawiyoo, Kenya Community Development Foundation
Jenny Hodgson, Global Fund for Community Foundations, South Africa
Kieu Oanh Pham, Centre for Social Initiatives Promotion, Vietnam
Marcos Kisil, IDIS, Brazil
Maria Chertok, CAF Russia
Mayan Quebral, Venture for Fundraising Asia, Philippines
Michael Alberg Seberich, Active Philanthropy, Germany
Natalia Kaminarskaya, Russian Donors Forum
Nelson Colon, Puerto Rico Community Foundation
Nilda Bullain, European Center for Not-for-Profit Law, Hungary
Pham Kieu Oanh, LIN Centre, Vietnam
Philo Alto, Asia Value Advisors, Hong Kong
Simon Chadwick, Asian Venture Philanthropy Network, Singapore
Sumita Mishra, IPartner India
Tina Chan, Chen Yet-Sen Foundation, China
Walter Veirs, Mott Foundation, UK

ANNEX 2

Websites of featured organizations:

CAF has offices in a number of regions and countries. Information on any of the elements of the network can be accessed through the following webpage:

www.cafonline.org/about-us/international-network.aspx

East and South-East Asia

Asian Philanthropy Advisory Network, <http://asianphilanthropy.org>

Asian Philanthropy Forum, www.asianphilanthropyforum.org

Asia Value Advisors, www.value.asia

Asian Venture Philanthropy Network, www.avpn.asia

China Foundation Center, www.foundationcenter.org.cn

Give2Asia, www.give2asia.org

LIN Center for Community Development, <http://linvn.org>

Narada Foundation, www.naradafoundation.org/english/index.asp

One Foundation, <http://jetli.com/jet/index.php?s=spirit&ss=projects&p=one>

The Pari Project, www.thepariproject.com

Philippines Business for Social Progress, www.pbsp.org.ph

Philippine Development Foundation, www.phildev.org

Venture for Fundraising Asia, www.venture-asia.org

South Asia

Bombay Community Public Trust, www.bcpt.org.in

Centre for Advancement of Philanthropy, <http://capindia.in>

Credibility Alliance, www.credibilityalliance.org

Dasra, www.dasra.org

EdelGive Foundation, <http://edelgive.org>

GiveIndia, www.giveindia.org

iPartner India, www.ipartnerindia.org

Navam, www.navam.org

New Concept, www.newconceptinfo.com

ProPoor, www.propoor.org

Samhita, www.samhita.org

Villgro, www.villgro.org

Middle East and North Africa

Arab Foundations Forum www.arabfoundationsforum.org

John D Gerhart Center, www.aucegypt.edu/research/gerhart/Pages/default.aspx

SAANED, www.saaned.com

Sub-Saharan Africa

Absa Bank, www.absa.co.za

African Grantmakers Network, www.africangrantmakersnetwork.org

East African Association of Grantmakers, www.eaag.org

Greater Good South Africa, www.myggsa.co.za

Inyathelo, www.inyathelo.org.za

Kenya Community Development Foundation, <http://kcdf.or.ke>

National Business Initiative, www.nbi.org.za
Southern Africa Trust, www.southernafricatrust.org
TrustAfrica, www.trustafrica.org
Tshikululu Social Investments, www.tshikululu.org.za
T Y Danjuma Foundation, www.tydanjumafoundation.org

Central and Eastern Europe

Bulgarian Donors' Forum, www.dfbulgaria.org
Centre for Philanthropy (Slovakia), www.cpf.sk
Czech Donors' Forum, www.donorsforum.cz
Hungarian Donors' Forum, www.donorsforum.hu
NIOK, www.niok.hu
Pontis Foundation, www.nadaciapontis.sk
Russian Donors Forum, www.donorsforum.ru
Slovak Donors' Forum, www.donorsforum.sk
Workshop for Civic Initiatives Foundation, www.wcif-bg.org

Central America

Alternativas y Capacidades, www.alternativasociales.org
Central American Women's Fund, www.fcmujeres.org
Centro Mexicano de la Filantropia (CEMEFI), www.cemefi.org
FUNDEMEX, www.fundemex.org.mx

South America

CERES, www.redceres.org
Grupo de Fundaciones y Empresas, www.gdfe.org.ar
GIFE (Grupo de Institutos Fundações e Empresas), www.gife.org.br
Institute for the Development of Social Investment (IDIS)
Instituto Argentina de Responsabilidad Social Empresaria, www.iarse.org
Instituto de Comunicacion y Desarrollo, <http://lasociedadcivil.org>
Instituto Ethos, www.ethos.org.br
Instituto Geracao, www.institutogeracao.org.br
Latin America Donor Index, www.indicedonantesal.org
Mattos Filho, www.mattosfilho.com.br
PRAGMA, www.pragmapatrimonio.com.br
RedEAmerica, www.redeamerica.org