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Since its inception in 2002, Inyathelo has worked with civil society and institutions such as universities on their long term financial sustainability. Critical to the survival of our South African civil society is the growth of a strong philanthropic movement to begin to replace the enormous international funding that has previously supported our non-profit organisations. Inyathelo strongly believes that South Africans themselves should support our own civil society if we want to ensure the maintenance and strengthening of our democracy, its institutions, our intellectual engine-rooms and our human rights.

The Our World Our Responsibility donor conference held in Cape Town in November 2010 grew out of a commitment by The Atlantic Philanthropies to bring together a small grouping of international donors to take stock of their activities in South Africa and to explore ways of co-operating. Inyathelo: The South African Institute for Advancement was asked to work with The Atlantic Philanthropies on this meeting. As the concept developed and we explored a possible agenda, it became evident that this was a window of opportunity to raise a number of fundamental issues about philanthropy in South Africa.

A key issue for international donors was the capacity to develop partnerships with South African private foundations. It was therefore agreed that the meeting should include opportunities for both local and international private foundations to engage with one another and the meeting began to take the shape of a conference.

In order to develop an agenda, consultations were held with various foundations and individual philanthropists in Cape Town and Johannesburg. These discussions highlighted the themes that emerged at the conference and we were able to accommodate most issues throughout the three days. This conference provided the first opportunity for many participants to engage with each other: South African foundations connected with international foundations; peers had the opportunity to share good practice; special arrangements were made for philanthropy to meet with the South African non-profit sector; affinity groups provided space for potential partners in philanthropy to meet; and specific keynote speakers raised the critical issues faced by South Africa.
90 people attended the conference representing a broad spectrum of foundations and individuals involved in private philanthropy in South Africa. Key inputs by Jay Naidoo, Chairman of the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition and Sipho Pityana of the Council for the Defence of the Constitution set the contextual background for philanthropy in South Africa, while an extremely interactive session chaired by Rick Mennel exploring philanthropy through the lens of the Dinokeng scenarios generated enormous interest.

There was no doubt that the conference was a great success and key outcomes have been improved lines of communication between private funders in South Africa; the development of funding partnerships; and the establishment of a loose network of local private grantmakers (the Private Philanthropy Circle). This circle is now meeting regularly to focus on issues of common interest and Inyathelo is serving as its secretariat to take this initiative forward. We look forward to seeing its development as a more sustained network of local private philanthropy that can deal with issues that affect the sector in South Africa.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank those who made major contributions towards this conference. Firstly, The Atlantic Philanthropies, the CS Mott Foundation, the Claude Leon Foundation and the BoE Private Clients Philanthropy Office who committed funding to the project; Vincent McGee from The Atlantic Philanthropies who served as part of the conference team and organised the consultative focus groups and encouraged speakers to participate; Amanda Bloch, our energetic and enthusiastic conference co-ordinator, whose personality and commitment left a clear stamp on the conference and its programme; Justine Gevisser who organised the conference with such enthusiasm and grace; US Ambassador Donald Gips and his wife Liz who kindly hosted the opening reception at their home in Cape Town, together with all the preparatory work undertaken by US Consul Dr Alberta Mayberry and Amy Bell-Malaudzi; Theo Coggin and Chantal Meugens of Quo Vadis who worked beyond reasonable hours on our communications and press liaison; In House Conference Solutions, Mark and Candice Christians for their amazing support with electronic registrations and venue arrangements; Paul Finlayson of Board of Executors Private Clients who provided the venue for day three and contributed towards the speed networking evening with non-profit organisations; Jason Lurie of Moyo who also made a contribution to our speed networking evening; Sean Jones who very ably produced this report; all the speakers who made a wonderful contribution to the debate on philanthropy in South Africa and most especially to Gaby Ritchie, Inyathelo Programme Director, and all the Inyathelo staff who, as always, assisted and provided back up with extraordinary levels of professionalism. Thank you.
Noting that philanthropy had emerged as a significant economic driver and force for social innovation over the past century, Mr Naidoo singled out two key functions of the philanthropic enterprise which he hoped the conference would address:

- The “reconstitution” of wealth to address social problems; and
- The promotion of social innovation to deal with the root causes of society’s most pressing challenges.

He called on conference delegates to consider the notion of philanthropy not simply as “giving back” but also as “giving forward”; that is, as creating the societal conditions – such as social stability, economic prosperity, peace, security and development – for a future which enables the perpetuation and growth of giving back.

Mr Naidoo said that, as it had done elsewhere, philanthropy offers the potential to serve as a catalyst for change on the African continent: “Economic growth and emerging markets in Africa offer us an unprecedented opportunity to secure the right conditions for democracy, developing Africa’s resources and developing enterprises which result in a broadly shared prosperity that is socially cohesive. This means that entrepreneurship will grow and small and medium enterprises, the backbone of Africa’s future, will lead to creation of jobs and wealth. New wealth and job creation will need to be balanced by the emergence of African philanthropy, and at this stage this ought to be taken for granted.”

Philanthropy could leverage resources and expertise across all sectors for maximum impact.
and multi-sectoral collaboration, and that leverage resources and expertise across all sectors for maximum impact: “The 21st century will be about evolving the model beyond financial capital to include other forms...social, technological, network capital to name a few. Integrated...models require smart capital driven by leaders who understand how to harness the assets of the public, private and social sector and to deploy these assets in the most efficient and effective ways to solve the very complex societal challenges we face.”

Particularly critical to emerging African philanthropy, according to Mr Naidoo, is the development of “smart partnerships” which could “combine social entrepreneurship with social movements” and which involve “private sector innovation driving services [to meet] the development needs of the poor.” Specifically, civil society should be seeking new and innovative ways of leveraging private sector capital to achieve the development goals we set.

In ending, Mr Naidoo called for the conference to consider the role of philanthropy as a change agent in partnering government, business and civil society to make good the promises of 1994 and ensure a better life for all South Africans. This would require, among other things:

- New models for leveraging resources and taking innovation and change to scale;
- Participation by government as a critical partner in the philanthropic enterprise; and
- Remobilisation of a strong civil society to strengthen the democratic voice and enable communities to call to account the state and other significant players.

Professor Adam Habib drew delegates’ attention to data on philanthropy in the USA and South Africa to demonstrate the need for an altogether more nuanced understanding of the nature of giving in this country. He observed that, although there were very strong philanthropic traditions in the USA, these traditions do not always service the greatest needs. A fair proportion of philanthropic funding, for instance, is dedicated to enhancing the cultural, social, health, sporting and educational needs of...
middle class and privileged communities. According to Professor Habib, the situation in South Africa is somewhat different. Not only is it a misconception that this country does not have a strong philanthropic tradition, but giving is also controlled largely within poor communities themselves.

In 2003 wage-earning South Africans gave approximately 2.2% of their earnings and, aside from the state, the primary contribution to development and poverty alleviation nationally came from individual giving. Like the USA, the largest proportion of giving – approximately 80% – was directed through religious organisations but, unlike the USA, a significant proportion of philanthropic money was held and distributed within poor and survivalist communities through structures like churches, stokvels, and burial societies. As it was located in poor communities, South African giving was managed in much more collective ways than in the USA, where philanthropic traditions tended to be more individualistic. Also important to bear in mind was that, in South Africa, religious giving had begun to have broader impacts, with Christian, Jewish and Muslim giving directed at causes beyond the giving community itself.

Professor Habib also observed that ignoring contextual specificity and building philanthropic practice based on Western models had seriously hindered the development of local philanthropy. For instance, advocacy in South Africa had focused on changing the tax code so that, as in the USA and elsewhere, individuals would be encouraged to give. While creating an enabling environment for philanthropy was clearly desirable, said Professor Habib, in the process of trying to emulate Western models South Africans had missed a major opportunity to harness vast capital for philanthropic purposes through Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) transactions. According to Habib, that is where the advocacy should have been directed and this might have been the case had South African advocacy not been so doggedly focused on emulating the USA.

Mr Tchozewski posed the question: what is the relationship between social change and money? He observed that there is in fact little evidence of a causal relationship and that, as the South African experience has shown, “the ability of social movements to create social change does not have a direct linear relationship with the [financial] resources available to it.” He explained his view that, like any complex adaptive system, social change happens in loops and is probably driven as much by unexpected political opportunity as other contributors to the power of social movements. According to Mr Tchozewski, this means that “philanthropy has the unenviable task of trying to pre-position its money in the hands of people with the best sense of anticipating unexpected opportunity...[which is]...a very convoluted way for sociologists to explain that they have no idea how social change happens!” After providing examples of how shifts in social norm evolved into social change, Mr Tchozewski made the important observation that, by their nature, philanthropists tend to be moderate or conservative in outlook and so support social movements of a similar nature: “One of the concerns...about the role of philanthropy in supporting social movements for social change is that, on the surface, the self-interest of high net
worth individuals, families and companies would be biased towards non-progressive social movements.” Lastly, he observed that civil society and philanthropy might be viewed as co-evolving drivers, with the one fueling the other and together creating unexpected pulse change at certain moments in time.

Dr Salole began by providing an African take on philanthropy, observing that “Philanthropy...is not about giving, it’s not about charity, it’s not about giving back. Philanthropy for me is about reciprocity and resilience, and in the African context this is the quintessential form of giving....It’s about reciprocity, it’s about redistribution, it’s about actually helping one another and it’s about stuff that’s on the ground.” Mentioning a range of African institutions and practices, such as stokvels, rotating credit associations, burial clubs, and home-boy groups, Salole noted that local philanthropic institutions which were always looking to the West for models failed constantly to see what they had in their midst. According to him, new forms of philanthropic organisation are emerging in Africa that are starting to make a strong departure from the more traditional foundations like those largely represented at the conference. Several examples were provided of ‘indigenous philanthropy’ or ‘citizen philanthropy’ (as panellists variously referred to it). Dr Salole described how Italian foundations in the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries originated by citizens pooling their resources for the betterment of society, while Professor Habib referred to how working class white South Africans mobilised funding during the 1960s to establish the former Rand Afrikaans University (RAU), which had the effect of transforming large segments of the working class Afrikaans population of the region from the working class to the white upper middle class within the space of a few decades. Speaking of indigenous African mechanisms such as stokvels, home-boy groups and burial societies, Dr Salole observed: “There may be ways in which one can work with such institutions by mimicking things that have actually been evolved by people themselves rather than imported from outside. I think a healthy dose of humility is needed from development workers. We know we are failing...”

The issue of a paternalistic approach by philanthropists was raised several times in the session. Dr Salole’s injunction sums up these sentiments well: “People...on the ground are doing things for themselves all the time. And if you don’t find the grace...to help people with what they are already doing, get out of the way because you’re doing harm. And we haven’t learned that lesson.”
Some of the salient points made in the presentations and the wide-ranging discussion which followed included:

- Just as South African civil society was effectively demobilised after 1994, so too have universities since been demobilised and their voices muted. Some progressive intellectuals left academia to assist with building the state and others were no longer critical because they feared marginalisation. As academia was a primary driver of change, this diluted the intellectual capital of the nation and disabled possibilities for change.

- A clear breakdown had occurred between the South African state and civil society. In view of this, the key question was: How should organised philanthropy, which was always very sensitive about not being confrontational and wanted to build partnerships, work with civil society on the one hand and the state on the other?

- In the developed world where the state played an enormous part in providing basic services, philanthropy almost has a voluntary aspect to it. In the developing world, true philanthropy is focused around community development and is a social and economic imperative.

- Philanthropy is growing fastest in Asia, and the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China) more generally are becoming important drivers of philanthropy. How philanthropy in these contexts interacts with domestic social movements and global social movements could have a major impact on the nature of philanthropy internationally.

- A central issue is how philanthropy is to develop real partnerships with government. How is complementarity between philanthropic giving and state funding to be achieved?

- Philanthropy should be better organised and co-ordinated to make it easier for government to embrace and partner. Some kind of collective infrastructure which could advocate and engage on behalf of the philanthropic sector would be crucial in the future.
Keynote Address

SIPHO PITYANA, COUNCIL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONSTITUTION (CASAC)

Starting from the premise that South Africa needs to be a driver of economic change and a standard-setter for accountable governance on the continent, Mr Pityana appealed to philanthropists to support South Africa because it was reaching a fork in the road and should avoid travelling in the wrong direction. The consequence of taking the wrong fork would be devastating and confidence in Africa’s ability to defy the clichéd narrative of poverty and famine, kleptomania and corruption, and state failure, would be bitterly undermined. According to Mr Pityana, failure is unthinkable.

A great deal had been achieved since 1994, he said, yet the quality of life of the vast majority of South Africans has not improved. Instead “...we are witnessing a transition from the politics of social justice, liberation and public service to that of personal wealth accumulation, concentration of political power and hegemony.” During this period, too, the voice of civil society has become progressively more muted and the majority of South Africans have become passive spectators; “the notion of active citizenship has been lost”.

The principles and values out of which the Freedom Charter and later the Constitution were born were, as Mr Pityana put it, “in danger of being submerged by a rush of personal enrichment of a new now-conservative faction that straddles the right wing in the ruling party and a broader political establishment that has formed over the past decade. These developments threaten not only the progressive vision of the constitution, but potentially our whole democratic foundation and our prospects for future prosperity.”

The struggle for liberation, said Mr Pityana, was about seizing state power in order to use the instruments of that institution to free the people from poverty, economic marginalisation and subjugation. The state was to have been transformed from an entity aimed at serving the apartheid system to one that would be a catalyst for delivery of services to all. Its transformation was more than just a pursuit of race and gender reordering, but fundamentally about populating it with a competent fresh generation of civil servants, many of whom were drawn from the ruling party and its allies in the trade union movement, as well as broader civil society structures. The outcome was great reform in government and policy alongside social programmes directed at addressing the inequities of society.
At the same time, civil society structures were stripped of much of their intellectual and strategic capacity, as well as financial and other assets, as the new democratic state commanded these resources. By default rather than design, the structures of civil society were disempowered and marginalised as the politics and agenda of transformation were institutionalised. With the benefit of hindsight it was clear that this had been a grave strategic misjudgement. The ruling party and the state had come to be seen as the only vehicles through which transformation could be pursued. With this realisation, the politics of opportunism and self-service had begun to take root. This was a consequence not only of weak and marginalised civil society structures but also of the absence of a legitimate opposition party capable of challenging the ruling party.

As the gap between what the state promised and what was delivered had widened, a vibrant civil society became increasingly conspicuous by its absence. Not only should civil society be articulating the needs of the people but, in partnership with government and the private sector, it could help deliver services to communities, and could serve to ensure a level of transparency and accountability in the use of public resources. As Mr Pityana concluded: “We need civil society organisations with the credibility, organisational muscle and astute leadership, able to stand up to the ruling party when necessary but also capable of constructively engaging with it. While it is understandable and appropriate that philanthropists...would want to fund grassroots projects that ‘touch the people’ and which have immediate, tangible outcomes...we also need – as a society – the ability to engage with political power at a macro-level. We need to be able to join the dots; we need to be able to see the full picture from above and not avoid or ignore the systemic challenges and political threats that may fatally undermine all our efforts to change peoples’ lives for the better.”

Responding to questions about how civil society should manage its relationship with the state, Mr Pityana said that civil society needed “to be critical but we also need to empower, to ensure that the behaviour and the conduct of public representatives appreciates that they are accountable ultimately to ordinary citizens.” He called upon philanthropists to support programmes which strengthen civil society and its ability to call the state to account: “Those are the areas that I think you should be investing in.”
Question & Answer

**Question:** “Is it naïve to expect a government that might be suspicious of the motives of some philanthropists to then embrace us as partners? And what do we need to do as philanthropists to build trust and confidence between government and civil society?”

**Pityana:** “It’s very important that the way you give should be enabling....But the most important thing is that philanthropists should be agents of change. Yes, government would look at this with suspicion. We gathered recently as civil society structures – the government was uncomfortable about that gathering: Is this the emergence of a new opposition? What is the intention behind this?...It doesn’t serve civil society to alienate government. It serves civil society to be independent so that government knows that, where government is unreasonable, civil society is able to organise, embarrass and challenge government – that’s the point.

And I think that philanthropists as well should also occupy a similar space as civil society in some respects. Government would probably be suspicious but philanthropists must maintain their autonomy and not direct resources in ways that are dictated by government because it will just undermine a vigorous, vibrant and strong civil society – and that would be unfortunate.”

Can we [philanthropists] expect a government that is suspicious of our motives to partner us?

... philanthropists must maintain their autonomy and not direct resources in ways that are dictated by government
Panel Discussion:
Government, Philanthropy, the Corporate Sector and Civil Society

FACILITATOR: DAVID HARRISON, DG MURRAY TRUST
PANELLISTS: AMANDA BRINKMANN, WESTERN CAPE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT - DEPARTMENT OF STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS
DR ASHRAF GRIMWOOD, KHETH'IMIPOLO
KGOTSO SCHÖMAN, KAGISO TRUST
MAPENA BOK, NATIONAL DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
NOBAYENI C. DLADLA, THE ATLANTIC PHILANTHROPIES SOUTH AFRICA

The Facilitator, Mr David Harrison, introduced the session as a dialogue about how government, civil society and business could work together in collaborative partnerships. He suggested that the panel should address the following issues:

- What has worked and what has not worked when partnering government?
- What were the critical success factors and what were the stumbling blocks?
- What are the opportunities for moving forward?

As a prelude to the remarks of panellists, Harrison presented several points which, in his view, made for successful public-private partnerships:

- The National Treasury had to be on board. While the line department was important, Treasury had to be behind the partnership or it would not be supported;
- All the levels of the bureaucracy should be cultivated and engaged simultaneously. Collaboration should be considered a secondary aspect; the principal intervention is the programme and making it a success should be the primary focus. Collaboration then follows to enable the programme to snowball. Too often collaboration becomes an end in itself and the real work does not get done; and
- It was sometimes necessary to break the rules in a considered way and on a limited basis. For example, LoveLife was battling to obtain support for a programme to build recreational and sporting facilities for young people at a clinic in KwaZulu-Natal. With some support from officials,
the organisation went ahead and built these facilities at the clinic anyway. The provincial minister demanded an apology, which was provided. That community now has youth services and sports facilities (the only ones in the community), the prospects for HIV prevention have been strengthened, and officials have in fact bought into the model.

Following Mr Harrison’s introductory remarks, Ms Amanda Brinkmann described an initiative of the Western Cape provincial government which was underpinned by recognition that cycles of poverty could not be addressed without civil society, academia, the private sector and funders working together. This has led to the establishment of a Department of Strategic Partnership in the province which aimed to “inculcate the notion of transversal service delivery solutions and partnerships” across the five key strategic objectives of the province.” While the levels of capacity and commitment in this Department were admirable, Ms Brinkmann indicated that the real question was how, in practice, to implement this aspiration of a truly collaborative approach to breaking cycles of poverty.

One of the major issues which affects and frustrates such collaboration is that large-scale funding is being expended across different sectors without sufficient co-ordination, resulting in institutions and organisations working in silos. This, said Ms Brinkmann, is where government has a critical role to play: “We are only the capacitor, the enabler, the facilitator. We have the mandate from the people to put the deliverables and measurables on the table to say these are the things that we need to achieve on behalf of the people of our country and of our province. We need to set the agenda, but it is also our responsibility to bring all of the role-players around the table, and by that I mean all of the role-players, be they civil society, the private sector, donors. We have to have the conversation in one place and one space. We have to collaboratively agree what it is that we need to achieve...”

In the Western Cape the provincial government is attempting such an approach with what it termed its “long-term preventative development and growth strategy”, which is about “re-creating a family and a community for the youth”. There is a clear plan in place and funding mechanisms have been created which are being run by the private sector at arms’ length from government to ensure transparency. As Ms Brinkmann put it: “We are open for business. We run like a business, we run transparently, and we are prepared to try, under empirical conditions, to find solutions and share with the rest of the country”.

Dr Ashraf Grimwood then outlined a variety of statistics to illustrate that South Africa was failing very badly in respect of several of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). On the basis of his extensive experience in the non-profit health sector, he identified six areas where NGOs could support, reinforce and complement the public health-care system:
In fields where trained personnel were scarce, every effort should be made to refrain from hiring health or management professionals away from the public sector; Pay structures should be kept in line with those of government so as not to introduce competition; Management advice and support should be provided to the public health system wherever necessary and possible; A relationship of open communication with government should be developed and maintained, the absence of a political agenda should be made clear, and the welfare of the community should be emphasised as a fundamental shared goal; Communities should be drawn actively into the programmatic work of NGOs and, wherever possible, NGO workers should be recruited from within the community and trained; and Local communities, local institutions and civil society should be encouraged to take primary responsibility for any actions that might be required.

Mr Kgotsso Schoeman spoke about the decision of the Kagiso Trust to focus on education in South Africa and the approach it had taken in doing so. A major reason for this strategy was not just the poor state of education in the country but also the fact that large investments were being made, through public-private partnerships, in schools that were completely dysfunctional. Two principles thus underpinned the programme:

- It had to be transformative in nature because there was little point in investing without influencing government and provoking systemic change; and
- It had to leverage government funding.

In some provinces where the programme was being piloted, schools were meeting the targets set for them but provincial government had unfortunately failed to meet its commitments to the programme. In these instances, the Trust had taken a decision to reward the successful schools but to discontinue the programme in the province. In other provinces government had met its commitments and was jointly investing in the programme. In these cases, there was excellent opportunity for truly transforming education. The lessons learned from these experiences were:

- In provinces where public-private partnerships failed, the concept of ‘leverage’ was generally not properly understood. It even happened that organisations offering to provide funding or free services were instructed to tender to do so;
- There is inadequate understanding of the need for systemic change – of the fact that to provide education, government has to change how it managed and supported schools;
- Brutal honesty is necessary in philanthropy. If a programme is not working and partners did not meet their obligations, philanthropists have to walk away;
- There are very good opportunities for using philanthropic funding to leverage government resources and scale up successful programmes. Philanthropic organisations could achieve this but intensive work with government is necessary to build the right mindset for it;
A major hurdle often lies in the deep mistrust between senior managers and politicians, which is why brokering relationships across the spectrum is important; and

- Success comes from making a strong connection with “the will of a politician who feels this is the right thing to do.”

Mr Mapena Bok, the next panellist, concurred with the view of the previous speaker that the civil service does not understand notions of leverage and systemic change, noting also that the current policy and legislative environment in fact obstructed rather than encouraged effective public-private partnerships. His view was that a truly enabling environment needs to be created.

He stated that the Department of Social Development, where he was Director for Non-Profit Organisations, is committed to lobbying the National Treasury to create a milieu which facilitates public-private partnerships.

Mr Bok raised the issue of the massive backlogs in service provision and the need for government to partner other sectors, stating that “philanthropy is a critical partner… and the Department is … committed to ensuring there is a healthy and active sector by constantly engaging with other role-players in government to create an enabling environment.” In response to questions from the floor, Mr Bok clarified that much of the framework for strategic partnerships is in place but that there is a problem with donations, which do not fall within the ambit of public-private partnerships. If donations were so classified, matching funding from government would be leveraged more easily.

The last panellist, Ms Nobayeni Dladla, reiterated previous speakers’ observations about the importance of engaging with the National Treasury in using philanthropic resources to leverage funding from national government. Like Mr Harrison, she emphasised the critical need also to engage at the implementing level of the province: “You need to run the corridor. You need to run it from Treasury into line function into provinces.” In Ms Dladla’s view, a broad-based network is crucial: “You have to know from stage one to the last stage who the critical players are and be able to line them up along the way in a two-year or three-year cycle.” Knowing how to frame the way in which one builds leverage, and the sequence in which different players are to be approached (ie. who could be used to leverage whom), is also important.

Lastly, according to Ms Dladla there is little point in getting the corridors on board – Treasury, Ministers, Director Generals, Provincial Director Generals – without building alliances with the people who actually process paperwork. They could play a decisive role and, without their support, partnerships with government are unlikely to succeed.
Our World, Our Responsibility

Donor Conference 2010

Summary Report

The Facilitator, Ms Alice Brown, introduced the session’s objective to explore the ways in which five different donors operated in South Africa. Each speaker was to address issues such as his or her organisation’s grantmaking priorities, mode of operation, successes, challenges, and factors which have affected implementation and achievement of programme objectives.

A major barrier to successful public-private partnerships is that government departments work in silos. These silos need to be dealt with before a worthwhile partnership can be forged with government. How do grantmakers and civil society break through the silos for partnerships to happen?

A Point to Ponder

Quotable Quotes

“I try and stay away as far as humanly possible from anything resembling a public-private partnership. It is cumbersome, it is over-legislated. It has its place, certainly for mega-projects like our re-build of Tygerberg Hospital. It has its space and that also then obliges a contribution from National Treasury. But as for the rest, when we speak of partnerships...my mandate and my instruction is to find the one way that we can make it happen, as opposed to the fifteen ways that legislation will try and stop us.”

AMANDA BRINKMANN – WESTERN CAPE GOVERNMENT

Panel Discussion:
The South African Grantmaking Experience – The State of Giving and Non-Profits in South Africa

Facilitator: ALICE BROWN, THE FORD FOUNDATION
Panellists: CAITLIN BARON, THE MICHAEL AND SUSAN DELL FOUNDATION
GAIL CAMPBELL, THE ZENEX FOUNDATION
MARGARET KUSAMBIZA, EASTERN CAPE NGO COALITION
EUNICE MALULEKE, THE MTN FOUNDATION

The Facilitator, Ms Alice Brown, introduced the session’s objective to explore the ways in which five different donors operated in South Africa. Each speaker was to address issues such as his or her organisation’s grantmaking priorities, mode of operation, successes, challenges, and factors which have affected implementation and achievement of programme objectives.
The first panellist, Ms Margaret Kusambiza, spoke about the experience of the Eastern Cape NGO Coalition, which decided to move into philanthropy and grantmaking upon the request of its members and because the Premier’s Office asked it to administer the Eastern Cape Poverty Alleviation Fund. The coalition had played this role since 2005. It assessed projects, managed the fund and undertook project monitoring and evaluation. Lessons learned thus far have included:

- The relationship between donor and beneficiary was key to the success of a project. Appreciating and respecting beneficiary organisations, and creating a relationship of trust with them, were paramount;
- It was worth investing a great deal in project planning and stakeholder mobilisation at the outset. Ensuring that local government officials and businesses, for example, were on board made a massive difference to impact and sustainability. It also helped to leverage further support of differing kinds, financial and otherwise. All who were to be part of the implementation process in some way should sign a Memorandum of Understanding;
- Encouraging organisations to undertake self-assessments, and if necessary providing the tools for them to do so, were important;
- Flexibility and understanding, and providing technical advice and assistance with report-writing and monitoring and evaluation, were vital to success; and
- Long-term support was more desirable and apt to lead to sustainable impacts. Short-term and medium-term funding (six months to three years) was more risky and less likely to have high impact sustainable outcomes.

Ms Eunice Maluleke of the MTN Foundation, the only corporate donor on the panel, stressed that the impact of major donor funding in South Africa is often lost due to a lack of coordination between donors. Corporate Social Investment (CSI) in most companies has the mandate first, of adding value for all concerned, including the company, beneficiaries, and government; and second, of ensuring that the company is viewed as a good corporate citizen in ways that ultimately increase brand recognition, attracts good employees and improves the bottom-line. But in Ms Maluleke’s view, the question needs to be asked: what impact does CSI register on the ground and who dictates the agenda? According to her, the agenda is too often set by the donor and frequently fails to articulate with the existing strategies of communities on the ground. A further problem, she said, is that the approach of local donors tends to be piecemeal and short-term. For real impact to be felt, donors need to be better focused, committed for the long haul, and part of a broader co-ordinated long-term grantmaker strategy. As Ms Maluleke put it, “there is no integrated planning, no integrated implementation of programmes, and as a result it is difficult...to monitor, evaluate and check impact.”

Ms Gail Campbell, of the Zenex Foundation, then also addressed the matter of whose agenda is pursued, alongside several other issues. Although her organisation was mindful of government priorities, she said, it fully acknowledges its power as a donor and

Ensuring local government officials and businesses are on board makes a massive difference to impact and sustainability. It also helps to leverage further support of differing kinds.

Long-term support is more apt to lead to sustainable impacts. Short-term and medium-term funding (six months to three years) is less likely to have high impact sustainable outcomes.

The agenda is too often set by the donor and frequently fails to articulate with the existing strategies of communities on the ground.
admits upfront that it sets agendas. In fact, this was a conscious transition made by the Zenex Foundation over the last five or so years during which it had moved more into defining programmes and actively identifying implementing partners rather than just doing grantmaking via calls for proposals. In so doing, it patently had to set agendas. A second issue addressed by Ms Campbell related to impact: are donors who are active in the education sector actually doing systemic and sustainable work? Research in fact showed that education interventions in this country are seldom, if ever, replicated. This suggested, said Ms Campbell, that there is a lot of talk about things like ‘systemic’ change and ‘sustainable’ interventions but actually, when it comes down to it, very little in the way of sustainable systemic change is achieved by donor-funded work in the primary and secondary education sectors. Ms Campbell briefly outlined the following four aspects of the approach of the Zenex Foundation:

- It is highly interventionist, with Programme Managers who work in the field alongside NGO beneficiaries;
- A major emphasis is placed on evaluation. This has rendered rich and useful information about critical success factors but is also very intrusive for beneficiary organisations;
- A fair proportion of the budget is set aside for capacity-building within the community, civil society, and the public sector; and
- The Foundation operates with an ethos of partnership, ranging from simple information-sharing all the way through to funding partnerships. Relationship-building is essential to the kind of partnerships in which the Foundation engages.

Ms Caitlin Baron stressed that a basic principle of the Michael and Susan Dell Foundation, of which she is the South African representative, is that grantmaking should take place through a local presence. According to Ms Baron, the Foundation has three offices around the world and grantmaking is tightly concentrated in those geographic regions. Focus or programme areas in each region are defined very much in a bottom-up fashion through an intimate understanding of the socio-economic needs of the region. In South Africa the focus is presently limited to high school and tertiary education. As there has been an enormous amount of highly creative work in this sphere over the last 15 or so years, the Foundation has come to this area with humility alongside grand ambition. Important aspects of the Foundation’s approach to this work are:

- Close interaction with prospective beneficiaries in proposal development;
- A high level of involvement in working side-by-side with beneficiary organisations;
- Eagerness to identify and work with thoughtful collaborators in the sector, such as other donors;
- Use of external evaluations of their projects, which helps the Foundation to be accountable and face up to hard questions; and
- Leadership by living benefactors who are keenly interested in every grant that is made.

Ms Alice Brown of the Ford Foundation’s South African office provided an overview of Ford’s operations globally and considered some of the key issues that have affected the organisation’s ability to implement its objectives. On the one hand, Ford has had the capacity to work nationally, regionally and
at an intermediary level with a range of organisations addressing systemic problems of poverty, inequality and violations of rights. It works with groups that conducted applied research, policy analysis and capacity building and also supports groups working on advocacy and public interest law and litigation. Among the limitations of Ford's approach has been its inability – for institutional and administrative compliancy reasons – to fund CBOs directly. The very significant role of CBOs is understood but, like some other large grantmaking organisations, Ford has not had the infrastructure to administer grantmaking at real grassroots levels.

One means of addressing this in South Africa, said Ms Brown, had been to join the Multi-Agency Grantmaking Initiative, otherwise known as MAGI, a partnership between Ford and several other major international donors. The objective of MAGI is to support and promote a stronger and more sustainable CBO sector by serving as a responsive mechanism for grantmaking support, capacity building, the brokering of services, partnership building and CBO monitoring and evaluation. In addition, Ford's South African grantmaking programme was involved in a partnership called the Joint Gender Fund which was a collaborative donor fund that made re-grants to innovative projects at the intersections of gender-based violence, HIV/AIDS and social and economic empowerment.

MAGI and the Joint Gender Fund are two examples, said Ms Brown, of how larger donors – who may not have had the ability to work with groups on the ground – have developed models to get funding to CBOs whilst remaining accountable and compliant with the requirements of their senior management and boards.

On the matter of who sets the goals and agendas, Ms Brown stated that civil society organisations could sometimes be rather precious about this issue – which was understandable – but need to recognise that donor organisations are also accountable, also have to be transparent, and also have to justify their actions via mechanisms and regulations in the countries in which they are incorporated. The agency of both donors and civil society organisations has to be recognised. While there would never be a perfect overlap, what is required is as large an intersection between the two as possible.
Points to Ponder

Issues raised during discussion include:

• At the levels of monitoring, evaluation and reporting, there was more room for donors to collaborate so that a single organisation with four or five donors would not have to write five different reports, host five different evaluators and adhere to five different monitoring or evaluation frameworks.

• Thought might be given to introducing mechanisms for centralised grant applications, shared reporting systems, and common monitoring and evaluation through some kind of centralised grantmaking body. Some participants believed that, in practice, this would be unworkable owing to the differing requirements of donor governing boards.

• Monitoring and evaluation should be properly funded. Organisations should not be expected to do it as an add-on or it will not be done properly.

Donors should collaborate so a single organisation does not have to write five different reports, host five different evaluators and adhere to five different monitoring or evaluation frameworks.

Quotable Quotes

“Perhaps most importantly, we need to be accountable to the issues at large. Why are we doing this work? Many of us, most of us, I would hope all of us, are doing this work because we believe passionately and strongly in social justice. We want to reach people who are most marginalised and most vulnerable and we want to protect their rights and improve, or help protect their rights and help improve, the conditions in which they live. We need to be accountable to those causes and we need to be accountable to the greater good. So we all need to keep that in mind as we beat our chests about independence or autonomy and accountability.”

ALICE BROWN – FORD FOUNDATION

“There are some really interesting alternative models...[and]...one of our problems is that, if we have only one kind of foundation in mind, you may end up with a very limited sense of ways of working and there are alternatives – and I would urge people in South Africa to look at some of the European foundations and the way they work because the diversity is there and the differences are there.”

GERRY SALOLE – TRUSTAFRICA AND THE EUROPEAN FOUNDATION CENTRE
Mr Rick Menell, a member of the scenario-building team involved in development of the Dinokeng Scenarios, proposed that this session should be a brainstorming exercise about where South Africa might be in ten, 15, and 20 years to come and the role philanthropy could play in helping it to get there. By way of background, he outlined the purpose and content of the Dinokeng Scenarios (see related box).

The Dinokeng Scenario Team – a selection of 40 South Africans from across all racial, economic, political, academic, religious, gender and age constituencies – came together to take stock of where South Africa was 15 years after the advent of democracy and to consider possible futures for the nation. According to the Dinokeng Team, South Africa’s honeymoon was over. An enormous amount had been achieved since 1994 but mistakes had been made along the way and the country and its citizens had failed to come to terms with the realities of running a modern democratic state: leadership was poor across most sectors, the state was weak and populated by increasing numbers of self-interested politicians and bureaucrats, and the citizenry and civil society had either been co-opted by the state or were increasingly disengaged from political processes. This led the Dinokeng Team to ask several very fundamental questions:

- How could South Africans address the most critical challenges before they became time bombs that might destroy the nation’s accomplishments?
- What could each South African do to help build a future that lives up to the promise of 1994?

In response, the team developed three scenarios which offered possible ways in which this question might be answered; three possible routes we might travel to create a future for South Africa. Having outlined the scenarios – which he stressed were not predictions but constellations of challenges; routes South Africa might follow depending on what choices were made in responding to the challenges – Mr Menell then posed a set of questions about the role of philanthropists in each of these scenarios:

- Should philanthropists promote the work of social activists who organise at grassroots level? Is this too overtly political and a risk to other activities?
- Should philanthropists collaborate more with one another?
- Should philanthropists use the Dinokeng Scenarios or similar mechanisms to develop a common agenda and to guide a collective, more integrated, and possibly more activist course of action?
- Or should philanthropists simply continue with their traditional work?

Should philanthropists be promoting the work of social activists? Is this too overtly political?
The Dinokeng Scenarios

- **Walk Apart:** The *Walk Apart* scenario is basically ‘more of the same’ with a ruling clique controlling a dominant party which ends up paying lip-service to the commitments of 1994 and is really more concerned about preserving its own interests and privileges than delivering the basic quality of life changes promised to society. The outcome is ultimately a backlash by society against an increasingly negligent, defiant and corrupt state, which responds belligerently and brutally so unleashing a spiral of resistance and repression. The message of this scenario is that if we eschew addressing the critical challenges of the moment – if we fail to mobilise as citizens and engage with government – our society will disintegrate and decline.

- **Walk Behind:** The second scenario, dubbed the *Walk Behind* scenario, anticipates an increasingly directive state which is enabled and emboldened by a mute and largely ineffective civil society. Despite its power, the state alone does not have the wherewithal to address critical challenges effectively and severe strain is placed on its capacity and resources. In the worst case, the state overspends and has no choice but to borrow from multi-lateral financial agencies, with the result that South Africa loses the ability to direct its own social spending agenda. The message here is that state-led development will fail if the state does not have adequate capacity for implementation. If the state is overly interventionist and dominates all the major sectors, it will crowd out innovation and initiative by business and civil society and cultivate a complacent and dependent citizenry.

- **Walk Together:** In the third scenario, called *Walk Together*, the state becomes more enabling and accommodating, listening to critical voices from across the social, economic, and political spectrum, consulting across diverse constituencies, and sharing its authority in the public and national long-term interest. The public is strongly engaged with government, both holding it to account for service delivery and progress with development and also sharing responsibility for delivery and progress. The scenario is not without difficulty; the road is a rocky one with shifting partnerships and allegiances and diversions towards other scenarios. The message of this scenario is that South Africa’s critical challenges can be addressed effectively only if the general public, the private sector, labour, civil society and all other sectors engage actively and vigorously with the state about service delivery, policy reform and accountable government. In addition, the Walk Together scenario will only succeed if:
  - Citizens and civil society re-engage with the state and political processes;
  - The essential capacities of the state are strengthened; and
  - Leaders in all sectors cast aside sectarian self-interest and put their weight behind building the nation.

---

1. This summary of Menell’s presentation also draws on the Dinokeng Scenarios website at http://www.dinokengscenarios.co.za/scen_overview.php.
Mark Heywood addressed the possibility of the third scenario, *Walking Together*, and the place of philanthropy in edging South Africa along this particular path. In essence, Heywood's case was that, even if the role were to be labelled political, philanthropy should ideally have a direct and purposive engagement with civil society. As Mr Heywood explained: “I think that's not something you need to apologise for. Charity is based on pity and we’re not talking about charity. We’re talking about philanthropy, which is much more something that is based on purpose and intended direction and a vision of society.”

In Mr Heywood's view, *Walking Together* required vision and an understanding of context, particularly the context created by South Africa's Constitution. What many failed to recognise, according to Mr Heywood, was that the Constitution envisaged an activist society: “Effective government depends on effective civil society and the Constitution envisages a peaceful contest of ideas in order to achieve the best possible outcomes.” One of our key challenges of the moment, then, is how we change culture: what are we to do to cultivate an empowered society that could demand the type of accountability required to avoid the privileged and the elite galloping away from everyone else in the *Walk Apart* and *Walk Behind* scenarios?

The key to this, said Mr Heywood, is civil society. As civil society is so diverse, the starting point in mobilising it to play the part it should is to understand better the sector – to “try to find the centre of civil society”. What are the pillars of civil society upon which all agree? What is common in civil society between those involved in delivery, those involved in training, and those involved in advocacy? Above all, philanthropists should remain mindful of what they are investing in when they support civil society. What scenario are we investing in when we provide a grant to a particular NGO or CBO? For instance, providing financial resources to the Treatment Action Campaign (TAC) was not just an investment in antiretroviral treatment for people living with HIV and AIDS. It was at once investment in an organisation which routinely used the Constitution as a reference point to test freedom and access to rights; an organisation that forced the government to take a stand on issues such as separation of state and party, executive and cabinet. Social investment in the TAC and similar organisations, therefore, was an investment in strengthening the very pillars of democracy in this country.

In response Mr Menell noted that, in his experience, it is largely the bilateral funding agencies which are prepared to invest in overtly activist organisations of this kind. With a very few exceptions, trusts and foundations eschew organisations at this end of the spectrum, yet it is precisely these organisations – those which are engaging with, questioning, contesting, and challenging vigorously the state – which are helping to steer South Africa along the path of *Walk Together*. Traditional philanthropy should be challenged to re-examine its priorities. If philanthropists were to invest in organisations with activist social justice agendas and in so doing help to create a society where there is accountability and a culture of community engagement and respect, then the chances of South Africa following the path of *Walk Together*, rather than *Walk Apart* or *Walk Behind*, would be so much greater.
Following Mr Menell’s comment about the breadth of civil society, Ms Sibongile Mkhabela began by posing the question of what actually constitutes civil society, suggesting that a separate conference is required to delve more deeply into the nature of this sector. She noted that civil society in South Africa had become progressively more focused on service delivery and capacity-building, and much less on activism, warning that in such circumstances there is a danger of losing sight of, and failing to engage with, the political environment in which delivery and training occur.

When philanthropists arrive they generally find existing responses of various kinds. They then impose the label “CBO” or “NGO” and insist on plans, capacity building and adherence to some or other civil society model to bring the indigenous responses into line with their thinking.

Having recently returned from the November 2010 Pan African Congress of Grantmaking Institutions in Nairobi, Ms Mkhabela made several points about the approach taken by philanthropists to African civil society organisations. First, philanthropists tend to impose capacity building upon their grantees as part of the ‘grantee package’. Whilst useful in some respects, this has the effect of “communities having to be perpetual students of their own issues”; they are made to be students of indigenous problems, ideas, activities, practices, and institutions which were going on long before the philanthropist arrived and would continue long after he or she has gone. Second, when philanthropists arrive they generally find existing responses of various kinds; communities have developed ways of responding to their own issues. It is the philanthropist who then imposes the label “CBO” or “NGO” and insists on organisational development plans, capacity building and adherence to some or other civil society model to bring these indigenous responses into line with the way the philanthropist thinks they should be. As Mkhabela put it: “The fact of the matter is that the relationships and what happens on the ground are much more complex than the brief I bring, and often the formats that I bring, that they must fit into. Now often they don’t fit into those things; they are responding to their own situations.” Third, it needs to be recognised that philanthropic agendas are often individually rather than collectively defined: somebody with money becomes worried about a particular subject and decides to direct resources towards it. And then everyone’s brief has to change because of individual whim.

According to Ms Mkhabela, these were some of the issues addressed at the Pan African Congress. The conclusion at which the delegates to the Congress arrived was something of a conundrum. They acknowledged that democracy and long-term thinking did not go hand-in-hand because democracy works in three-year or five-year blocks. Yet the problems of Africa needed to be thought through and addressed in the very long term over 20, 30 or even 50 years. Traditionally, philanthropists have slotted into the short-term mode of operating alongside democracy, demanding that issues be addressed in three-year or at most five-year cycles. Where philanthropy really could make a contribution, therefore, is by injecting resources into long-term planning and programmes which feeds into these really long-term plans.

In conclusion, Ms Mkhabela stressed that philanthropists have to agree a common set of values and a common agenda for transformation. They also need to have the humility to recognise that the best solutions lie with those on the ground. Any capacity building activities should be designed to build stronger communities based on their own solutions and their existing values.
The last panellist, Mr Doron Isaacs, set out to provide a sense of the value of civil society and its role by considering examples of organisations in action. Noting the appalling state of primary and secondary education throughout South Africa, but particularly in rural areas and black township schools, he recalled how his NGO had held a photographic exhibition of obstacles to education taken by children themselves. One of these photographs – a picture of a school in Khayelitsha which had approximately 500 broken windows – was selected as the locus of a campaign to begin ‘fixing’ education in the Western Cape. All learners in that part of Khayelitsha, no matter what school they went to, took part in the campaign, which involved writing letters, making and putting up posters, calling public meetings, making press statements, and so on. In the end, the Minister for Education in the Western Cape attended a meeting at which he announced that, instead of providing the R7,000 required to fix the windows, his department would provide R700 000 to fix the entire school. The community emerged from this with an enormous sense of power. Numerous other examples could be provided but the essential point was that civil society has a critical role to play in energising and mobilising the citizenry and in helping it to re-claim the political voice and leverage which has progressively slipped away.

Question & Answer

Question: “Are we as local donors connecting to the political side? How do we redefine advocacy and how do we as local donors come in to support this part of the work so that we walk out here proudly, so that it’s not just the international donors alone who fund that part of the work?”

Heywood: “Advocacy is not a handful of individuals shouting from the rooftops, however right those people may be. Advocacy, I believe, is about effective community education, community mobilisation and community empowerment around particular objectives. Now for us, the touchstone of effective advocacy is the Constitution. And I think that as philanthropists and donors, nobody has to apologise for seeking to advance the Constitution. As individual philanthropists you may be isolated if you support an Equal Education or a Treatment Action Campaign (TAC) because Equal Education has been and will be unpopular, just as TAC has been and will be unpopular. But if donors could forge some sort of consensus about how and why they support advocacy...I think you would be in a stronger position. Advocacy cannot help but be political.”
Ms Anna Vayanos of the BoE Private Clients Philanthropy Office presented on tax-efficient giving and principles for the investment of foundation endowments. The presentation provided a summary of the tax advantages available to donors and foundations and the principles of the investment of a foundation’s funds to facilitate long-term giving objectives. The difference and requirements for the various approvals and registrations were summarised as well as their advantages for the foundation itself as well as for its donors. Ms Vayanos pointed out that whilst there are available tax advantages to making donations directly to organisations that have the necessary approvals, there would be further tax savings if a donor established a charitable foundation through which to carry on his/her philanthropic endeavours. From an investment perspective, the removal of restrictions on investment for approved Public Benefit Organisations was discussed as well as the importance and impact of the fiduciary duties of trustees. Following on from this, Ms Vayanos advised on the importance of ensuring that the capital of a foundation remains at least current with inflation to fulfil the foundation’s giving objectives, particularly for one intended to be of long duration. This would necessarily involve some exposure to asset classes which have some degree of risk attached to them but this should be to an appropriate extent. She urged that all foundation trustees devise a formal investment policy for the foundation that would enable the foundation to fulfil its giving objectives whilst also fulfilling the trustees’ fiduciary duties.

This session presented the findings of two research projects undertaken on the challenges of accessing funding from the National Development Association (NDA) and National Lotteries Board (NLB). One project was undertaken by the Coalition on Civil Society Resource Mobilisation, the other by South Development Consultancy on behalf of four partner organisations in the Western Cape who collectively form the Funding Practice Alliance.
According to Ms Saranel Benjamin, the purpose of the Funding Practice Alliance project was to investigate the funding practices of the NDA and the distribution by the NLB of monies held by the National Lotteries Development Trust Fund (NLDTF) and, in tandem, to document civil society organisations’ experiences of applying to, and accessing funding from, these two bodies.

According to the study, a lack of accountability had taken root at the NDA, rendering it impossible to undertake a thorough assessment of the organisation and its funding practices. The processes whereby board members were appointed were unclear, though interviews with some ex-board members suggested that many appointments had been political, and there had been a succession of poor administrators at the helm of the organisation. The European Union froze grants to the NDA when R50 million of its funds was found unused in an NDA bank account. No complete list of beneficiaries had ever been made public in the annual reports of the NDA, nor were the accounts of the organisation available for scrutiny or interrogation. The strategic and business plans were also not publicly available; the application process was centralised and thus very distant from grassroots organisations spread around the provinces; funding decisions lacked transparency; there was no process of appeal; and large amounts of money were routinely not distributed. In short, the picture which emerged was one of a highly dysfunctional organisation which was failing dismally in its mandate to act as a bridge between the state and civil society to contribute towards the eradication of poverty and its causes. In the meantime, NGOs and CBOs were closing their doors daily.

The study also revealed deep dissatisfaction on the part of charities, non-profits and other civil society organisations with the NLB and the NLDTF. Actual decisions about fund disbursement were made by a series of sectoral Distributing Agencies (DAs) made up of practitioners and others from within particular fields. Again, the study demonstrated that the grantmaking process operated by the DAs, which was developed by the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) when establishing the Lotteries, was deeply flawed. There were no meetings with the DTI Minister to account for the distribution of lotteries funding, even though he had formal oversight, indicating a very serious lack of good governance. NGOs and CBOs claimed that the grant application and management system was cumbersome, slow, inefficient and inept, with onerous documentation requirements (particularly for CBOs and some NGOs with little experience of dealing with bureaucracy) and some payments took months, and even years, to be made. Like the NDA, most members of the board appeared to be political appointees and among them had very limited experience of grantmaking or the non-profit sector.

Mr David Barnard reported that the Coalition on Civil Society Resource Mobilisation’s project took place over a six-month period during 2010, during which the Coalition hosted at least one meeting of civil society organisations in each province. Approximately 300 organisations thus participated in the process. The objectives of the meetings were primarily fourfold: to make organisations aware of the aim of the Coalition to promote a flow of resources to the civil society sector; to explain the NLB and NDA processes and difficulties so that organisations at least had some understanding of their positions vis-à-vis these funding bodies; to gather information about organisations’ experiences of the funding practices of the...
NDA and the NLB; and to enquire about other related funding issues experienced by NGOs and CBOs around the country. The findings of this work in respect of the NDA and NLB echoed those of the study by the Funding Practice Alliance. Most hard-hitting was the decimation of civil society which had resulted from the administrative incompetence of government departments and these two agencies. Some of the country’s oldest and most valuable NGOs had closed their doors as a consequence. Also striking was the lack of options – or at least the perceived lack of options – for many organisations in search of any alternative sources of support.

The Lotteries grant application and management system is cumbersome, slow, inefficient and inept, with onerous documentation requirements. Some payments take months and even years to be made...

How do we ensure that our civil society partners have the capacity to be sustainable? Should we be investing in capacity building?

PRESENTERS: VUYISWA SIDZUMO, CHARLES STEWART MOTT FOUNDATION
FRAN BARRETT, THE ATLANTIC PHILANTHROPIES
TRACEY HENRY, TSHIKULULU SOCIAL INVESTMENTS

Ms Fran Barrett, Director of Capacity Building at The Atlantic Philanthropies, related how Atlantic was focusing specifically on capacity building for resource development in the context of its spend-down. In considering how to develop and pursue their brief, Barrett and her colleagues were committed to remaining mindful of several considerations:

- When developing a capacity building intervention within an organisation, care should be taken to identify the problem or need correctly. What could manifest as lack of capacity might well actually be something quite different. For example, lack of skills may not be hindering an organisation as much as a disjuncture between mission and practice: does the organisation actually know how to do what it is trying to do?
- A desire for capacity building should not be assumed. Did an organisation and its leadership want to undergo capacity building processes or were they happy as they were?
- A further consideration was time. Did those in the organisation have time to engage in capacity building without affecting adversely their implementation and delivery? What kinds of capacity building are best suited to the particular operating context of an organisation?

Capacity building should not automatically be associated with some kind of external agent, such as a consultant. Internal capacity building could be a possible solution.

There is a distinction between lack of capacity and shortage of staff. Is an organisation being hindered simply because it does not have staff, or are there gaps in skills and expertise which spread across the organisation?
The Atlantic Philanthropies was considering two different models, both of which are based on a triangulated model for capacity building where strategic advice sits along one side of the triangle, resources along the second, and leadership along the third. Of these three, leadership is looming very large because strong organisations require strong leaders. One of the models was a scholarship approach, where the leader spends time at an agreed institution or set of institutions. The other, which may be preferable, was an approach which aims to build a leadership cohort within an organisation, so avoiding situations where success and failure rests on the presence of one individual.

While leadership is a major factor in Atlantic’s thinking about capacity building, it is important to remain respectful of the leadership and avoid thinking that outside experts could whip organisations into shape. There had to be an acknowledgement that the real knowledge-base lies within the organisation. By imposing foreign models, what was in fact a very successful organisation could be made to look like a very unsuccessful one. Philanthropists with an interest in capacity building need to find ways of assessing and valuing organisational efficiency in local and internal terms rather than terms imported from elsewhere.

Barrett concluded by revisiting the issue of evaluation, metrics, performance management and the like – that is, of funders requiring measurable results – which had been raised in several sessions of the conference. Reiterating another delegate’s comment that what is required are “trusting” relationships between grantmakers and grantholders, she cited a writer “who says that if someone asks you to measure something, they’re expressing doubt. And every time we ask for metrics as funders, I think we’re conveying to the grantee that we’re expressing doubt as to whether or not they’re really getting anything done.”

Beginning with the observation that the concept of capacity building is sometimes used rather glibly as a seemingly easy intervention and a cost-effective way to invest in communities without real financial commitment, Ms Tracey Henry of Tshikululu Investments noted that capacity building is a complex process which requires careful consideration by donors: it could be extremely damaging if poorly delivered or haphazard, or it could be extremely worthwhile if targeted properly and executed well. Ms Henry defined the essence of capacity building as “actions that improve or enhance effectiveness and support the achievement or mission and strategic objectives,” and believed that enhancing sustainability should be the key focus of any capacity building activity. This did not mean that capacity building was about training an organisation to become self-sustaining, as was often thought. “Rather sustainability should focus on the ability to consistently, continuously and effectively raise, manage and deploy funds in order to implement programmes effectively and achieve set goals which ultimately will benefit communities.

By imposing foreign models, what is in fact a very successful organisation can be made to look like a very unsuccessful one.

Capacity building is not about training an organisation to become self-sustaining. Rather sustainability focuses on the ability to consistently, continuously and effectively raise, manage and deploy funds in order to implement programmes effectively and achieve set goals which ultimately benefit stakeholders.

Although some donors dislike supporting capacity building, there is a direct link between organisational capacity building and social impact.
in which they operate.” Very important, noted Ms Henry, is that capacity building should ideally complement, not replace, programmatic funding or the organisation could begin to exist for capacity building rather than core purpose.

The actual process of capacity building was time-consuming, required enormous commitment, and there were no silver bullets, said Ms Henry. Most importantly, “leadership must build the capacity to build capacity by freeing up management time and organisational resources.” According to Ms Henry, many donors unfortunately view capacity building as a support function and dislike supporting it in attempting to keep administrative costs low. Donors need to reflect carefully on this. Yet there is a direct link, she said, between organisational capacity building and social impact. One mitigating factor is the high staff turnover within NGOs, which is problematic if mobile staff are those who have benefitted from capacity building. For this reason, said Ms Henry, “it is...critical that any organisational or capacity building interventions focus on whole organisational development, including succession planning, talent management, learning, and development retention strategies.” In conclusion, Ms Henry emphasised that philanthropists should definitely be in the business of funding capacity building but should do so only if they are absolutely clear about both what is achievable and what the limitations are.

Panel Discussion:
Key Issues in the Relationship Between Grantmakers and Beneficiary Organisations

FACILITATOR: SHELAGH GASTROW, INYATHELO
PANELLISTS: AMANDA BLOCH, CHILDREN’S HOSPITAL TRUST
JANET LOVE, LEGAL RESOURCES CENTRE
TEBOHO MAHUMA, IMPALA BAFOKENG TRUST
MOIPANE BODA-RAMATLO, NELSON MANDELA CHILDREN’S FUND

This panel aimed to explore:
• Contextual factors that affect relationships between grantmakers and grantees;
• Issues of due diligence and accountability;
• How to build meaningful partnerships with grantees; and
• Other matters which impact the quality of grantmaker-grantee relations.

Accountability is not singular and linear. Boards look after the interests of NPOs but are equally accountable to donors, beneficiaries and the general public. These complexities are often not fully appreciated by donors.

Instead of providing full-length presentations, panellists were requested to identify a small number of key issues they believe affect the relationship between the philanthropic sector and civil society.

The Facilitator, Ms Shelagh Gastrow, identified three issues. First, philanthropy appears to be shifting from an art to a science. Some are resisting this shift, others are embracing it. Second, Ms Gastrow
noted that the boundaries between donors’ responsibilities and grantees’ responsibilities are becoming blurred. Some donors now desire intensive engagement, others believe that grantees’ independence should be respected. Third, she pointed out that accountability is not singular and linear. For instance, in South Africa the Boards of registered non-profit organisations look after the interests of the organisation but are equally accountable to donors, beneficiaries and the general public. The complexities of these layers of accountability are often not fully appreciated by donors, said Ms Gastrow.

The next speaker, Ms Amanda Bloch, identified a series of factors which she believed have a significant impact on the grantmaker-grantee relationship, key among which were:

- **Relationship-building:** Philanthropists need to build relationships of mutual understanding and respect with those they support. As Bloch neatly put it: “With giving comes enormous responsibility and that responsibility does not lie with grantees alone to meet our expectations, deliverables or the outcomes that we set for them. As donors we have a responsibility to learn and understand the complexity of the circumstances and realities under which grantees operate, which are fluid, constantly changing and not always predictable”;  

- **Sound due diligence:** If conducted thoroughly at the outset, due diligence helps to eliminate disappointments later when grantees do not meet expectations. During this early stage of the engagement, the onus is on the prospective grantee to be transparent and provide an indication of the ability of the organisation to deliver reporting. Sound due diligence is thus crucial before actually cementing a relationship;  

- **Monitoring and evaluation:** Donors are sometimes inclined to set generic standards for monitoring and evaluation, often without due consideration and understanding of context. For the most part, there should be much more flexibility and adaptability built into the process;  

- **Measurement of impact:** This seems to be a growing preoccupation of some donors but, in Ms Bloch’s view, evaluating impact was a ludicrous notion in many of the contexts in which philanthropists funded, certainly in South Africa. If strategic philanthropy is to be concerned with systemic change, and if it is acknowledged that change usually involves long-term processes, how could the impact of a three-year grant possibly be measured in any meaningful way? While philanthropists could certainly measure the impact of building eight new operating theatres at a children’s hospital, the liberation movement in South Africa would probably not have been funded if ongoing support had depended upon demonstrable impact;  

- **Setting of agendas and goals:** At the same time, said Ms Bloch, grantees might need to be challenged slightly beyond their comfort zones. Goals and agendas would thus be negotiated in partnership. Donors would also be prepared to recognise that some grantees may lack the capacity...
or expertise to set realistic goals. In these cases, the partnership needs to incorporate an element of guidance and mentorship;

• **Supporting of core costs**: Many donors have an aversion to contributing to grantees’ core running costs but nevertheless still expect their own agendas to be met. According to Ms Bloch, this was unrealistic and should be reconsidered by grantmakers; and

• **Exit strategies**: Having a well-formulated and mutually negotiated exit strategy was crucial. Without a negotiated and responsibly executed exit strategy, she said, the consequences could be devastating.

The following panellist, Ms Janet Love, began with a point of departure, saying she regarded philanthropy as part of – not other than nor external to – civil society. All sectors of civil society and all forms of it – CBOs, NGOs, and philanthropic organisations – have resources of different kinds which are ultimately directed towards beneficiaries in broader society. As all occupy this space called civil society, defending it and preserving the space is clearly in the interests of philanthropy as much as other sectors of civil society.

While South Africans enjoy great support from global philanthropy, said Ms Love, donors inside the country do not seem to appreciate fully the importance of defending the democratic space and the constitutional rights which underpin it. The simple fact is that progressive donors would be less and less able to realise their mandates the more the democratic space is permitted to shrink. The obvious corollary is that, to fulfil their mandates, local donors have a duty to participate in efforts to preserve it.

In Love’s view, corporate social responsibility (CSI) initiatives were particularly ambivalent in this regard, tending to shy from supporting rights-based work and social justice advocacy. But if people did not have rights, stressed Ms Love, there would be no development. CSI officers and those above them in their organisations who determine CSI policy should thus develop a better understanding of a rights-based approach to development.

As there is a direct relation between rights and development, said Ms Love, any funding dedicated to development by CSI offices and other South African donors might ultimately be wasted if these same donors do not also invest in preserving the democratic space.

If it were recognised that grantmakers and grantees were all part of civil society, then a balance of power between grantmaker and grantee would be easier to achieve. As Ms Love put it, all have the same overarching goals and all are participants in the same overarching plan; they just bring different resources. NGOs and CBOs contribute knowledge, skills and experience while philanthropists bring funding.

Ms Love’s views were supported by the following panellist, Ms Teboho Mahuma, who reinforced the point that grantmakers and grantees are all ultimately just employees – “middle people” who serve the same ends. Both grantmakers and grantees should acknowledge that all are simply intermediaries with a job to do, and that job is to serve beneficiaries in society. Yet somewhere along the way power entered the equation. As Ms Mahuma put it, “we develop a false sense of superiority or inferiority,
depending on where we’re sitting”. In her view, the NGO sector confers too much power on the donor community and in the process compromises its own integrity.

Ms Mahuma continued to note that the most successful projects are always based on an ethos of true partnership involving all stakeholders: “It’s not about grantee and grantmaker; it’s about a partnership that includes multiple partners who do have an interest in the issue to be resolved. Once the issues are unpacked...it is easier to talk about issues of sustainability, issues of measurement, issues of accountability in such a way that it’s no longer about one policing another but about agreed measures and agreed processes for getting where we want to get to – all of us. I do not believe that...it’s all about money. When we convene our partnerships we need to recognise that some people have social capital and others have technical skills – and [not] get so focused on the power [of] people who have the purse.”

In concluding, Ms Mahuma highlighted the problem of over-promising and under-delivering. Unlike other speakers and delegates, many of whom had stated during the course of proceedings that grantees should not be overburdened by onerous monitoring, evaluation and reporting demands, her view was that grantees should indeed be placed under pressure to deliver and be accountable: “I don’t think that we should feel guilty...about pushing our grantees to deliver what they said they would do when they said they would – because if you’re not part of that, if you’re not wholly committed to that, then you shouldn’t be in that partnership.”

The core point of the last panellist, Ms Boda-Ramatlo, was that the route from original donor to ultimate beneficiary must be understood properly and the rules of engagement between the levels must be clear: if an agency in the USA provides a grant to a South African foundation for early childhood education, and the South African foundation then re-grants to a provincial NGO, which then awarded funding to a small rural CBO early childhood facility, the original grantmaker does not have rights of access to, nor any other rights over, the ultimate beneficiary. Nor, in fact, should the South African foundation have an expectation of automatic access to the beneficiary. In these circumstances, any direct contact would be mediated by those most immediately involved, in this case the provincial NGO. In short, giving from afar via various intermediaries, who are then left to do the work and develop relationships with grantees, does not entitle international donors to a sense of ownership over local projects.

Ms Boda-Ramatlo stressed a further two points. The first was that grantmakers should not live under the illusion that they make change happen. Grantmakers help to facilitate change, but the real change-makers are grantees themselves. Lastly, Ms Boda-Ramatlo reiterated a point made several times during the conference, this being that grantmakers should have the humility to support communities in what they are already doing. They should operate on the premise that communities have assets, value and worth rather than perceiving programme beneficiaries as objects or blank pages on which to impose expertise.
Session Summation

“What has come out of this is that there is a continuum, there’s not a separation around philanthropy, the non-profit sector, the communities we work with. It is a continuum – and how that continuum operates and the relationships within it are clearly very important but equal...I really appreciated the issue around the democratic space. I think this is something very unique in South Africa where, as a young democracy, that democratic space is a critical area of work. And I often speak to donors who are looking at what an organisation is delivering and I’ve said to them, the organisation has value because it exists in that space. The delivery component in many ways is secondary, because what organisations do is they’re part of building social capital and social cohesion in our society.”

SHELAGH GASTROW – INYATHELO

Discussion Groups:
Creating a Community of Best Practice

Group 1: What do we presume about non-profit governance?

RAPPORTEUR: RICHARD ROSENTHAL, RICHARD ROSENTHAL ATTORNEYS

Various deficits were identified by the group in respect of non-profit governance in South Africa. These included, for example, the absence of an easily accessible database of non-profits with all the relevant records (founding documentation, deeds, annual financial statements) such as existed in the USA (Guidestar) and the United Kingdom (the Charity Commission). As non-profit organisations sought benefit in the form of tax exemption or other benefits at the expense of the public, said Mr Rosenthal, so should they be obliged to place certain related information on record. A second deficit was the absence of something like a Non-Profit Act to define and regulate the field – an overarching statute which governed the affairs of non-profit organisations and foundations. A third highly problematic area identified was the application to the non-profit sector of non-statutory documentation, such as the King Code, which was formulated for other sectors without adequate consultation with non-profits and their beneficiaries. One suggestion made by the group was the establishment of a charity commission in the form of a statutory authority which would not be appointed by, but might have some representation from, government.
This group brought back four issues to the plenary. First, donors should recognise that monitoring and evaluation involve mutual learning. It is not a matter of the donor standing on the outside and viewing, applauding and critiquing the process. Rather, there is a continuous learning loop in which donors are as much learning participants as anyone else. Evaluation should thus be re-cast as a mutual endeavour rather than something that one party expects of another. The second point was that the language used – terms such as “measurement” and “monitoring” – engendered suspicion and anxiety among grantees. Donors need to recognise that language has a particular impact and should perhaps re-think some of the terminology which is used in the context of monitoring and evaluation. Third, the major weight placed on monitoring and evaluation and on demonstrating results could lead grantee organisations and donors alike to emphasise the positive and neglect what was not working, even at times perhaps overstating the success of their work. All players need to guard against this. Lastly, there was a feeling in the group that the “number crunchers” – those concerned with quantitative data – were winning when it came to monitoring and evaluation and that better space should to be given to, and cognisance taken of, qualitative measures.

From the perspective of trusts and foundations rather than CSI donors, the group discussed what grantmakers look for in an application. First and foremost is the relationship developed prior to the application. Has a relationship already been established between the donor and the prospective grantee or is this a cold application? Other important considerations include the existence of annual financial statements; an annual report or, failing this, some form of document recording the organisation’s activities; a list of other donors; the project or programme plans; and the annual budget being requested. With these elements in place there is a sound basis for deepening the relationship.
The group agreed that core funding is necessary and important, and that efforts should be made by the grantmaking community to increase it, with the proviso that – like programme funding – core funding should also be linked with clear objectives, results and measurables. These could be organisational rather than programmatic measures of effectiveness and performance. In order to facilitate increased support for core costs, grantmakers should probably become better educated about organisational processes and needs. They need to advocate for this among themselves, but grantees should also collectively take up the cause, perhaps through an organisation like Inyathelo.

According to Mr Shearer, the group agreed that “safe” partnerships are generally the order of the day but the prevailing view was also that this should change. More of an emphasis on seeking innovative partners, finding new ways of doing things, and exploring different kinds of results is necessary. The feeling was that a risk-taking culture would give rise to new and different models and ways of doing things. In addition, the failures that would inevitably occur would provide valuable lessons.

This group concluded that philanthropists should think much more broadly than just in terms of exit strategies. In fact, the consensus was that what is more influential is how grantmakers enter rather than...
how they exit. It is also important, said Dr Salole, to distinguish between planned exits and exits that happen under other circumstances. In addition, the group agreed that there should be some kind of infrastructure and low-level rules about grantmaker practice in South Africa, including entry and exit conventions, which could be applied to both local and international grantmakers.

An administrative infrastructure should preside over low-level rules governing grantmaking practice in South Africa

Dialogue:
A Way Forward for Local and International Grantmakers

FACILITATOR: THANDO MHLAMBISO, E2
PANELLISTS: CHRIS MKHIZE, UTHUNGULU COMMUNITY FOUNDATION
JOANNE HARDING, SOCIAL CHANGE ASSISTANCE TRUST (SCAT)
KATHY ACKERMAN-ROBINS, ACKERMAN FAMILY FOUNDATION
BERNADETTE MOFFAT, THE ELMA PHILANTHROPIC SERVICES (AFRICA) PTY LTD

The Facilitator, Mr Thando Mhlambiso, began by identifying three issues which, in his view, might have a bearing on how cooperation between grantmakers could be configured in the theatre of South African philanthropy. First, he questioned the usefulness of the distinction between foreign and local grantmakers. Might there not be more meaningful differentiators, such as the distinction between the ‘purists’ who viewed philanthropy as a way of giving back and the ‘activists’ who wanted to support social, economic and political change? In this case, the question to be asked was whether it might not be most appropriate for the purist philanthropists and the activist philanthropists to work as separate interests groups: should the local and foreign purists seek to form one alliance or set of alliances, and the local and foreign activists seek to form another? The second issue which Mr Mhlambiso called on the gathering to address was whether informal contact and collaboration would suffice or, alternatively, whether a formal structure or formal structures should be established? Lastly, he asked delegates to consider whether there was an independent champion who might be called upon to take the process forward.

After reiterating several of the strong themes which permeated earlier sessions of the conference, Mr Chris Mkhize responded to the matter, raised by Mr Mhlambiso, of strategies for moving ahead with the creation of structures to enable collaboration between grantmakers. He suggested the establishment of a national office to coordinate the non-profit sector. This, he believed, would provide an extremely powerful voice that would be heard and appreciated by the public and private sectors, as well as the international community.

Are there more meaningful differentiators than local and foreign philanthropists? Is there instead a case for alliances between ‘purist’ philanthropists on the one hand, and ‘activist’ philanthropists on the other?

Is there wisdom in establishing a national statutory body, separate from government, to coordinate the non-profit sector?
Another panellist, Ms Joanne Harding, related an anecdote about the challenges posed by an extremely effective yet administratively underdeveloped grassroots organisation in the deep rural Eastern Cape to demonstrate that, among other things, there probably is not one set of grantmaking practices that would work for everybody. In Harding’s view, the dialogues that should happen would be around how donors enter the grantmaking space more creatively; how they might do so in ways that would not challenge civil society organisations to question their own value, would not intimidate, and would not impose solutions. She suggested that the Funding Practice Alliance, a small group of non-profit organisations in the Western Cape who had established a forum for scrutinising funding practices in South Africa, might take responsibility for moving the agenda forward. Finally, Harding noted that it should not just be a matter for the donor community to decide how to move forward. NGOs need to be brought into the dialogue so that donors and other civil society organisations can jointly participate in creating the new space in which they operate together.

Beginning by addressing the question of what is to be gained from working together, Ms Bernadette Moffat noted that the facility to leverage one another’s intellectual capacity, practice and experience would be a tremendous boon to philanthropists working in the same theatre of operations. Her belief was that efforts certainly should be made to collaborate, but she warned that partnering other donors is extremely difficult in practice, both because there is an arrogance about the philanthropic world which makes partnerships difficult, and because governing boards fail to understand the need for flexibility to make partnerships work. She stressed that working together should be approached as a learning experience. On the question of whether donors can work effectively with government, Moffat believed there is little choice in the matter, noting that “somehow it has to be done”.

**Donors must enter the grantmaking space more creatively – in ways that do not challenge civil society organisations to question their own value, do not intimidate, and do not impose solutions**

**Point of View**

“If we start thinking of philanthropy as a social agent as opposed to social engineering, because those are different things, then we need to also think about the kind of organisational and institutional arrangements that are necessary in order to make that work a lot more effectively...What would be useful would be for Inyathelo to isolate some of the main themes...and then to invite local players – and this is not saying there’s no place for international organisations but it’s really about ownership – who express an interest to start organising, convening...so that something really organic begins to take shape....But it has to be something that’s locally driven...and that local people are prepared to put some resources behind.”

**UNKNOWN – FROM THE FLOOR**
In his closing remarks, Mr Naidoo underlined the importance of systemic change and the need for philanthropists and civil society to find ways of working in collaboration with the state and the private sector to achieve such change: “At the end of the day you want systemic changes – and systemic change means you can’t just do it as philanthropic capital…. even though it’s very important and catalytic, it’s like a drop in the pond compared to what the state is. The real player in this room – he’s not visible – is the 900 Pound gorilla, which is the state. That’s the one we need to find a way of working with.”

According to Mr Naidoo, one means of doing this would be to play it safe – to help government to deliver services successfully in areas where it invites other stakeholders to play a role. This route would be fairly unthreatening but should not be allowed to overshadow the other critical path that should be treaded to protect social justice issues: “This conference establishes that there’s a role for giving people voice and giving communities the power to take control of their lives. And if we don’t do that, there is a danger of implosion.”

On collaboration with the private sector, Mr Naidoo noted that “we have new private sector, we have old private sector. There’s lots of divisions, let’s not pretend, you know – just like you in the philanthropic sector, you have the old money and the new money; the new money that is not yet in the room and new money that doesn’t believe it has anything to do with this…. So I’m just saying…don’t ignore the fact that there are differences everywhere...The question is how do you navigate a minefield?”

When all was said and done, according to Mr Naidoo, philanthropy had to be clear about its role: “What do we want to be? We want to be catalytic, we want to be the honest brokers, we want to share information, we want to share best practice globally, we want to improve execution capacity within the country. We want to strengthen the ability of organisations that the people have decided to form, whether you agree with their objective or not, you want to support them.”

In concluding, Mr Naidoo called for the development of a roadmap for making philanthropy relevant in South Africa. With Inyathelo acting as a secretariat, he suggested the establishment of a small working group comprising people who government would take seriously to extract the core issues raised at the conference, begin to engage with government and other sectors, and plan another conference for a year’s time.
Points to Ponder and Possible Next Steps

- Probably the foremost decision made during the closing session was the need for some kind of umbrella body for grantmakers active in South Africa. As one delegate put it: “We need to be able to speak in a united voice and after that the work of everyone in this room [could be] so much easier.”
- One delegate emphasised that the future should be informed by the lessons of the past, particularly in respect of the erstwhile South African Grantmakers Association (SAGA) which closed several years ago. This organisation failed for a variety of reasons which are analysed in some detail in several papers available on the web.  
- An issue raised for consideration was whether a code of practice should be established and held by the umbrella body. This led to some discussion, which was not conclusive, about how the code would be managed and what authority would exist to enforce it.
- The very practical suggestion was made that an on-line database, with membership-only access, should be developed containing the contact details of all who attended the conference and others who might wish to become part of this nascent community of South African donors.
- Many seemed to take for granted that this conference was the first of many annual gatherings of a similar kind and supported the notion. The suggestion was also made that different interest and/or geographic groups might meet together up to four times annually to keep up the momentum. These might ultimately evolve into affinity groups.
- It was noted that any discussion about how to coordinate better the activities of grantmakers should properly include the private sector and government, who should be better represented as the initiative moves forward.
- The next steps were summed up as follows: There was support for a move towards an umbrella body funded by members, and Inyathelo should be tasked with taking the next steps, formulating some thoughts, and putting them to a group of interested donors.

Conference Outcomes

Inyathelo was mandated to maintain the momentum, develop a network of South African donors, and work on mapping the future of philanthropy in this country. The intention, among other things, is to form a private philanthropy circle which will include delegates from the conference who wish to move forward as part of a forum or network. The circle will be established in 2011 and Inyathelo has already begun the process of devising a programme for it.

We are extremely fortunate that Jay Naidoo has agreed to work with Inyathelo on the initiative to map the future of philanthropy here and elsewhere in Africa. Inyathelo has every confidence that organised philanthropy will grow significantly in the years to come.

AMANDA BLOCH – CONFERENCE ORGANISER

## Delegate List

**OUR WORLD, OUR RESPONSIBILITY** SOUTH AFRICA – OPPORTUNITIES NOW!  
SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE DONOR CONFERENCE 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>COMPANY/ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ackerman-Robins</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Pick ’n Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrie</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Brad Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ally</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aseesi</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>ARK (Absolute return for kids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baron</td>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>Michael &amp; Susan Dell Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berett</td>
<td>Fran</td>
<td>Atlantic Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloch</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Inyathelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bornfield</td>
<td>Astrid</td>
<td>The Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brackman</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Bain Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budha-Ramadlo</td>
<td>Mosipane</td>
<td>Nelson Mandela Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burt</td>
<td>Fiona</td>
<td>ELMA Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Zenes Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Jary</td>
<td>Michael &amp; Susan Dell Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawda-Thomas</td>
<td>Anthea</td>
<td>Social Change Assistance Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didia</td>
<td>Nobuseni</td>
<td>The Atlantic Philanthropies (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downton</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Brad Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>The Children’s Hospital Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>Natasha</td>
<td>Kay Mason Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elster</td>
<td>Audrey</td>
<td>The RAITH Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fash</td>
<td>Lynne</td>
<td>BoE Private Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericks</td>
<td>Llewellyn</td>
<td>E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furness</td>
<td>Carley</td>
<td>ELMA Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriës</td>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>J &amp; J Development Projects Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaiden</td>
<td>Gabeba</td>
<td>ELMA Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrow</td>
<td>Shelagh</td>
<td>Inyathelo: The South African Institute for Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gips</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girna</td>
<td>Aida</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimwood</td>
<td>Ashraf</td>
<td>Kheth’Impilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habberton</td>
<td>Colin</td>
<td>GivenGain Foundation, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggie</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Haggie Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Tracey</td>
<td>Tshikulu Social Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>The Bertha Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafuko</td>
<td>Joanda</td>
<td>ELMA Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Shain</td>
<td>The Atlantic Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komis</td>
<td>Saul</td>
<td>Rural Health Initiative (AHP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraak</td>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>The Atlantic Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laitinen</td>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>Embassy of Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leboda</td>
<td>Marjorie</td>
<td>National Lotteries Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubner</td>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Lubner Family Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubner</td>
<td>Hilary</td>
<td>Lubner Family Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macogola</td>
<td>Francina</td>
<td>National Research Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madzikela</td>
<td>Zola</td>
<td>The Atlantic Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magege</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>ELMA Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAST NAME</td>
<td>FIRST NAME</td>
<td>COMPANY/ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masango</td>
<td>Bridget</td>
<td>Nelson Mandela Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Kay Mason Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurel</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Office of J.E. and J.W. Oppenheimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGee</td>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>The Atlantic Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mkhabela</td>
<td>Sibongile</td>
<td>Nelson Mandela Childrens Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffat</td>
<td>Bernadette</td>
<td>ELMA Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mujuzi</td>
<td>Jamil</td>
<td>Open Society Foundation for South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullany</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>The Atlantic Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutima</td>
<td>Vusumani</td>
<td>Africa Grantmakers’ Affinity Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandoo</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>GAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndhlovu</td>
<td>Beatrice</td>
<td>American Jewish World Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicklin</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>BoE Private Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieman</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>ELMA Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonkwelo</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>National Research Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyedele</td>
<td>Oluseyi</td>
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