

FEBRUARY 2012



THE VALUE OF COMMUNITY  
**PHILANTHROPY**

RESULTS OF A CONSULTATION

BARRY KNIGHT

# PREFACE

Discovery of something in common is an exhilarating occurrence. So it was back in the spring of 2010 when we discovered our joint commitment to community philanthropy. At the Aga Khan Development Network, community philanthropy is an integral aspect of our work — from community contributions to projects, to initiatives supporting local civil society and creating local assets. At the Mott Foundation, we believe local institutions need to nurture partnerships between individuals and their community. This belief has driven our long-term commitment to help develop community foundations in the U.S. and around the world.

So, with a shared vision our two institutions embarked on a journey, along with others, to discover how we might work together to support community philanthropy globally. We realized our first step was to ensure we had a common understanding of what is a seemingly straight-forward term but has widely varying interpretations. At the same time, we reached out to various experts and practitioners in the field — especially from Africa and Asia — to include their experience, wisdom and perspectives. Finally, we took stock of the great work that already is being done and identified gaps that would need to be filled so community philanthropy could become more widely accepted as a valuable approach for achieving more lasting and deep-rooted development outcomes.

The ensuing report, authored by CENTRIS Consultant and Facilitator Barry Knight, not only synthesizes the conclusions of several roundtable discussions but makes a powerful case for community philanthropy as a means for advancing civil society and furthering human development. It also points us toward priority areas where we might work together, and our next steps will be developing those areas further.

We invite you to join us on this continuing journey so together we can align our efforts and grow our investments in community philanthropy. If you have questions or would like to learn more, feel free to send an e-mail to [info@akusa.org](mailto:info@akusa.org), [info@mott.org](mailto:info@mott.org), or [centris@cranehouse.eu](mailto:centris@cranehouse.eu).

We express deep gratitude to all who participated in the consultative roundtable meetings in Washington D.C. (September 2010), Johannesburg (June 2011), and Dhaka (September 2011), especially those who prepared presentations. These include: Jenny Hodgson, Halima Mahomed, Chandrika Sahai, Sutthana Vichitanandra, and Rita Thapa. We also wish to thank the Ford Foundation for providing travel support for several roundtable participants, and the Global Fund for Community Foundations for its organizational and intellectual contributions. Finally, we are grateful to Elma Philanthropies for hosting a November 2011 consultative meeting of funders that also resulted in valuable input for the ensuing report.

**Aga Khan Foundation USA**

**Charles Stewart Mott Foundation**

*February 2012*

# THE VALUE OF COMMUNITY PHILANTHROPY

## RESULTS OF A CONSULTATION

### THIS REPORT

This report sets out results from a consultation to explore ways to stimulate and develop community philanthropy as a means of contributing to the sustainability of civil society and supporting the effectiveness of development aid.

The consultation was undertaken by the Aga Khan Foundation USA and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation in association with the Global Fund for Community Foundations. The Ford Foundation also contributed resources to the process.

Three meetings were held (in Washington D.C., Johannesburg, and Dhaka). Three working papers were written during the process, and two articles published in *Alliance* magazine so that a wider constituency could offer feedback. People who took part in meetings are listed in Annex A.

### MAIN CONCLUSIONS

Community philanthropy should be a central feature in developing civil society and enhancing the effectiveness of development aid. Having local people involved as donors is a game-changer in efforts to build civil society and enhances the prospects of sustainability of external funding when the program ceases. If successful, community philanthropy also leads to more lasting, entrenched outcomes by increasing local ownership and local accountability.


Despite its potential, community philanthropy is under-developed. There should be a joint program to develop the capacity of the field of community philanthropy, so that it can more effectively partner with foundations and development agencies. Such a program should strengthen the infrastructure, build key links between partners, and enhance technical features such as definition, performance, and evaluation. The program should also aim to increase the pool of funders, and to raise awareness of community philanthropy among official development aid practitioners for whom it is presently invisible.

## STATE OF THE FIELD

There appears to be a new force in philanthropy driven by ordinary people working from the bottom up of our societies, rather than by wealthy people working from the top down. This has the potential to transform how philanthropy works and in the process help to solve some of the deeper problems in our society, such as poverty, racism, and gender inequity. This development appears, from a number of indicators, to be gaining ground rapidly. The shorthand term for what is occurring is “community philanthropy.”

The community foundation field is one among a number of manifestations of these new developments. In a series of six “Global Status Reports,” The Worldwide Initiative for Grantmaker Support (WINGS) has charted the growth of community foundations across the world.<sup>1</sup> The following scatterplot summarizes the results.

Number of community foundations 2000–2010



It is evident from the chart that growth has been consistent and stable across the decade, with an average of 70 community foundations being added each year. The Global Status Report attributed this growth to three main factors. The first was the usefulness and flexibility of a business model that combines assets and development with local ownership and leadership. The second was the quality of the supporting infrastructure that fostered learning about techniques of community philanthropy between different cultures of the world. The third was the long-term investment of a number of charitable foundations, most especially the C.S. Mott Foundation.

Almost all of the visible growth in community foundations has so far been in North America and Europe. However, it was clear from the consultations that there is an underlying ferment of activity in other parts of the world. As the “first wave” of community foundations established outside of North America and Western Europe begins to mature, this gives valuable experience to build on, as do earlier investments in other forms of local philanthropy such as women’s funds and environmental funds.

<sup>1</sup> [www.wings-community-foundation-report.com/gsr\\_2010/gsr\\_theme\\_facts/global-growth.cfm](http://www.wings-community-foundation-report.com/gsr_2010/gsr_theme_facts/global-growth.cfm)

There is the emergence of new thought leadership, for example through TrustAfrica, and developing forms of community foundations that are shaped by their local context. Examples include the Community Foundation of South Sinai, Amazon Partnerships Foundation in Ecuador, Ilha Community Foundation in Mozambique, and Newmont Ahafo Development Foundation in Ghana. Some of these have been on the frontlines of democracy building, as in the case of Waqfeyat al Maadi Community Foundation in Egypt, and in changing mindsets, as in the Dalia Association in Palestine. Although many of these developments are new and small, what characterizes their importance is that local people are both taking the lead and contributing their own money.

In part, these developments are responses to the way that immense global forces are affecting neighborhoods. Increasingly everywhere is affected by climate change, world recession, retreat of the state, and mounting inequality, and local people are increasingly active in addressing these concerns. There is a raft of social enterprises, social movements, protest groups, women's funds, and hybrid forms that defy easy categorization. These groups are increasingly seeing the need to have their own money, and so set about developing foundations.

## DEFINITION

Developments from the bottom-up of societies rarely come in neat categories that conform to the ideal types of organizations. In our consultations, the idea of "community philanthropy" was more often likened to a human impulse than an organizational form. During the consultations, people recognized that community philanthropy in the sense of "local people helping each other, by sharing resources for the common good," is a naturally occurring asset, found in all communities and cultures, and encouraged by all major religions and traditions.<sup>2</sup>

People who were consulted found it difficult to pin down the precise meaning of "community philanthropy." The European Foundation Centre had a helpful definition:

"...the act of individual citizens and local institutions contributing money or goods along with their time and skills, to promote the well being of others and the betterment of the community in which they live and work. Community philanthropy can be expressed in informal and spontaneous ways ... It can also be expressed in formal, organized ways whereby citizens give contributions to local organizations, which in turn use the funds to support projects that improve the quality of life."

However, some people felt that this definition did not distinguish community philanthropy sufficiently from traditional NGO activity. People at one of the meetings therefore developed a new definition. Rather than try to find a better "definition by essence" (the perfect form of words that suits every situation), the meeting sought a "definition by characteristics" (a list of individual qualities that, in combination, add

<sup>2</sup> Steven Mayer (2005) "Community philanthropy and racial equity: what progress looks like," [www.effectivecommunities.com/pdfs/ECP\\_CommunityPhilanthropy.pdf](http://www.effectivecommunities.com/pdfs/ECP_CommunityPhilanthropy.pdf)

up to the idea). The advantage of the latter approach is that the definition can be verified by comparison with institutions and activities in the real world. The list of characteristics identified was:

- Organized and structured
- Self-directed
- Open architecture<sup>3</sup>
- Civil society<sup>4</sup>
- Using own money and assets
- Building an inclusive and equitable society

Looking at the list, it is vital to understand that it is the combination of features that adds up to “community philanthropy.” The first four items — organized, self-directed, open architecture, civil society — could apply equally well to any non-governmental organization (NGO).

For community philanthropy to be present, these four qualities need to be combined with the fifth item on the list — using own money and assets. This asset-based approach relates both to attitudes and to the accumulation of monetary assets. The key to this is found in a phrase used by the Black Belt Community Foundation in Alabama: “taking what we have to build what we need.” On the development of resources, it is an essential component of community philanthropy that local people put in some of their own money to develop long-term assets for a community. An asset-based approach contrasts with a deficit-based approach, which starts with an assessment of needs and works out how to fulfill them.

The final item on the list is about values. An essential quality of community philanthropy is reciprocity based on a principle of solidarity, which are qualities that build an inclusive and equitable society. This means that benefit is public and widespread, rather than private or restricted to certain privileged groups in the community.

### **Added value**

Everyone agreed that, in using this definition, community philanthropy was based on a voluntary impulse embedded in the human condition. It follows, some people said, that such a naturally occurring good needs no justification. It is a good in itself and the question of added value is not relevant.

The question of added value only arises when an external agent wishes to use, co-opt, enhance, invest, or otherwise interact with community philanthropy to harness its energy for some other public good (for example, as part of a funding program to develop civil society or as a means of ensuring the sustainability of development aid).

In this context, people suggested that there were important benefits associated with community philanthropy that could assist development processes. These typically related to intangible processes and outcomes, such as “trust,” “community

<sup>3</sup> “Open architecture” is a term borrowed from computer applications. It means that anyone can design add-on products and is the opposite of being closed or proprietary.

<sup>4</sup> Civil society is here defined as “the totality of many voluntary social relationships, civic and social organizations, and institutions that form the basis of a functioning society, as distinct from the force-backed structures of a state (regardless of that state’s political system), the commercial institutions of the market, and private criminal organizations like the mafia.”



Learners from Protea Primary School taking pride in their vegetable garden supported by the Community Development Foundation Western Cape in South Africa.

leadership," "social capital," "sustainability," and "reduction of dependency."<sup>5</sup> Such factors are regarded as important yet are hard to measure. In the meetings in Washington and Johannesburg, participants accepted without question that these factors were good and valuable outcomes from community philanthropy.

Participants in Dhaka, however, required proof of concept before they thought it worth taking community philanthropy any further. At first, participants could not see any special value accruing to community philanthropy over and above other forms of civil society, most notably non-governmental organizations.

A detailed examination of Tewa changed people's minds.<sup>6</sup> Tewa is a foundation based in Nepal. Community philanthropy lies at its heart, not least in the fact that it has 3,000 local donors. The value added of local people giving in this way means that community philanthropy is central to the *voluntary impulse*. Giving is intimately connected with identity, and a powerful means of bridging different interests and communities, while offering more or less the only hope of sustainable interventions that would transform communities away from aid dependency. The meeting accepted that a weakness of many NGOs is that their donors own them. In contrast, what distinguishes Tewa from traditional NGOs is that local people using their own money confers legitimacy in a way that no amount of external funding could ever do.

When local people act as donors, the hierarchical structure at the heart of development aid breaks down. The point is well made in the Tewa story:

"The alternative model of development offered by Tewa is grounded in the reality of Nepal, but explicitly works to do away with established hierarchies of

<sup>5</sup> For a comprehensive list of these type of benefits see: Jenny Hodgson and Barry Knight (2010) *More than the poor cousin? The emergence of community foundations as a new development paradigm*, Global Fund for Community Foundations

<sup>6</sup> Rita Thapa (2011) Tewa: Doing the Impossible: Feminist Action in Nepal: The Founder's Story



*Rita Thapa of Tewa presents on the importance of inclusive and participatory philanthropy for community development in Nepal.*

gender, class and caste, ethnicity, age, and even geography. It demonstrates an inclusive, non-hierarchical structure that can be transparent and accountable, as well as trusting and respectful. Tewa therefore works in true partnerships that promote lateral as opposed to top down relationships.”

Using these lateral processes, community philanthropy breaks down boundaries between people, taking account of place, issue, and identity. The nature of support will vary from place to place. A key tenet of community philanthropy is “help the other but help the other to help the other,” so that each act of philanthropy begets other acts of philanthropy.

Such an approach has real potential to work with communities within communities and, in the process, involve the most excluded. Examples were given during the consultations about when this approach was followed, minorities within communities could gain power by interacting with the majority through joint service provision and in the process gain status and respect from the mainstream. Such collective activity carries powerful messages for collective “within group” and “between group” processes in society, containing the potential to resolve conflicts, build harmony, and develop an equitable frame of reference for the development of progress within society.

People attending the meeting agreed that organizations like Tewa were breaking the mould of how development should be done. Tewa — and similar institutions that form part of the constituency of the Global Fund for Community Foundations — offer a new way of doing business in civil society.



## FACTORS THAT HELP OR HINDER

A key question now arises. How do we develop community philanthropy further so it can become more mainstream? To answer this, people listed factors that would help or hinder the development of community philanthropy. The results are shown in the following table.

FACTOR	HELPS	HINDERS
<b>LEADERSHIP</b>	Local leadership developments; culture of voluntarism for young people	Donor funding has become increasingly output-driven and lost sight of the community
<b>TRUST</b>	High trust within community	Low trust within community
<b>GOVERNANCE</b>	Good governance, transparency and accountability	Corruption and dishonesty. Small organizations may lack transparency
<b>PARTICIPATION</b>	Involvement of local people	Desensitization/apathy. Lack of right amount of participation
<b>TOP DOWN AND BOTTOM UP APPROACH</b>	Broad and equal participation (bring people from top and bottom of society)	Top-down approach. Intermediaries perceived as untrustworthy
<b>EXPERTISE</b>	Technical support/competence	Too many demands and no one to deliver. Lack of awareness. Short-sightedness
<b>MONEY</b>	Not looking for large funds	External influence/too much outside funding. Complex financial procedures required by funders
<b>TYPE OF PROBLEM</b>	Cause/immediate need. Episodes, such as disasters, can bring people together	Long-term major problems requiring large investments
<b>SOCIAL COHESION</b>	Homogeneity in a community or ability to manage diversity	Poverty and inequities in society that fragment communities
<b>ATTITUDE TO BUSINESS</b>	Social business paradigm	Narrow political and commercial interests
<b>LEGAL AND FISCAL FRAMEWORKS</b>	Enabling legislation	Unsympathetic legal and fiscal regimes

## JOINING UP THE FIELD

To make progress in developing community philanthropy as a mainstream force in building sustainable civil society and improving the effectiveness of development aid would involve joining up different parts of the field that are presently disconnected.

Community philanthropy tends to operate from the bottom up, with local actors taking the initiative, while aiming to influence the way central authorities behave. Most international development tends to operate from the top down, as a central agency disperses resources to a range of local actors.

Evidence suggests that both top-down and bottom-up approaches are important, and neither is sufficient to deliver progress on its own. Indeed, what often determines success is what happens at the point at which top down meets bottom up. This is the point where outside intervention meets inside culture. Many planners of social programs fail to see the significance of this point even though this has been known for 40 years.<sup>7</sup>

In an article in *Alliance*, Barry Gaberman laments the fact that community foundation people and development people don't talk to each other.<sup>8</sup> Part of the problem is that much community philanthropy is informal, taking place as part of a daily routine that is unseen and unrecorded. In *The Poor Philanthropist*, Susan Wilkinson-Maposa suggests that such "horizontal philanthropy" is a potent force within communities, enabling people not only to survive the ups and downs of life, but also to invest in systems that improve their collective future.<sup>9</sup> While community philanthropy typically uses horizontal relationships, development aid typically uses "vertical relationships" where donors are outside the communities that they are supporting. Thus the relationships have few points of intersection.

However, an opportunity is opening up to begin these conversations, particularly since official development agencies are experimenting with foundations as a means of creating local sustainability. For example, in Bulgaria and the Baltic States, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has introduced the community foundation model, the World Bank has seeded community foundations in Moldova, Thailand, and Tanzania, and the U.K.'s Department for International Development (DfID) has funded the Manusher Jonno Foundation in Bangladesh. Given that it would make sense for the two different worlds to join up to pool their resources, and there have been previous efforts to do this, what needs to happen to develop this? This question came up particularly strongly in the roundtable in Johannesburg. People were much animated by how community philanthropy could gain recognition as a valuable, necessary, and legitimate feature of development practice. Meeting participants created an agenda to obtain this recognition. At the meeting in Dhaka, they took the result of their work and developed it further. A composite agenda from the two main groups involves five main actions on the part of the field to strengthen itself. These were evidence, legitimacy, partnerships, roles, and communications. We will take each of these in turn, as follows:

**1. Evidence:** to improve the rigor of the field, using clear definitions, metrics and data analysis to demonstrate what works. Such an approach has not been a high priority up to now, and this needs to change.

<sup>7</sup> The classic study on this issue is *Dilemmas of Social Reform* by Peter Marris and Martin Rein. See Marris, P and Rein, M (1972) *Dilemmas of Social Reform*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth

<sup>8</sup> Barry Gaberman (2008) 'Strangers in the Night,' *Alliance*, Vol. 13 No. 3, September

<sup>9</sup> Susan Wilkinson-Maposa, Alan Fowler, Ceri Oliver-Evans, and Chao F.N. Mulenga (2005) *The poor philanthropist: how and why the poor help each other*, The Southern Africa-United States Centre for Leadership and Public Values at the Graduate School of Business, University of Cape Town, 2005.



*The Kenya Community Development Fund works with local people to build permanent funds for the benefit of the community in a particular geographical area.*

A particularly important task is to build on various indicator sets developed by the Knight Foundation<sup>10</sup> and the Global Fund for Community Foundations.<sup>11</sup> Once this is done, it would be useful to publish studies that demonstrate the added value of community philanthropy to the field. These should focus on what is different about outcomes when community philanthropy is present compared with when it is not. As we saw with the Tewa example earlier on, it is empirical evidence that provides proof of concept.

We also need material on “what works” in intervening to develop community philanthropy. A useful series of hypotheses can be derived from the work of Halima Mahomed and Brianne Peters who studied the Makutano Community Development Association (MCDA) in Kenya.<sup>12</sup> At the Johannesburg roundtable, Halima reported that, in addition to factors internal to MCDA, six external factors relating to the support of the Kenya Community Development Foundation to MCDA were critical to its success:

- Have a shared vision and approach
- Support local asset development
- Focus on hardware (resources and organizational development) and software (relationships, power, context, and structural analysis)
- Regulate pace and extent of support in line with community needs and capacity
- Recognize that change needs time and requires multiple actors
- Focus on long-term sustainability

<sup>10</sup> Knight Soul of the Community 2010, [www.soulofthecomunity.org](http://www.soulofthecomunity.org)

<sup>11</sup> Jenny Hodgson and Barry Knight (2010) *More than the Poor Cousin: The Emergence of Community Foundations as a New Development Paradigm*. Global Fund for Community Foundations

<sup>12</sup> Halima Mahomed and Brianne Peters (2011) *The story behind the well: A case study of successful community development in Makutano, Kenya*; Global Fund for Community Foundations and the Coady International Institute. See [www.globalfundcommunityfoundations.org/latest-news/2011/9/17/the-story-behind-the-well-a-new-report-from-the-gfcf-and-coa.html](http://www.globalfundcommunityfoundations.org/latest-news/2011/9/17/the-story-behind-the-well-a-new-report-from-the-gfcf-and-coa.html)

**2. Legitimacy:** to mobilize a critical mass of people as part of a process of participatory democracy in favor of the common good. The field has tended to see its own activity as sufficient justification without demonstrating that it is a legitimate sphere of activity.

It is important to showcase good examples that already exist in the field such as the Kenya Community Development Foundation, which has been a shining beacon of propriety in the 14 years of its existence. For one of its grantees, the Makutano Community Development Association, it was clear that three factors ensured the legitimacy of the venture. The first was shared vision; the second was a collectively developed process with wide community ownership; and the third was the accountability of leaders to the community.

The model of legitimacy inherent in community philanthropy ultimately rests on the issue of the power of donors to make positive change in their communities. Because local people are the donors and hence sustainers of the effort, this legitimacy stands or falls on the judgments of local people about whether the institution that they are supporting is well managed. If not, they will withdraw their support. In this way community foundations and similar organizations have to be accountable to their communities in a way that external donors do not. Moreover these behaviors create norms that society respects and expects of its leaders, which in turn creates the basis for a more transparent and democratic society. It is this core attribute of community philanthropy which makes it so profoundly important to the international development agenda for “state building,” particularly among the forty-five so called fragile states.<sup>13</sup>

**3. Partnership:** to join top-down efforts with the views of beneficiaries of programs so that there are complementarities between different interests, particularly by developing horizontal relationships between community organizations to bring the voice of local people to the development table.



*A BRAC-supported village organization solicits the input and commitments of community members to development projects in Bangladesh.*

<sup>13</sup> OECD-DAC International Network on Conflict and Fragility (2011) *Ensuring Fragile States are Not Left Behind: 2011 Factsheet on Resource Flows in Fragile States*. See [www.oecd.org/dataoecd/5/11/49108935.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/5/11/49108935.pdf)

A distinctive comparative advantage of community philanthropy is its ability to connect with hard-to-reach and marginalized populations within certain communities that other agencies cannot reach. There is some evidence that one of the reasons why aid is less effective than it might be is that it fails to get through to the grass roots where resources can drive local peoples' images and enthusiasms for progressive social change. At the same time, one of the reasons why bottom-up efforts to develop progressive social change fails to gain traction is that activists do not connect with the mainstream agendas of development agencies and governments. This leads to a gap, so that development and government professionals and other people live in different worlds and fail to join together to develop effective programs.

There is an important agenda to begin to develop ways of bridging the gaps between top-down and bottom-up initiatives. There are examples of how some community foundations have done this. For example, the Community Foundation for Northern Ireland has managed to have a significant effect in bringing peace to Northern Ireland by using external money from aid agencies and large philanthropies to conduct sensitive community development to bring together divided communities. The Community Foundation for Northern Ireland has played an interstitial role in society connecting both with marginalized communities and with governments and helping to build bridges between them.

**4. Roles:** to find complementary roles for different actors to ensure the sustainability of civil society and the effectiveness of development aid. This was considered at the roundtables, and preliminary conclusions were reached.

People working in NGOs saw themselves taking two kinds of actions. The first action was to transform themselves using the principles of community philanthropy to reenergize their work by rediscovering the principles of voluntarism. Many NGOs have been, in a sense, appropriated by their donors as part of output-driven programs that cast communities as beneficiaries rather than actors or donors. People would seek an asset-driven approach harnessing the energy of the community, rather than following a deficit-based approach where external agencies and resources tended to breed a culture of dependency and powerlessness. The second action was to support community philanthropy in their procedures and processes, such as purchasing, where supporting local efforts would increase the sustainability of local people's actions.

Funders and development agencies saw themselves in supporting a range of actions. On funding, they could support efforts with seed funding, develop better models of financial assistance, and ensure that the perspective of community philanthropy is included on the agenda of official aid institutions. On technical assistance, they could strengthen key intermediaries, such as the Global Fund for Community Foundations and possibly regional networks for community philanthropy, help with mapping the field, and assist with measurement, evaluation, and impact measurement. On the enabling environment, they could help develop appropriate legal and fiscal frameworks in various countries and help develop codes of conduct and certification processes. Finally, should the efforts in building community philanthropy evolve into a more visible way of doing business in civil society, funders and development agencies could help scale up the efforts.

**5. Communication:** to develop a constructive engagement using plain language. The consultations suggested that communication should form a key part of a constructive engagement strategy with a wide range of development actors. It was important, people felt, to use plain language in such communication, and to develop a glossary of key technical terms at work in the field.

It was felt that there was a low level of understanding about community philanthropy. It is not, for example, on the radar of development agencies or international NGOs. In part, this was due to the field being highly local, dealing in invisible qualities, and having intangible outcomes. There was also a tendency for the field to pay too little attention to communicating its results.

Some of the past initiatives to strengthen community philanthropy have tended to be focused on the internal development of the field, rather than getting out and creating a dialogue with others. Many of the programs supporting community philanthropy have built the field from the inside, creating tight networks of community foundations and support agencies, but the next step of developing the conversation with the wider world of bilateral and multilateral funding agencies has not taken place. This needs to happen soon.

## TAKING IT FORWARD

The consultative process has given a good empirical base, both in terms of justifying community philanthropy and setting out what might be done. Such a program would need to be worked out in some detail and would, desirably, involve a number of different funders to take this forward. The Global Fund for Community Foundations needs to play a big part in what happens next and, as a young institution, it is important to build its capacity alongside other networks and institutions.

The five main priorities for a program going forward are:

1. Map successful community philanthropy activities and learn what works about them to strengthen the evidence base of the field
2. Strengthen the international infrastructure for community philanthropy, paying particular attention to the Global Fund for Community Foundations
3. Support the development of regional networks of community philanthropy organizations and leaders, especially in Asia where the infrastructure is much weaker
4. Support pilot community philanthropy projects that appear to have potential for learning
5. Influence international development donors to support community philanthropy

*This work represents many people's contributions; amongst them particular thanks go to Sarah Comer of the Aga Khan Foundation USA.*

## Annex A: List of Participants in Community Philanthropy Roundtables

### SEPTEMBER 2010 MEETING IN WASHINGTON D.C.

**Janet Awimbo**, NGO Resource Center, Tanzania  
**Elizabeth Boris**, Urban Institute  
**Nick Deychakiwsky**, C.S. Mott Foundation  
**Eleanor Fink**, International Finance Corporation  
**Linetta Gilbert**, Ford Foundation  
**Jenny Hodgson**, Global Fund for Community Foundations  
**Richard Holloway**, Aga Khan Foundation Geneva  
**Mirza Jahani**, Aga Khan Foundation USA  
**Barry Knight**, CENTRIS  
**Janet Mawiyoo**, Kenya Community Development Foundation  
**Monica Patten**, Community Foundations of Canada  
**Ellen Remmer**, The Philanthropic Initiative  
**Sara Shroff**, Changing Our World  
**Suzanne Siskel**, Ford Foundation  
**Edward Skloot**, Duke University  
**Shannon St. John**, Synergos  
**Peter Walkenhorst**, Bertelsmann Stiftung

### JUNE 2011 ROUNDTABLE IN JOHANNESBURG

**Alica Brown**, Ford Foundation  
**Sarah Comer**, Aga Khan Foundation USA  
**Nick Deychakiwsky**, C.S. Mott Foundation  
**Nobayeni Dladla**, Atlantic Philanthropies  
**Aleke Dondo**, Allavida  
**Hussein Faruque**, Aga Khan Foundation Geneva  
**Beulah Fredericks**, Community Development Foundation of the Western Cape  
**Jenny Hodgson**, Global Fund for Community Foundations  
**Mirza Jahani**, Aga Khan Foundation USA  
**Barry Knight**, CENTRIS  
**Shannon Lawder**, C.S. Mott Foundation  
**Halima Mahomed**, Global Fund for Community Foundations  
**Janet Mawiyoo**, Kenya Community Development Foundation  
**Bongi Mkhabela**, Nelson Mandela Children's Fund  
**Ishmael Mkhabela**, Independent Community Organizer

**Mamo Mohapi**, C.S. Mott Foundation  
**Arif Neki**, Aga Khan Foundation East Africa  
**Najma Rashid**, Aga Khan Foundation/Madrasa Regional Program  
**Egas Simbine**, Aga Khan Foundation Mozambique  
**John Ulanga**, Foundation for Civil Society  
**Gerald Walterfang**, Viwango  
**Susan Wilkinson-Maposa**, University of Cape Town

### SEPTEMBER 2011 ROUNDTABLE IN DHAKA

**Amir Ali**, Aga Khan Foundation Bangladesh  
**Karim Alibhai**, Aga Khan Foundation Pakistan  
**Sarah Comer**, Aga Khan Foundation USA  
**Nick Deychakiwsky**, C.S. Mott Foundation  
**Jenny Hodgson**, Global Fund for Community Foundations  
**Mohammed Ibrahim**, Federation of NGOs in Bangladesh  
**Mirza Jahani**, Aga Khan Foundation USA  
**Khushi Kabir**, Nijara Kori  
**Salimah Kassam**, Aga Khan Foundation Bangladesh  
**Barry Knight**, CENTRIS  
**R. Kohilanath**, Neelan Tiruchelvam Trust  
**Nick McKinlay**, Aga Khan Development Network Geneva  
**Sumitra Mishra**, I-Partner  
**Anthea Mulakala**, The Asia Foundation  
**Apoorva Oza**, Aga Khan Rural Support Programme India  
**Nirmala Pandit**, NAVAM  
**Sadrudin Pardhan**, Aga Khan Foundation Pakistan  
**Chandrika Sahai**, Independent Consultant  
**Sujeet Sarkar**, Aga Khan Foundation Afghanistan  
**Mansoor Sarwar**, Pakistan Center for Philanthropy  
**Suzanne Siskel**, Ford Foundation  
**Steven Solnick**, Ford Foundation  
**Rita Thapa**, Tewa  
**Sutthana Vichitrananda**, Independent Consultant



**AGA KHAN FOUNDATION USA**  
1825 K Street NW, Suite 901  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Web site: [www.akdn.org](http://www.akdn.org)  
e-mail: [info@akfusa.org](mailto:info@akfusa.org)  
Phone: +1.202.293.2537 ext. 116



**CHARLES STEWART MOTT FOUNDATION**  
Mott Foundation Building  
503 S. Saginaw Street, Suite 1200  
Flint, MI 48502  
Web site: [www.mott.org](http://www.mott.org)  
e-mail: [info@mott.org](mailto:info@mott.org)  
Phone: +1.810.238.5651