

Report on the One-2-One Programme 2005 Philippines/Australia

(Michael Strübin, WINGS, January 2006)

These pages discuss the WINGS-CF One-2-One peer exchange in 2005 between the Association of Foundations (Philippines) and Philanthropy Australia. With support from WINGS-CF, Maria Socorro (Marissa) Camacho-Reyes and Milagros (May) G. Corpuz, two members of the Community Foundation Committee of the Association of Foundations, visited Australia from 18 to 29 September 2005 for a series of meetings and site visits to learn about the promotion and support of community foundation development.

The first part (pages 1-4) surveys the programme and this specific visit. The appendices provide more detail on the visit's itinerary (Appendix I, page 5), and contain verbatim the comments of all participants regarding their learnings and insights as well as their recommendations for future programmes (Appendix II, page 8).

Background

WINGS-CF One-2-One is a programme of peer to peer exchange between organisations in the WINGS-CF network to benefit both the visiting and host organisations; to find new knowledge and tools for the community foundations in their respective countries; and to share learning with other membership associations and support organisations in the WINGS-CF network. WINGS-CF provides logistical and financial support of up to €5,000 for visiting organisation and €500 for the host.

Specifically, the programme offers support for a visit by two people from one organisation in WINGS-CF to another, with some help also for the host's costs. The visits include structured meetings between visiting and host representatives, working sessions with the host's other staff and volunteers, attendance at their events or committee meetings, and meetings with local community foundations and other relevant agencies.

The programme began in 2002 under the name “WINGS-CF peer exchange”. There were exchanges between: Community Foundations of Canada and the Institute for the Development of Social Investment (Brazil); Philanthropy Australia and Community Foundation Network (UK); and Charities Aid Foundation (CAF) Russia and CEMEFI (Mexico). In two of these cases there was a full exchange, with each partner acting as both host and visitor, on separate occasions.

In 2004 the programme was restarted under the name “WINGS-CF One-2-One”. The new name is intended to reflect the opportunity for face-to-face, peer-to-peer learning between two organisations, and to distinguish the programme’s format from other activities in the WINGS and WINGS-CF networks that also create opportunities for peer exchange of experience and expertise.

The programme is managed by the WINGS Secretariat, and overseen by a working group consisting of Ruth Jones (Community Foundations of Canada), Olga Alexeeva (Charities Aid Foundation), David Winder (Synergos Institute) and Dorothy Reynolds (consultant to Charles Stewart Mott Foundation). Representatives of WINGS-CF One-2-One “alumni” have joined the group to share their first-hand knowledge.

In late 2004 the Association of Foundations (Philippines) was selected for support in 2005 through a competitive application process.

The proposal

AF’s application was for Maria Socorro (Marissa) Camacho-Reyes and Milagros (May) G. Corpuz to participate in a WINGS-CF One-2-One to learn in the area of community foundation development. Specifically, AF hoped the programme would address how to

1. determine a community’s readiness to organise a community foundation;
2. identify and provide technical assistance to people who will initiate and organise community foundations;
3. learn about types and extent of technical assistance provided by a support organisation to nurture community foundations, and technical assistance requested by community foundations; and
4. transform an existing NGO into a community foundation.

AF hoped that the exchange would strengthen its advocacy work for community foundations, provision of technical assistance to emerging community foundations, and development of manuals and other promotional and learning materials appropriate to the local context.

In consultation with the working group and the WINGS Secretariat, it was determined that Philanthropy Australia (PA) was a suitable match. PA agreed to host the visitors and to develop a programme. From PA’s side, the key staff were Andrew Lawson, Community Foundation Development Officer, and Jane Kenny, Membership Services Officer.

The programme

In an April 2005 conference call among representatives of AF, PA and the WINGS Secretariat, the participants agreed on the purpose and the objectives of the exchange, and scheduled the date of the exchange for June 2005. The date was later changed to September to suit the visitors.

PA, in consultation with the visitors, developed an itinerary that provided a number of opportunities to visit and meet community foundations, as well as to discuss community foundation support from the support organisation perspective. In addition, visits to a United

Way organisation and the Lord Mayor's Fund in Melbourne gave an opportunity to see other types of community philanthropy organisations. The following organisations were included in the itinerary:

Support organisations:

Catherine Brown & Associates, Melbourne
Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal, Bendigo
Philanthropy Australia (Melbourne and Sydney offices)

Community foundations:

Bendigo Community Fund
Geelong Community Foundation
Melbourne Community Foundation
Sydney Community Foundation
Tomorrow: Today Foundation, Benalla
Warrnambool Community Foundation (in development)
Wingecarribee Community Foundation, Bowral

Other organisations:

Lord Mayor's Charitable Fund, Melbourne
The Myer Foundation, Melbourne
United Way Geelong

The WINGS-CF One-2-One took place as planned from 18-29 September 2005. The detailed itinerary, with the names of organisations visited, the names of people met, and the types of activities, can be found in Appendix I: Itinerary.

Outcomes

The visitors from the Philippines gained a number of insights from the encounter with Australian models and experience of community foundation development. Specifically, they learned about

- the potential of community foundations to address needs and strengthen the community, in urban as well as rural settings and homogenous as well as diverse populations;
- the usefulness of a community foundation kit as well as templates for the incorporation papers to facilitate the beginnings of a community foundation;
- the importance of the legal and fiscal dimensions of a community foundation;
- the need or even requirement that a feasibility study be conducted to determine the readiness of a community for a community foundation, as well as its appropriate geographical coverage;
- the value of hiring an executive director early on, and to build a local board of trustees with a clear and transparent process, and with individuals who know what is expected of them (which does not necessarily include making personal financial contributions);
- Australian resource development strategies such as employee payroll giving and estate planning, and donor services such as named funds for wealthy families;
- the need at the support organisation level to have a dedicated senior staff in charge of community foundation development; and
- the need for patience and tolerance that some communities will take longer to form their community foundations than others.

Both visitors stressed the importance of casual conversations which gave them insights that are normally lost in more formal presentations. May found especially useful the interactions

with community foundation implementers in the rural areas, because “you get the flavour and nuances of community foundation work that cannot be adequately captured by just reading materials on community foundations”.

Marissa found of special value the discussions with board members of Geelong Community Foundation and Tomorrow: Today Foundation, who gave her “insights on how business people think and feel about their community and community foundations”. She also found their participation in the emerging Warrnambool Community Foundation instructive: “from this activity, I was able to observe how PA was giving technical assistance to a group in the process of organizing their community foundation.”

In addition, the visitors expressed appreciation that this visit expanded their network of community foundation practitioners as well as their exposure to Australian culture.

In regard to **next steps**, the visitors committed themselves to

- reporting back to their Community Foundation Committee at AF;
- adapting the Australian Community Foundation Kit to the Philippines (the Australian kit was itself based on a kit from Canada but had been reworked to fit the Australian environment);
- revising AF’s community foundation presentation material to make it suitable for a wider audience;
- adapting the Australian feasibility study design and questionnaire, and researching possible funding for conducting such studies in the Philippines;
- studying the legal and financial implications of community foundations; and
- identifying banks and other financial management and accounting firms to brief them about the concept of community foundations.

In regard to **benefits and learnings for Philanthropy Australia**, Andrew Lawson and Jane Kenny developed a better appreciation of the Philippine context of community foundation development and the organisational structure of the Association of Foundations.

Excerpts from the detailed comments of all participants can be found in Appendix II: Comments.

Another phase of evaluation will take place six months after the visit to determine what has happened as a result of the visit.

Summary

In sum, all objectives for this WINGS-CF One-2-One were met or exceeded, and all participants considered it a success. Evidently, the time invested in the preparing the programme was important. Said Marissa: “I think that for the programme to work, the visiting organization must be very clear on what they need and what they hope to learn from the visit. The pre-programme interactions between the visiting and host organizations are also very important.”

WINGS-CF will carefully absorb the experience and suggestions from this visit in running WINGS-CF One-2-One in 2006.

Appendix I: Itinerary

(adapted from Philanthropy Australia's report.)

DAY	AM	PM	Evening
Sun 18 Sept		Arrival Melbourne	Melbourne
Mon 19 Sept	<i>Philanthropy Australia</i>	1) <i>Catherine Brown & Associates</i> 2) <i>Melbourne Community Foundation</i>	Melbourne
Tues 20 Sept	Drive to Bendigo	1) <i>Bendigo Community Fund</i> 2) <i>Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal</i>	Benalla
Wed 21 Sept	<i>Tomorrow: Today Foundation, Benalla</i>		Geelong
Thurs 22 Sept	<i>United Way Geelong</i>	<i>Geelong Community Foundation</i>	Geelong
Fri 23 Sept	<i>Warrnambool Community Foundation Development</i>		Ocean Rd
Sat 24 Sept	Melbourne	Fly Melbourne to Sydney	Sydney
Sun 25 Sept	Sydney		Sydney
Mon 26 Sept	<i>Sydney Community Foundation</i>		Sydney
Tues 27 Sept	<i>Wingecarribee Community Foundation, Bowral</i>	Fly to Melbourne	Melbourne
Wed 28 Sept	<i>Lord Mayors Fund, Melbourne</i>	<i>The Myer Foundation Philanthropy Australia (Wrap up)</i>	Melbourne
Thurs 29 Sept	Return Flight to Manila		

Day 1, Mon 19 Sept

Marissa and May visited *Philanthropy Australia* to meet PA staff and discuss with them the work they do and the services they provide to members of PA. Marissa and May explained the workings of the Association of Foundations in the Philippines and the status of the community foundation movement in their country.

Following the PA meeting, Marissa and May met Catherine Brown of *Catherine Brown & Associates*. Catherine was instrumental in the design and development of the Community Foundation Kit, in which the Canadian kit was reworked to fit the Australian environment. Catherine was also the first Company Secretary of the *Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal (FRRR)*. She also continues to be involved with community foundation grant applications to FRRR, as well as working as a consultant to developing community foundations around the country.

The final meeting of the day was a visit to *Melbourne Community Foundation* to meet with CEO Andrea Rumph who explained the work of the MCF in the Melbourne.

Day 2, Tues 20 Sept

Marissa and May travelled to Bendigo with Andrew Lawson and met Sylvia Admans and the staff of the *FRRR*. Since formation in 2001, FRRR has had, as one of its objectives, the development of rural community foundations. Marissa and May were taken through the FRRR story and the work it does with developing community foundations.

From Bendigo the team moved on to Benalla and in the evening met with three board members of the *Tomorrow: Today Foundation*, as well as Barbara Alexander, the Executive Officer.

Day 3, Wed 21 Sept

Barbara Alexander took the team on a visit to one of the foundation's projects as well as on a tour of the Benalla Hospital. She explained the work of the Foundation in the Benalla region. From Benalla the team moved to Geelong.

Day 4, Thurs 22 Sept

In Geelong, Marissa and May met Anthony Wilson, the CEO of *United Way Geelong* and his team in the morning. This organisation raises \$2 million annually for 56 health and welfare agencies in Geelong. It was from a United Way initiative that the Geelong Community Foundation was formed.

In the afternoon, Marissa and May met Geoff Neilson, the Chairman of the *Geelong Community Foundation*. Andrew Lawson also participated in his role as Executive Officer of GCF. The history of GCF's development and seed funding was covered as well as the work of GCF up to the present.

Day 5, Fri 23 Sept

The team moved on to Warrnambool and attended a meeting of the formation committee which is working on the development of a community foundation for South West Victoria. The aim of the visit was for Marissa and May to see a group working through the issues prior to start up, such as selection of the board members.

Day 6, Sat 24 Sept

Return to Melbourne and flight to Sydney

Day 7, Sun 25 Sept

Sydney. Report writing and recreation.

Day 8, Mon 26 Sept

Marissa and May and Jane Kenny from the Sydney office of *Philanthropy Australia* met with Heather Kent from *Sydney Community Foundation*. Heather explained the set up of the SCF and how the Chair and various board members were recruited. As the Chair of the SCF has resigned recently, the Foundation is advertising the position. This fascinated Marissa, who explained that this is something that would not be done in the Philippines, for fear of offending unsuccessful candidates.

Heather also spoke about the challenges of promoting a community foundation in a large capital city, and convincing donors to give to an endowment fund. Accessing start up funds from government, both local and state, plus The Myer Foundation, has been an important step in seeing the SCF through its early days.

Following that meeting, Jane introduced Marissa and May to Gillian Harrison, a conference production manager for a private company. Gillian is currently organising a conference for advisers to high net worth individuals and had expressed interest in including a perspective on the Asian high net wealth market. Marissa talked extensively about the collaborative efforts between individuals, companies and government to alleviate poverty, and also the potential to tap into diaspora wealth.

Day 9, Tues 27 Sept

The visitors travelled to Bowral in the Southern Highlands of NSW to visit *Wingecarribee Community Foundation* (WCF). Director Helen McCue gave May and Marissa a wide-ranging analysis of the founding of WCF and its early days. She also spoke about the recruitment of the directors and volunteers and the areas that WCF supports. She gave the visitors several examples of fundraising techniques that WCF employs, as part of an overview

of their streams of income. Marissa and May were interviewed by a journalist from the local paper, providing an interesting story and giving additional profile to the WCF.

The visitors were then joined by a volunteer from the Foundation, Helen Saville, who took Marissa, May and Jane out to Radio MVH-FM, the local youth radio station that was funded with a grant from WCF. There the visitors met the station manager, Scott, and two young people who work as volunteers with the station, Krystal and Brendan. The two young announcers taped an interview with Marissa and May: "Ten Quick Questions", in which the two explained the purpose of their visit and outlined some of the youth endeavours that are funded by foundations in the Philippines.

Day 10, Wed 28 Sept

Back in Melbourne the morning visit was to meet Leigh Wallace and his team at the *Lord Mayor's Fund*, a long standing organisation that has been raising funds for charitable purposes in Melbourne. They have a United Way type of operation as well as an arm called the Greater Melbourne Community Foundation. Leigh Wallace explained the progress and development of this organisation and its work today.

Prior to a visit to meet The Myer Foundation, Andrew Lawson drew together all the parts of the visit and how all these organisations fit into the Australian community foundation scene today.

The final meeting of the day was with Christine Edwards, the CEO of *The Myer Foundation*. Christine explained the work of this Foundation and its role with FRRR and Australian community foundations. She also discussed her links with APPC and her knowledge of and links with people in the philanthropic field in Asia.

Appendix II: Comments

Maria Socorro Camacho-Reyes, Association of Foundations

Learnings/Insights:

1. The availability of the Community Foundation Kit is very useful for the groups that initiated and organized community foundations. Going through the kit, prior to actually deciding to organize a community foundation, gives the “core group” members an idea of what it takes to organize and maintain a community foundation. It can help weed out those who are not serious about a community foundation.
2. An important insight is the attention to the legal and financial implications of a community foundation. At first, I thought these were not relevant to the Philippine context. However, as I heard more about these two concerns, I realized that we have to revisit the legal and financial implications of community foundations in the Philippines.
3. To facilitate the organization of community foundations in the Philippines, it will be useful to come up with templates for the incorporation papers and the financial system that conform to the Securities and Exchange requirements.
4. The idea of conducting a feasibility study to determine the readiness of the community and feasibility of the geographical coverage of the community foundation was a critical learning. We (AF) have been grappling with the issue of what we should look at in order to decide whether it is feasible to organize a community foundation or not. Now, we can use the Australian model for the feasibility study and just adapt to the Philippine context. In Australia, the cost of a feasibility study is about AU\$5,000.
5. Another insight is the importance of hiring an Executive Director (no matter how part time) from the start. Even when the board members are active and committed, I realized that the development of the community foundation would be constrained to a great extent by the absence of an ED. At the start, while the community foundation does not have enough resources to actually pay for an ED, the ED can be a board member who agrees to devote a specific amount of time for the community foundation. Maybe the idea of a managing director (who volunteers his/her time) will work.
6. There is no science in identifying the composition of the board of trustees. What is important is that a process is followed with clear criteria for the selection. Some of the considerations that those we talked said worked are: a) can be trusted; b) has credibility and respected by the community; c) has skills/competence needed by the community foundation (finance/legal/etc); d) has a good network; e) must have the passion for the work (not just lending their name).
I think it is critical to have the responsibilities of the board members clearly spelled out so that the potential board members know what is expected of them.
7. The resource mobilization strategies I saw were very interesting – employee payroll and estate planning and the board members going on a “street program”. The employee payroll is the strategy that will yield immediate results. Estate planning is something we can look into for the future of community foundations. However, one thing I learned which could immediately be implemented is touching base with the big law offices, private bankers and accountants who have high net-worth individuals and families as clients.
8. The idea of “named accounts” seems like an attractive package to offer to wealthy individuals/families who are not wealthy enough to start their own foundation but have enough wealth to fund some programs.
9. At the AF level, I also realized the importance of having a person to concentrate on community foundations. The position need not be full time as demonstrated by the PA experience. The work of this person is really to provide technical assistance to all

- the groups that are organizing their community foundations and community foundation members of PA. It is important that the community foundation person is senior enough to be effective.
10. The types of technical assistance range from telephone consultations to email communications to participation of the PA person in community foundation meetings. Another important activity to support community foundations is organizing assemblies of community foundations. These activities are doable in the context of AF.
 11. The Australian experience shows that community foundations can work in rural as well as very urban setting (Sydney) where it is more difficult to feel the sense of community. Perhaps, the idea of a community foundation in Metro Manila or Cebu will work considering the wealth available and the pockets of poverty that have great need for assistance.
 12. The need for visibility in the community through the maximum use of local media. Our hosts used our visit as an opportunity to talk about community foundations.
 13. At the end of the day, the community foundation can only move as fast or as slow as the community wants it.
 14. Finally, I must say that I was inspired by the potential of community foundations in addressing the concerns of the community as well as in strengthening the community spirit.

Recommendations/Plans:

1. The first thing that we would like to do is convene the community foundation committee to give them feedback about what we learned from the program.
2. Develop a Philippine version of the Community Foundation Kit.
3. Study the legal and financial implications of community foundations. For this purpose, we need to seek the help of the AF corporate secretary.
4. AF will also review the feasibility study design and questionnaire used by PA and adapt a version appropriate for the Philippine setting.
5. Look into how we can fund the feasibility studies for the pilot areas for community foundations. An initial suggestion is to request the Peace and Equity Foundation for assistance for the feasibility study.
6. We will also review our community foundation presentation materials which is basically addressed to NGOs. We hope to revise the community foundation presentation to address all members of the community.
7. Identify legal and accounting firms and private bankers who have high net worth individuals and families as clients and brief them about community foundations.

Milagros G. Corpuz, Association of Foundations

Learnings / Insights:

- **On Philanthropy Australia (PA)**

1. Having a part time Community Foundation Development Officer in the person of Andrew Lawson, with Jane Kenny assisting him in Sydney, is a facilitating factor in the growth of community foundations in Australia. This speaks of the seriousness of PA to mainstream community foundation work as a parallel development effort to government. The importance of having one person tasked with community foundation development cannot be overstated as communities need someone to be able to consult every now and then as they progress in their community foundation work. Andrew provides not only the technical support but the nurturing aspect in an evolving community foundation.
2. PA's ability to engage existing expertise (e.g. legal and accounting) for pro bono work for community foundations is noteworthy.
3. Keeping in touch through meetings, teleconferences, and e-groups are important. Everyone involved in community foundation work must be put on board at all times to be able to track developments and secure the needed assistance.

- **On Community Foundation Operations in Australia**

1. **The market is big enough.** In Geelong, the United Way and the Geelong Community Foundation have segmented the market for funds sourcing in such a way that the competition for donors is eliminated. United Way focuses more on corporate donations for grant giving while Geelong Community Foundation looks to individual donations and bequests. For a first world community, this is feasible. For a developing country like the Philippines, I am inclined to suggest and encourage just one community foundation covering a particular geographic area. Competition for scarce resources is a major constraint to contend with.
2. **The areas for grant giving in Australia have to do mostly with care for the aged, youth participation, protection of the environment, beautification, arts and culture.** This is to be expected of a developed country. In the Philippines, the areas for grant giving would involve more the basics: providing income generating projects, food security, health, education etc.
3. **The selection process for a community foundation board member or chair is an exercise of prerogative, consistent with the principle of autonomy or independence.** The Sydney Community Foundation chose to advertise for the position of a board chair. While this may appear off track or an unusual practice, the board members agreed to this course of action. They may or may not succeed in doing this. But what matters, I think, is that a collegial decision was reached. Applicants to the position, in turn, must expect to be rejected in favor of someone else, by their implicit agreement to this mode of selection.
4. **The making of a personal contribution to the community foundation corpus by board members as a gesture of commitment, is not a "must" requirement, contrary to what some materials on community foundations I have read might say.** While the Melbourne Community Foundation board members make annual contributions, other community foundations we visited do not carry this policy. Again, this is a local issue that must be settled locally.

5. **The gestation period for a community foundation varies and is a function of the level of enthusiasm and commitment of a small working group.** Some community foundations we visited took two to three years to come to operational terms. But others are taking longer. We witnessed a meeting of the steering committee for the Warrnambool Community Foundation. This particular community foundation is now four years in the making. They are finalizing their business plan and are in the process of inviting board members. Ms. Josie Black figures as the moving spirit behind the emerging community foundation. The steering group also commissioned the preparation of the business plan to a consulting group for a modest fee. This is an example of another “out-of-the-box” reality in the field. While others would prefer to have a direct hand in the crafting of a business plan for their own community foundation, Warrnambool chose to do it differently. This was a collective decision, though. And in the end, what matters is that the exercise of decision making is representative and collegial.
 6. **The conduct of a feasibility study is a necessary first step to establishing a community foundation.** Whatever form or extensiveness this feasibility study will take, some assessment must be made to ensure that establishing a community foundation is the right track for the community. Because the need for a community foundation must not be imposed but must be a desire by the community borne out of an objective analysis of strengths and potential. The Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal (FRRR) has been very helpful in giving grants for feasibility studies. This might be one track that can be explored in the Philippines – to tap a grant maker that is willing to invest in feasibility studies for community foundations. One other possibility would be to partner with a local research or academic institution so that the students can participate in the conduct of the feasibility study as part of the school requirement for community service.
 7. **Board members must have shared values in relation to the community they are serving.** In the Wingecarribee Community Foundation, one board member who is from the local government had to give up his seat apparently because of differing values with the rest of the board. While a community foundation board should be as heterogeneous as possible in terms of the interests that are represented, it is also important that, among the board, there is a comfortable level of shared values and interests to facilitate an enabling environment for community foundation work.
- **On a More Personal Level**
 1. This WINGS-CF program expanded my network of contacts for community foundation work. Because there was enough time for interaction with our counterparts at PA, I feel I can go back to them anytime for consultation and assistance in community foundation work. Their generosity in sharing knowledge, tips, and materials is a real encouragement.
 2. I have done quite a lot of reading on community foundations and I made sure that I read the community foundation manual of PA before leaving for Melbourne. But the actual experience of “being there” and interacting with the key people in community foundation work in Australia engendered a better appreciation of all my readings.
 3. The program was very well designed as it provided a balance between community foundation exposure and exposure to the Australian culture, as well. The free weekend of Sept 24-25 also afforded us an opportunity to bond with family living in Sydney and to see more of Australia, which is not part of the official program.

Next Steps

- **Community Foundation Manual for AF:** After developing the community foundation primer for AF and experiencing this WINGS-CF One-2-One Program, I think a next logical course of action would be to develop a similar “how to” manual for community foundations in the Philippines.
- **Report to Community Foundation Committee:** There is a need to convene again the community foundation committee to lay out other plans and to fast track the development of community foundations in the country.

Andrew Lawson and Jane Kenny, Philanthropy Australia

What did Philanthropy Australia learn from this Visit?

Marissa is the Chairperson of the Community Foundations Committee of the Association of the Philippines (AF).

AF is a network of 150 foundations and non-government organisations nationwide. 85 – 90% of members are grant seekers. Marissa is also the Executive Director of the Jollibee Foundation which is a corporate foundation organised and funded by Jollibee Corporation, the largest fast food chain in the Philippines.

May is the Grants Officer of the Philippines Centre for Population and Development or (PCPD), a social development grant giving foundation whose areas of interest are population and development policy research and advocacy.

PCPD is a member of AF.

AF has a community foundations committee which is exploring the community foundation concept for the Philippines. May does briefings on community foundations and was responsible for developing a primer on community foundations in the Philippines.

Research on organisations in the Philippines has come up with one body that could be considered as acting in the role of a community foundation. This model and its fund raising were developed by the current Cardinal of Manila prior to him ascending to his current role in the Catholic Church.

The model has a very successful fund raising program that has succeeded in the region where it was started. Note that individuals do not receive tax deductions for gifts, but are prepared to give nonetheless.

The aim is to trial some community foundations in the Philippines with projects such as micro credit being a key priority.

Overall, this visit from the Philanthropy Australia point of view is considered to have been very successful with our objectives being met. We now have a good understanding of philanthropy in the Philippines and the status of the community foundation movement in particular.