

KNOWLEDGECONNECT

CONNECTING YOU TO SOCIAL IMPACT THINKING WORLDWIDE



The Centre for Social Impact

Level 7, 222 Pitt Street, Sydney NSW 2000

tel: +61 2 8936 0909 email: csi@unsw.edu.au

web: www.csi.edu.au

Issue 15, SPRING 2012

FROM THE EDITOR

As guest editors of the Spring 2011 edition of *Knowledge Connect on Philanthropy: Impact over Intentions*, Paul Flatau and Elena Douglas at CSI (UWA) examined the emergence of a generation of philanthropists who value impact and effectiveness over intentions. They looked at the principal global forces guiding these changes and how that was impacting Australian philanthropy.

In the then Federal Government's 2005 *Giving Australia: Research on Philanthropy in Australia*, it was estimated that a total of \$11 billion of money, goods and services were donated to not-for-profit organisations. The \$11 billion is made up of: \$7.7 billion from individuals and \$3.3 billion from businesses.

While the report did identify planned giving as a separate category (but with very little data) it was not considered significant enough for quantification.

Philanthropy, therefore, is a comparatively small slice of the total giving pie compared with individual giving. It is positively tiny compared to government funding of the non-profit sector.

Why then does philanthropy have such prominence? Why do we care?

For many it is because it is money not subject to shareholders or the ballot box. With it, organisations can be entrepreneurial and investors have a high tolerance for risk. It is money that can be directed to the new, the innovative, and in some cases, the unpopular.

For others, it is not just the 'power of the purse' but the various forms of influence that come with it. It

In this Issue

- 1. Living with the Gates Foundation**
Alliance magazine
- 2. Letters: Gates Foundation**
Alliance magazine
- 3. Power & Light**
Foundation Centre, USA
- 4. Screw Business as Usual**
Richard Branson
- 5. Philanthropy is Dead**
Dr Wendy Scaife
- 6. Why Philanthropy Matters**
Louise Walsh and Katy Tyrrell

KNOWLEDGECONNECT

Issue 15, Spring 2012

GUEST EDITOR: Gina Anderson

GUEST CONTRIBUTORS: Dr. Wendy Scaife,
Louise Walsh and Katy Tyrrell

gives the ability to connect people and organisations across silos, borders, geographies, cultures, sectors and spectrums to build powerful networks and coalitions to effect change.

As Marcos Kisil, Institute for Development and Social Investment in Brazil, cautions: “High Net Worth Individuals are not only economically powerful, they are also influential in the political and social life of the countries where they live and made their original fortunes. Their actions and attitudes and the use they make of their wealth are followed by the media. In some ways they can serve as a beacon for good, and unhappily for bad.”

As governments around the world face increasing financial stress, they withdraw funding from civil society organisations. Increasingly philanthropy, which crosses social, economic, and public policy sectors, that are having greater influence in addressing the most challenging of our social and environmental issues.

In this edition of *Knowledge Connect* we look at why philanthropy matters and review the different views on the issues of power, influence and accountability – the very issues that the philanthropy sector itself finds the most challenging.

Gina Anderson

Guest Editor, *Knowledge Connect*

1. LIVING WITH THE GATES FOUNDATION

Alliance magazine, September 2011

Raise the issue of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and, as Michael Alberg-Seberich from Active Philanthropy succinctly puts it: “People are impressed with the donor, they see the strategic work, but they find the size of the organisation tremendous and wonder about issues of power”.

In the September 2011 edition of *Alliance* magazine, editor Caroline Hartnell, ran a special focus on ‘*Living with the Gates Foundation*’. Controversially the cover of the magazine showed a picture of a big gorilla, which was reprinted later in the magazine as a very

direct reference to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

This series of articles – many of which were provocative – included titles such as:

- ‘Gates: a benevolent dictator for public health?’
- ‘How much difference it is making?’
- ‘Private actors in the public arena’
- ‘Inspiring, off-putting or irrelevant?’
- ‘How do other donors see Gates?’

In addition to these articles, the magazine included an interview with Jeff Raikes, CEO of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

In one way or another, all the articles dealt with the issues of power, influence and accountability – and not just of the Gates Foundation, but of philanthropy in general. Importantly, and unusually, these articles air a variety of quite different opinions and concerns.

The most common criticism of the Gates Foundation is that, given its vast resources, it doesn’t fund ‘X’. As Timony Ogden, Editor in Chief of Philanthropy Action, points out: “the root of that unhelpful critique is to be found in the fact that the foundation actually followed the general advice given everywhere to new philanthropists and foundations: find a focus”.

Richard Horton, the editor of the *Lancet*, cautions that while the Gates Foundation has the right to spend its money how it wishes, because of the size of the foundation, it has the potential to distort the research field and government priorities. Richard worries that Bill Gates’ singular belief in technology to change people’s lives over simplifies the solutions to many of society’s problems. Horton says that social and behavioural issues are not amenable to single technological solutions require much more subtle and complex interventions.

On the other hand, Amanda Glassman, Director of the Global Health Policy Program at the Centre for Global Development, is not concerned that the Gates Foundation’s single-minded investments may squeeze out diversity in both approaches to problems like vaccination and in attention to other areas. “For me,” she says, “vaccination is the quintessential public health intervention. If we can’t get that right, we probably shouldn’t be doing other things.”

Laura Freschi, New York University Development Research Institute in USA and Alanna Shaikh, a global health consultant based in Dushanbe, Tajikistan, state that the Gates Foundation has been able to achieve a great deal in public health in a short time precisely because it is unencumbered by many of the typical constraints of the aid bureaucracies. They argue it has been a valuable catalyst to a slow-moving community. They point out that another clear strength of the Gates Foundation is its willingness to fund programs that others can't or won't.

However, they are also concerned with its power, influence and accountability. They highlight that, currently, the foundation is ultimately accountable for its success or failure only to the four decision-makers on its board.

They conclude that: "For now, we know that Gates had done a lot of good in revitalising public health, and there's no conclusive evidence that they've done any harm. But in a possible future where a significant majority of voices involved with public health either receive Gates money or would like to, how will we know?"

Indeed who will be able to offer objective feedback on its goals, practices and impact?

For many, particularly the Europeans, the issue of public benefit is crucial.

Luc Tayart de Borms, King Baudouin Foundation in Belgium, asks: "is the money being spent for public benefit and is it in partnership with governments or imposing on them?" This, he felt, was especially important in a developing country where partners may be weaker.

On a similar theme, Megan Tompkins from the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy at the University of Michigan in the USA, posits that possibly the greatest impact the Gates Foundation will have is fostering a debate on appropriate policy for foundations in a democratic society.

In answer to these concerns, Jeff Raikes says: "Philanthropy has entered the public consciousness in new ways that means it is also open to public scrutiny. One should not take it on faith that critics and honest feedback will automatically emerge. But in the days of social media, it is easier for ideas to find a voice and travel across continents in seconds."

Edward Skloot, Duke University's Center for Strategic Philanthropy and Civil Society notes that: "Whatever one's view of its operation, it is clear that the Gates Foundation is absolutely unique – a spectacularly wealthy organisation of talented, determined and proactive individuals, energetically pursuing a vast, progressive social-change mission. It has pushed well past the boundaries of traditional foundation behaviour, intervening in and influencing public policy on both domestic and international matters – for good or ill, or very likely for a mixture of both. It is like no other foundation seen since the emergence of modern philanthropy a century ago, and its behaviour will have consequences that will be felt for years to come."

For my part, I believe that the most significant effect of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is that it has substantially increased the visibility of philanthropy. Through initiatives such as the Giving Pledge and its promotion world-wide, it has created interest and raised the expectations of citizens of all societies of the wealthy to contribute.

2. LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: REVIEW

A review of letters to the editor received in response to the Alliance magazine, September 2011 edition

The September 2011 edition of *Alliance* magazine's focus on 'Living with the Gates Foundation' attracted a fascinating array of Letters to the Editor. These were published over the subsequent editions of *Alliance* and were received from leaders of the philanthropic sector globally. In many ways, I found the letters even more engaging than the original articles.

Firstly there are differing opinions on the controversial use of a picture of a big gorilla to depict the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

Gerry Salole, European Foundation Centre, found the "winking allusion to the Gates Foundation unhelpful and detracting" reducing the Gates Foundation to merely its size, rather than acknowledging its many achievements.

On the other hand Karla Simon, Professor of Law, Catholic University of America, liked the "tongue-in-cheek allusion to the size of the Gates Foundation", noting the size of the Gates Foundation does not

detract in any way from the wonderful work it does. Indeed Simon went on to describe the gentle and compassionate nature of gorillas, much like the Gates Foundation, concluding that perhaps the allusion is valid after all.

Charles Keidan, Pears Foundation in UK notes that: “Depicting the Gates Foundation as a gorilla was perhaps not the most subtle way for *Alliance* to raise the debate about the role of philanthropy in society. But the kind of scrutiny the issue is receiving is precisely what philanthropy needs to help raise its game and realise its full potential as a major force for good in the world. There is probably no one better placed than Bill Gates to personify this change.”

However, most agreed with the sentiments of Robyn Scott, CEO of Philanthropy New Zealand. She thanked *Alliance* magazine for highlighting the most challenging of all issues in philanthropy: the power and influence of significant size, and the freedom that philanthropy enjoys where accountability is not required from voters or shareholders.

“Posing such questions is rare and generally occurs behind closed doors,” she says. Indeed Aaron Dorman, National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy USA, said: “Discussing openly issues of accountability and impact related to the foundation is credibly important, especially because so many people are fearful of speaking publicly about the world’s largest grant maker.”

Marcos Kisil, Institute for Development and Social Investment in Brazil, raises the issue of accountability in his letter: “not Gates’ own accountability as a foundation,” he specifies, “but its contribution to increasing the accountability of the philanthropic sector as a whole.”

He describes accountability as saying what you mean, meaning what you say, and doing what you say you are going to do.

He notes that High Net Worth Individuals are not only economically powerful, they are also influential in the political and social life of the countries where they live and made their original fortunes. Their actions and attitudes and the use they make of their wealth are followed by the media. In some ways they can serve as a beacon for good, and unhappily for bad.

In the Gates’ case, because of their size, visibility, iconographic presence, and present and future influence over other philanthropic entities, they have a tremendous influence on the accountability of the whole sector.

For Charles Erkelens, Erasmus Centre for Strategic Philanthropy in the Netherlands, the essential question is who can demand what type of accountability from foundations? In his view there are two main groups:

1. Governments: they provide foundations with tax benefits. The strength of civil society, of which foundations are a part, is that it operates independently and without involvement from government. Therefore, any accountability should be limited to allowing the government to check whether the foundation does harm, and this can be covered by legislation.
2. Communities: This is the group that foundations try to serve. Foundations’ activities directly impact the lives of people who make up communities. They are directly impacted because any intended good concerns them. Therefore, active effort should be made to try and demonstrate responsibility by the foundation for the actions taken on their behalf.

The key for Erkelens, therefore, is proper evaluation of projects and programs, not just how much money was spent on what.

Taking a different tack on the accountability question, Lisa Jordan from the Bernard van Leer Foundation, also in the Netherlands, states that: “private foundations and private companies are exactly that – private.” She says that if we are uncomfortable with the scale of private companies or philanthropies that spin off from an enormous profit base, we should all be funding more advocacy to rebalance the public and private interests in our societies, not attack the governance arrangements of a private institution.

She argues that the Gates Foundation operates with exactly the same principles as most family foundations, so if Gates is to be targeted for its governance structure, so should all family foundations. However she does advocate two changes that the Gates Foundation could undertake to further accountability in the philanthropic field:

1. Firstly, it could publish its failures, as it is vital to have information in the public domain about why some approaches to social needs work and others don't.
2. Secondly, she would like the Gates Foundation to publish all knowledge generated through and by its programs without copyright and for public use. As she notes large foundations sit on tons of grey literature that helps program officers discern patterns in complex social fields; helps executives and boards make decisions on which field to operate in and which fields to leave; and helps evaluate wider societal trends. Most of that information never makes its way into the public domain. Making it available would increase the Gates Foundation's accountability on the issue that matters most: how it makes decisions on what to fund.

Challenging much of the concern of article-authors and letter-writers is Diana Leat, from the UK, who asks: "But is the potential power of foundations necessarily a bad thing?"

She and Helmut Anheier have argued in their book *'Creative Philanthropy'* that independent foundations may fulfil an important and unique function in challenging the orthodoxies and powers of the day. At a time when governments, business and the not-for-profit sector all seem increasingly to speak the language and values of the market, the capacity of foundations to provide alternative viewpoints may never be more important.

Hear, hear!

3. POWER & LIGHT

Power & light: grappling with transparency and effectiveness. Video. Foundation Centre, USA, 26 January 2012

The tension between transparency and effectiveness is often not well understood by those outside the philanthropic sector. Like many of the sensitive issues around philanthropy, while engendering often quite passionate differing positions, the transparency and effectiveness tension is often not discussed publicly.

In this video, panel members Brad Smith of the Foundation Center, Phil Buchanan of the Center for

Effective Philanthropy, Emmett Carson of the Silicon Valley Community Foundation, Christy Pichel of the Stuart Foundation, with Chip Edelsberg of the Jim Joseph Foundation as the moderator, discuss these tensions with disarming honesty.

As President of the Foundation Center in the US, Brad Smith is responsible for the GlassPockets Foundation Transparency Initiative and believes "the best way to preserve philanthropic freedom is not to hide behind it; rather, foundations increasingly need to tell the story of what they do, why they do it, and what difference it makes".

He believes transparency is important for foundations for four reasons:

1. It is required for foundations in the USA.
2. It is the right thing to do – as tax benefit for public benefit needs some form of explanation.
3. It can increase the effectiveness of foundation work.
4. It is inevitable – in the digital age, no sector: government, church, business, or charitable, gets a free pass in the world of 24/7 media, blogs, YouTube, Twitter, crowdsourcing, social media and digital everything.

Phil Buchanan is the CEO of The Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP), a consulting firm that provides foundations and other philanthropic funders with comparative data to enable higher performance. Fascinatingly, Buchanan began by stating that he believes in transparency but he is not a transparency absolutist.

If nothing else, he believes that just to take the step on the transparency track, anyone or organisation needs to be brave to do it. By demanding total public transparency we only make people defensive. He feels it is much better to allow people some sense of control, and the choice to make their results public.

However, Buchanan believes it to be morally indefensible to know that something you funded isn't working and know others are trying to do the same thing and not to share your results. For Buchanan, this is where transparency and effectiveness come together.

Christy Pichel, is Acting President of the Stuart Foundation, a private foundation. From her point of view, for the allocation of foundation resources to be

more transparent and effective it would have implications on both money and staff time. While there is no requirement for foundations to be effective, she believes being passionate and caring is not enough. Foundations also need to be effective.

She wondered aloud whether effectiveness reviews of a one year grant, even two, three and five year grants, are really going to reveal much when the issues foundations are tackling are big, long-term, social, environmental and behavioural issues. She questioned whether information we are asking for is actually helpful to recipients – or even to funders?

In many ways Emmett Carson had a very different perspective on questions of transparency and effectiveness. As the CEO of the Silicon Valley Community Foundation he pointed out that in the USA, community foundations already face a very high level of transparency and, unlike the rest of the philanthropic sector, are rated by Charity Navigator. From his point of view the link between effectiveness and transparency is tenuous at best because most foundations aren't transparent and we really don't have a good handle on measuring effectiveness.

The panel wrestled with the whole question of transparency. The discussion was fascinating for the very different views held and the implications.

On the issue of transparency of family foundations, Smith felt that issues of transparency are linked to privacy and take on a different dimension for two reasons:

1. Firstly, the general privacy of the donors.
2. Secondly, the safety of family members.

He believed these to be legitimate concerns especially if the family foundation chose to tackle difficult issues such as child trafficking, and sexual abuses, where bad actors are involved.

Carson disagreed. As the CEO of a community foundation, the safety of his staff is of paramount concern. Despite the high level of transparency, they still tackle controversial, complex and tough issues and as a consequence attract their share of threats.

Buchanan noted that if foundations take on difficult, unpopular issues while it is general good to be clear to be about your funding choices, it might not be smart from an effectiveness point of view to be transparent.

His point being, that transparency is good but we need to be context specific.

However, it was pointed out that ironically if you are working on something controversial, the more impact you make, the more profile you will attract, irrespective of your appetite for transparency. Carson pointed out that if you undertake something controversial then you need to prepare for a firestorm, media attention and attacks on your website.

The panellists discussed whether large individual donors should be prohibited from being anonymous.

Smith felt there is a big divide between institutionalised philanthropy and the creation of foundation, and individual donors. While sometimes the use of a foundation can be more private because the foundation has the relationship with not-for-profit organisations, he also raised the spectre of the anonymous donor – the one that everyone knows.

While we struggle with the whole issue of transparency and the inherent tensions, generational change, technology and transparency are inevitable. The philanthropic field came late to communications, late to technology and late to social networking – partly as a result of being private and independent.

The next generation of philanthropists and those working in the philanthropic sector will no doubt have a very different relationship with privacy and transparency.

For my part, the moral ambiguity of some anonymous donors is best exemplified by Larry David and Ted Danson in their YouTube clip on *Anonymous Donations*. In this hilarious skit, Larry is upset that Ted made a donation anonymously and then told everyone about it! Using comedy, they explore some of the most delicate questions around philanthropists and how we treat them. It's an oldie but a goodie!

4. SCREW BUSINESS AS USUAL

by Richard Branson, published by Portfolio, December 2011

On meeting Richard Branson, Jochen Zeitz, the CEO of Sport & Lifestyle Group said: "I felt mesmerised by him

at first, not sure whether I was being charmed by a beast with the nature of a lion or a golden retriever.”
Mmm, I know what he means!

Branson’s book is a bright and breezy, easy read. It’s peppered with well-known names, inspirational stories and a Pollyannaish sense of optimism about everything, every problem, issue and event. Much of the time I felt like I was reading an advertorial for all things good about the Virgin Group and Branson.

But to simply characterise the book like that would be doing Branson, and the impetus and fundamental ideas that form the basis of the book, a disservice. Branson’s message is a simple one: business as usual isn’t working, and things have to change.

He writes: “While the industrial age was all about wealth, unsustainable growth through depletion of natural resources and delivering profit to your shareholders, this new era, the ‘Age of People’ is all about shifting the focus to how businesses can and must deliver benefits to people and the planet – as well as shareholders.”

Fundamental to this book is a rallying call to business that ‘doing good is good for business’, which he has titled ‘Capitalism 24902’. Over and over again he states that business leaders must take on a wider responsibility for issues that affect every corner of the globe.

This book is full of inspiring stories, quotable quotes and nuggets of business advice for all businesses, for-profit and not-for-profit alike, and particularly social entrepreneurs. Throughout the book Branson uses anecdotes and examples of bringing together businesses, governments and social sector to create brand new business delivery models that take far better care of our communities. In doing so, he demonstrates the power and influence of philanthropists to build unconventional networks and coalitions to confront global social and environmental issues and achieve large-scale change for the better.

In one of the most telling chapters of the book Branson quotes Julie Hill, a former Division CEO of the infrastructure giant, Costain. She says that: “...the CEO of a business has to have their own personal epiphany about why business has to have a wider stakeholder base than just the direction of the business itself... they have to be citizens of the world and have to

understand it, to have a broader mission and become more powerful, almost like government.”
But she stressed, that unless the CEOs themselves have this depth of world view of the humanist perspective, the company won’t really do anything. They may tick the boxes, but that’s all.

This book is a compendium to, and another expression, of Michael Bishop and Michael Greene’s book *Philanthrocapitalism* and Michael Porter and Mark Kramer’s writings on ‘creating shared value’. For most people and companies, much of this sentiment is still aspirational.

However some CEOs are taking the lead. Last year Paul Polman, the head of Unilever, launched an ambitious plan to double Unilever’s revenue by 2020 while halving the company’s environmental impact. A July 2012 edition of AFR Boss featured an interview with Paul Polman. They discussed with Polman the challenges of leading a socially driven mission while protecting his company’s core. Polman is quoted as saying: “Our form of capitalism has brought us far, but hasn’t solved everything. We think businesses that make contributing to society a part of their business model will be successful.”

Music to Branson’s ears – and to mine!

5. PHILANTHROPY IS DEAD...

by Harrow, J. and T. Jung (2011), *Public Management Review* (PMR) 13(8): 1047-1056

Guest Contributor: Dr Wendy Scaife, Senior Research Fellow, Australian Centre for Philanthropy and Nonprofit Studies

This special *Public Management Review* issue looks at how philanthropy interacts with public policy and also questions who is accountable to whom for what.

Harrow and Jung’s editorial introduces some key issues in this philanthropy/government relationship, as a taster to this edition’s seven articles. They observe that philanthropy’s role in relation to government is variously ‘stop-gap, stakeholder, standard-bearer, and stooge’!

Harrow and Jung also point to a worldwide trend that we are seeing locally: renewed government interest in

philanthropy in times of economic downturn and austerity. Talked about as ‘enchantment with philanthropy’ and even ‘courting’, they report that philanthropy is being seen as some kind of white knight in ‘post-recession’ western societies, particularly the U.K. with its Big Society agenda. Their provocative title ‘*Philanthropy is Dead; Long Live Philanthropy*’ refers to this see-saw motion between philanthropy and the welfare state and the current tip back towards high expectations on philanthropy.

This idea of philanthropy stepping in to fill government’s shoes where regimes are unable or unwilling to fulfill society’s needs comes under scrutiny: does post-GFC philanthropy in fact have the resources to do what governments and societies are expecting of it? Does it want to? Is this simply government’s vision, not that of a cussedly autonomous philanthropy sector? These writers reinforce that this independence of action, the freedom to walk away from or stay with particular directions is the key point of philanthropy/government difference.

Harrow and Jung pose the related 64 billion dollar questions:

‘To whom is philanthropy accountable, and who holds it accountable?’ Government policies are usually debated (at least in theory). But who contests the views of the Gates Foundation’s three board members (Bill and Melinda Gates and Warren Buffet)? Their US\$3.8b budget is just a tad smaller than the World Health Organisation, controlled by and answerable to 193 member countries.

In foundations of non-Gatesian proportions too, Jung and Harrow see this independence characterising philanthropy, giving it leadership influence and its public fascination. They raise the role of philanthropy in holding government to account, not vice-versa. The role of philanthropy-state partnerships is canvassed, interestingly in the area of schools, which should resonate in Australia today. The message is to be wary of partnership rhetoric and to focus on the social provision problem more than the partnership actors.

This editorial and the special issue are not easy reading – many fifty-cent words where five cent ones would do. But the depth of thinking in each article makes it worth the time and brain investment. These articles question the dogma. We need that.

6. WHY PHILANTHROPY MATTERS

by Guest Contributors: Louise Walsh and Katy Tyrrell, Australia Council for the Arts

Government funding is not a growth industry - demonstrated by increasing competition for grants, impending budget cuts and short-term funding priorities – it’s hard to keep up.

Philanthropy has become the great equalizer - bridging the gap between revenue and rising costs.

Results from the Australian Major Performing Arts Group (AMPAG) 2012 survey *Tracking changes in Corporate Sponsorship and Private Donations* indicate that non-government support of the major performing arts has hit a new high, increasing by \$10.8 million or 20 per cent from the previous year to more than \$65 million.

Arts and culture is the second most supported sector by private ancillary fundsⁱ, equal to education; and overall donations given to registered cultural organisations through the Register for Cultural Organisations has almost doubled since 2004ⁱⁱ.

But it’s not just about the money. It’s about the type of money, the role that the donor can play in leveraging other resources, and the ability to encourage a change in behaviour.

- Philanthropic funding can be both a partner to government – driving the government dollar further – and an alternative to government - funding more risky projects that sit outside government funding priorities.
- Philanthropists often become advocates introducing new contacts, networks and partners that generate value well beyond the financial gift.
- Philanthropic partnerships are a catalyst to look outside government funding and program opportunities, and understand the interests and needs of the community within which an organisation operates.

As part of the 2010 election, the Australian government committed to commissioning Harold

Mitchell to undertake a *Review of Private Sector Support for the Arts in Australia* (October 2011). The aim of the review was to identify ways for maximising private sector financial and in-kind support in order to supplement existing funding from government.

Mitchell provides a progressive framework for incentivising and broadening giving to arts and culture, building support from the ground up. His recommended improvements include:

- **Maximising opportunities to give** through reduced red tape and timeframes for the Cultural Gifts Program; tax incentives for testamentary giving; and a government matched funding initiative.
- **Enabling organisations and individuals to receive** through an amalgamation of services; increased capacity building and skills development; improvements to the Register of Cultural Organisations; government initiatives to match crowdfunding and support micro-financing; an awareness raising campaign to target professional advisors; and a public campaign to promote giving to the arts.

One of our favorite recommendations is the development of a crowdfunding initiative with matched funding from government – Incentivising capacity building at its best. Crowdfunding is an area of significant potential. The inspiration for impact demonstrated by Kickstarter (USA), who have successfully raised over \$245 million to date, shows us it works. The double whammy for the arts and cultural sector is that it is as much about building an audience as it is about raising funds.

Other countries such as the UK move ahead in leaps and bounds with initiatives like The Catalyst: Endowments programme – a partnership between the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), Arts Council England and the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) – committing £100m in match funding to leverage private giving investment in cultural endowments and fundraising capacity building.

We are delighted that the Federal Arts Minister Simon Crean has recently taken the next step in acknowledging the recommendations offered in the Mitchell Report by announcing the creation of a new arts private sector entity to be operational from 1 July

2013 – stay tuned as this will herald a new level of partnership between philanthropy and the government.

References

ⁱ Australian Taxation Office Taxation Statistics 2007-08 and 2008-09, The Australian Centre for Philanthropy & Not for Profit Studies Current Issues Sheet 2010/1, updated 6 May 2010.

ⁱⁱ Annual Report, Department of Water, Heritage and the Arts, 2010.

GLOSSARY

Philanthropy & Social Investment

The Centre for Social Impact has published an online glossary of terms related to social investment and philanthropy.

This useful resource can be found online @

http://www.csi.edu.au/site/Knowledge_Centre/Glossary.aspx