

ASIA PACIFIC PHILANTHROPY CONSORTIUM

**STRENGTHENING PHILANTHROPY IN THE ASIA PACIFIC:
AN AGENDA FOR ACTION**

Background Paper: The Philippines

July 2001

INTRODUCTION

In 1998, a number of philanthropic organizations formed a loose and informal association of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), networks of NGOs, academic institutions, corporate foundations and donors, called the Philippine Philanthropy Steering Committee. Its purpose is to continually promote the growth of Philippine philanthropy. Steering Committee members meet regularly, taking turns hosting gatherings. Through these meetings, members have provided input and direction on each other's programs, and, as a result, work more harmoniously together and minimize duplication of effort. The Steering Committee has also provided input to the work of such donors as The Synergos Institute, The Japan Foundation, The Asia Foundation and the Ford Foundation, as well as to the Asia Pacific Philanthropy Consortium.

CONTEXT OF PHILANTHROPY IN THE PHILIPPINES

Filipinos are a generous people, giving what they can to be helpful to others. The "bayanihan" spirit, exemplified by a community acting as one to help its members, whether to move a house or till the soil, best captures Philippine generosity. Catholicism, the predominant religion on the islands, reinforces neighborliness and charitable giving. The Church's centuries-old relationship with believers has ingrained the attitude of fulfilling one's obligations to give to the Church and to those less fortunate. The Church, therefore, has been the most popular recipient of individual and corporate gifts, although the amounts involved are modest.ⁱ

The practice of giving was institutionalized outside the Church in the early 1950s.ⁱⁱ Leaders of welfare agencies that had supported post-war relief and reconstruction work expanded their social work through "umbrella" organizations. The Philippine National Committee of the International Council on Social Welfare (later called the Council of Welfare Foundations of the Philippines, and known today as the National Council of Social Development Foundations of the Philippines) was formed in 1952. The Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement was also organized that year.

In the mid-1960s, underdevelopment in the countryside and urban poverty placed the country in a state of social and political turmoil. Different sectors of Philippine society were drawn to action, channeling resources to address poverty and other social issues. The Church set up the National Secretariat for Social Action in 1967. The business community formed Philippine Business for Social Progress in 1970 with an initial 50 members giving a fixed percentage of pre-tax income. The Bishops-Businessmen's Conference for Human Development was formed in 1971. Ten private foundations created the Association of Foundations in 1972 (growing to 40 members in a few years). Cooperatives wanting to work together set up the Visayas Cooperative Development Center in 1970 and the Mindanao-based Credit-Life Mutual Benefit Services Association in 1971. The cooperative movement became national in scope with the establishment of the National Association of Training Centers of Cooperatives in 1977.

NGO activism developed quickly in the 20 years of Marcos' dictatorship. Starting with church activism using the "Theology of Liberation" model, NGOs developed organizing and program delivery capacities in rural and urban areas. NGOs set up networks supporting sectoral alliances of peasants, labor and youth. Networking drew regional support, forming such groups as the Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in the Rural Areas in 1983.

In the 1986 "people power" revolt that finally toppled the Marcos dictatorship, NGOs were a driving force behind grassroots organizations that helped to unite the country at this critical moment. Thereafter, NGOs and peoples' organizations became more widely recognized for what they could help the country to realize. Their role in national development was articulated and provided for in the 1987 Constitution. There developed a basic unity in the NGO movement and a common agreement to expand programs and influence policy. In this effort, international development organizations gave to and supported NGO activities. In 1989, one of the largest and most vibrant of networks emerged, the Caucus of Development NGO Networks or CODE NGO, providing leadership on innovative development programs.

In the task of nation building, NGOs, the business sector and others found new ways to channel resources to respond to development needs. Relief and rehabilitation work in the wake of the 1990 earthquake and 1991 Mt. Pinatubo eruption produced the Corporate Network for Disaster Response, founded in 1990. As more corporate foundations were set up to do community relations and other activities, the League of Corporate Foundations was established in 1992 to support these foundations through training.

In the last few years, the NGO sector has come together with peoples' organizations and citizens' movements to bring about a renewed sense of "civil society" in the country. Today, the arena of civil society allows for broader participation among like-minded and not so like-minded institutions. For instance, the Philippine Philanthropy Steering Committee, mentioned earlier, regularly convenes venues for information sharing and reflection among big and small networks of NGOs, old and new NGOs, corporate and independent foundations, and foreign and local donors. The Steering Committee has facilitated partnerships in which more experienced NGOs assist less experienced NGOs on many aspects of management through training and consulting services, including program development, implementation and monitoring, and fundraising.

PATTERNS AND LEVELS OF PHILANTHROPIC GIVING

A. Individual Giving

The most recently published study on individual gift-giving habits of Filipinos¹ has been provided by the organization, Venture for Fund Raising. In its August 1999 to March 2000 survey covering seven cities and provinces, findings affirm the Filipinos' strong "culture of giving," even in times of difficulty and poverty.ⁱⁱⁱ Incidences of giving were uniformly high in all areas, with money/cash donations as the preferred form of gifts. In-

¹ A follow up survey focusing on Metro Manila has been completed, but the results have not been released.

kind giving was not popular. The amount of giving per household (cash and in-kind) varied widely, from a low of P 107 in a remote province to P 2,130 in the country's capital.² The relative amounts seemed to correspond to the area's relative income level. Churches and other religious institutions were principal beneficiaries, although the amounts given per donor were small. Next to churches, social service groups and culture and recreations groups were preferred beneficiaries. Between direct (informal) and indirect (through institutions) giving, Filipinos tended to choose the former, that is, giving to individuals. However, when they did give to institutions, the amount given was substantially more. In Venture's follow up survey,^{iv} focused on giving in Metro Manila, solicitations (cash) by relatives or friends and solicitations at the workplace and through special events were more effective than telephone and media appeals.

B. Giving by the Community

A clear picture of the capacity of communities to give for community-based activities involving schools is provided through a study commissioned by the Department of Education, Culture and Sports (DECS), with the support of the Asian Development Bank (Decentralization of Basic Education Management, March 2001). Because there is very little support in the DECS budget for schools, resources are raised within the community. The alumni are not yet a source of support. The local government unit is a source of sustained and institutionalized support. Its link is the active and committed parent-teacher-community associations (PTCA).

The single largest annual fund collection within communities is the forced contribution "authorized" by the central DECS.^v At the time of school enrollment, parents make contributions to the schools amounting to P 120 a year per child. The estimated national collection for elementary and secondary schools is upwards of P 1.75 billion annually (for comparison, the annual school building fund of the entire DECS is P 2 billion). The community has long complained about this forced contribution, since the money could be better spent on children's food and clothing. The newly appointed secretary of DECS has issued an order stopping all "authorized" contributions and any other payments at the time of enrollment^{vi} to enforce the law that public education is free and that all children should be able to attend school.

Another source of funds for schools is the parent-teacher-community association (PTCA). The PTCA is usually set up simultaneously with the founding of a school. It has two sources of funds: regular membership fees and other forms of contributions agreed upon by the membership to meet the resource requirements of school projects.^{vii} There are no estimates available on the amount of these contributions.

C. Giving to Churches

The Roman Catholic Church and the Iglesia ni Cristo Church (INC) receive millions of pesos annually from the faithful. While there are no studies available that quantify this

² Amounts are given in Philippine pesos. The current exchange rate is approximately P50 = US\$1.

giving practice, there are known figures that demonstrate the level of people's generosity to churches.

Fr. Antonio Pascual, Director of CARITAS and Vice President of Radio Veritas (two organizations established by the Roman Catholic Church), provided some insights for the purpose of this paper.^{viii} He confirmed the findings of the Venture for Fund Raising survey, which stated that many people give to the Church, but give modestly. Giving to Church renewal movements, however, is much more substantial (in terms of both cash donations and volunteer work). In the 1960s, renewal movements (the kursillo movement, marriage encounter, the charismatic movement) revitalized the worship practices of churchgoers and significantly increased the incidence of individual giving. The growth of the El Shaddai ("God of the Poor") movement, whose membership is in the millions, has been phenomenal. The movement's highly charismatic leader can persuade crowds to spend nights worshipping in Manila's sprawling Luneta Park. The El Shaddai members are mostly the poor, yet they give to their charismatic leader in amounts totaling P 200 million a year. By comparison, the wealthy Archdiocese of Manila (supported by over 300 parishes in the city) receives P 500 million a year. Another renewal movement, Couples for Christ (unique for being propelled by organizational "charisma" rather than by an individual charismatic leader), receives over P 100 million a year from its members.

Renewal movements that practice tithing are assured a sizeable amount of funds. In tithing, ten percent of an individual's gross personal income must go to one's church. Tithing finds its basis in the Old Testament scriptures that speak of fulfilling one's obligation to support the church and the poor. The Iglesia ni Cristo, a Protestant church with 4.5 million members, also practices "ten percent tithing" and closely monitors the participation of its members in church activities. The amount of contributions the church has received has not been made public, even to church members.

Because Filipinos are highly personalistic, the level of giving depends a lot on the charisma of the religious leader and his creativity in leading the people to worship. Fr. Pascual, then chaplain of Greenbelt Chapel, inspired churchgoers who were professionals working in Makati, the country's premiere business district, to give generously. When he was assigned to the Chapel in 1992, giving was about P 200,000 a month. It increased to more than P 1 million a month by 1997. Fr. Pascual attributed this increase to the quality of Greenbelt Chapel's services, good homilies by priests and inspiring liturgical ministries. The importance of an apostolate for the poor (for street children and Caritas Manila's scholarship programs, as examples) was also stressed. Finally, the Greenbelt community received monthly statements on how funds were used. Following the traditional usage of funds by the Church, 90 percent went to religious instruction and worship/formation and ten percent went to a social apostolate.

D. Corporate Giving

Data from the League of Corporate Foundations

Approximate levels of corporate giving are provided by 1996-1998 data from the League of Corporate Foundations (LCF).^{ix} LCF has a membership of 42 corporate foundations and eight corporations with social development programs and corporate networks. In a two-year period, LCF developed a combined asset base of P 4 billion. Close to P 1 billion was spent on programs in a one-year period: in education (engaged in by 82 percent of LCF members), entrepreneurship development (38 percent), community development (35 percent), environmental protection (33 percent) and in housing and related services (33 percent). The work of LCF members covers not one but several of these areas and includes other concerns, such as health, arts and culture, disaster relief management, advocacy, rural development, cooperative development, institutional development and communications development.

In mid-2001, the LCF Subcommittee on Education published the results of its March 2000 survey on giving to various educational causes by LCF members. Twenty-one of the 50 member firms set aside a total of P 71.64 million for scholarship grants for the 1999-2000 school year. The survey also revealed that while LCF members reported having been affected by the 1997 Asian financial crisis, most of these companies increased their 1998 budgets for scholarship grants by as much as 75 percent over 1996 levels. Furthermore, six companies started seven new scholarship programs worth P 4.8 million during the economic crunch. Most of the scholarship recipients were beneficiaries (dependents) of employees.

LCF members implemented other education activities, including sponsorships of public school science fairs (Intel), the Annual Search for Outstanding Teachers Program (Metrobank), support for computer laboratories in public schools (Citibank), and support for the Adopt-a-School Project of the Department of Education, Culture and Sports (supported by 12 companies in the amount of P 140 million in 2000).

Recent Figures on Corporate Giving to PBSP^x

Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP) is a nonprofit foundation comprised of leading corporations that collectively make grants in social development. Member companies contribute 20 percent of one percent of their net income before taxes annually, reserving the remaining 80 percent for their own social development programs. PBSP has tracked membership contributions in the last four years (1996-2000) and reported that an aggregate figure of P 153.35 million was received, which comprised 21 percent of the foundation's total revenues. In addition, about P 57.6 million came from non-member companies, both local and foreign companies (in the form of grants and other contributions). The total of P 211 million from corporate sources indicates that PBSP is effectively mobilizing 29 percent of its total revenues from businesses.

PBSP has used the contributions from member companies to leverage grants from local and foreign sources (corporate and non-corporate). As a result, the foundation has been able to generate greater total revenues. In the last four years, grants have amounted to P 458 million, or 63 percent, of total revenues. This four-year period of revenue mix is

consistent with other years and indicates that while PBSP receives substantial support locally, a larger source of funds are derived from abroad.

From year to year since 1996, corporate giving to PBSP has been somewhat erratic and, in general, showing a downward trend. In 1996-1997, member company contributions peaked at P 50 million. The following year, as the effects of the financial crisis were felt, member companies reduced their contributions, citing consistent business losses. Another reason given for the reduction was that companies were setting up their own corporate foundations. Contributions improved in 1999, but in 2000, they again declined, due to mergers within the financial sector. Specifically, PBSP did not realize contributions from at least three member companies that were among the top banks in the country. Companies also cited the unfavorable business climate created by the uncertainty in political leadership.³

In 2001, as the country welcomed President Macapagal-Arroyo as its new leader, PBSP's executive director, Mr. Gil Salazar, expressed the Board's optimism that the business climate would begin to improve and that the Board would be able to generate support from its member companies to meet the year's target of P 32 million. In general, PBSP is able to collect membership dues from about 100 of its 160 member companies.

PBSP believes that funds are available locally for philanthropic activities. Its 30-year practice of stable fixed giving of 20 percent of one percent indicates that there is a potential source of funds that could be channeled to non-profit organizations nationwide. PBSP membership represents only a fraction of the total number of corporations doing business in The Philippines. Its membership companies comprise only ten percent of the 1,000 top corporations in the country. PBSP believes that more companies today are aware of the need to respond to deepening social issues, and will do so as part of their social responsibility. Some companies that have declined to pledge the annual 20 percent of one percent have been willing instead to give a sizeable one-time contribution.

In PBSP's experience, companies will generally support and fund projects that are practical and related to their core businesses. They will give for industrial peace and an improved business climate. There is an increase of giving to specific causes, including the environment, health, education and urban poverty, but this also depends on the effectiveness of the fundraising activities. PBSP's annual golf tournament and Christmas dinner gala have produced increasing profits since they were started five years ago because there is a clear sense of purpose to the fundraising effort (coastal environment regeneration) and because the events are enjoyable for business people. The private sector is also more willing to recognize and support opportunities for tri-sectoral partnerships with government and civil society as a means of responding to larger issues hindering the country's development, specifically poverty among the majority of Filipinos, lack of quality education and deteriorating conditions in the environment.

³ At the time, then President Estrada was impeached for corrupt and illegal practices and was being tried by the Senate.

Corporate Giving Surveys

In 1992 and 1993, PBSP produced two surveys on patterns and levels of giving nationwide. Some 249 companies reported giving a total of approximately P 295 million in 1992. For 1993, 204 companies gave a total of approximately P 309 million. Average grantmaking per company was only about P 2.66 million in 1992 and about P 2.9 million in 1993. The Asian Institute of Management, Center for Corporate Responsibility, is currently conducting a third survey using the same PBSP survey tools. The results are not yet available.

CURRENT ISSUES

ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

The legal and regulatory environment for civil society organizations in the Philippines is generally deemed to be favorable. Starting with the Aquino government in 1986 and continuing through the Ramos government in 1998, civil society organizations (CSOs) were able to intensify their role in nation-building. In 1990, partly in response to the increasing number of fly-by-night NGOs, the sector undertook initiatives that would enable it to be self-regulating. A Covenant on Philippine Development was ratified in December 1991. A few years later, with the enactment of the Comprehensive Tax Reform Program and its provision eliminating the tax deductibility of donations to CSOs, the sector made a proposal to government for a self-accreditation mechanism based on agreed-upon criteria. With this certification, CSOs could attain donee institution status, giving their donors a tax deduction for their contributions. The Philippine Council for NGO Certification (PCNC) was thus organized by the country's largest national NGO networks, including the Association of Foundations, the League of Corporate Foundations, the Philippine Business for Social Progress, the Bishops-Businessmen's Conference for Human Development, the Caucus of Development NGO Networks, and the National Council for Social Development Foundations. PCNC's goal goes beyond ensuring donee institution status for CSOs. It also commits to promoting professionalism, accountability and transparency of CSOs. PCNC seeks to provide CSOs with a "seal of good housekeeping," thus helping them pass the scrutiny of donors.

Public awareness of the critical role of CSOs has grown over the years. One form of acknowledgement is the government's invitation of CSO leaders to key positions in local and national agencies, as well as in the Cabinet. After the "People Power" events in 1986 and in January 2001, in which CSOs were widely known to have contributed to effective nationwide mass protests, CSO leaders took the helm in government programs for agrarian reform, social welfare and development, housing and urban poor assistance.

There has also been greater media awareness of CSO programs through feature stories and regular coverage of environmental and social development issues. CSO leaders submitted editorials on corporate philanthropy, but this has been difficult to sustain because of lack of time to prepare materials.

INTER-SECTORAL RELATIONS

The CSO community has been linking with the academic community in several ways. One is in the development of databases for survey results and the consolidation of directories. The University of the Philippines has been involved in primary and secondary research on Philippine NGOs (Johns Hopkins University Research on the Third Sector) and has made this information available to members of the Philippine Philanthropic Steering Committee. A linkage is being explored by the CSO and academic communities to use hands-on experience in development management and other nonprofit management courses. Presently, there is no melding of theory and practice to enrich nonprofit management and other courses.

Civil society organization leaders and top officials of the public and the private sectors came together for the conference, “Effective Governance: A Tri-Sectoral Concern,” in February 2000 in Makati City. The goal was to map out strategies on policy reforms in three areas of governance that would fast-track economic development: preparation for an open economy, the efficient use and allocation of public resources, and institution building to improve the management capacities of National Government Agencies and Local Government Units.^{xi} The overarching theme was poverty alleviation and the conceptual framework was that the entrepreneurial poor must be supported to become the pillars of the national economy. The conference had a forward-looking agenda of Asset Reform, Educational Reform and Government Regulatory Mechanisms.

CSO leaders and government policy makers have contributed to a changing political landscape through advocacy programs.^{xii} The Aquino and Ramos administrations provided opportunities for policy reform in which CSO advocacy activities were legitimized. CSOs and government have successfully engaged in such issues as aquatic reform, agrarian reform, ancestral domain rights, foreign debt service, women and children’s rights, housing and urban development and the government budgeting process.

CHALLENGES AND CONSTRAINTS TO SUSTAINABLE FUNDING

Attitudes and behaviors were examined by the Philippine Philanthropy Steering Committee through discussions on emerging developments impacting civil society. The most important development is the change in the political administration, renewing Filipinos’ hopes for long-lasting reforms. President Macapagal-Arroyo’s main agenda focuses on economic recovery, agricultural programs, immediate assistance to workers through micro-finance and integrated social services. In pursuit of this agenda, the government is encouraging greater participation from civil society and its volunteer groups. Mr. Danilo Songco, National Coordinator of the Caucus of Development NGO Networks, expressed confidence that donors will want to show support for the new government by funding new programs. He suggested that civil society organizations should find ways to work more effectively with donors by first engaging in dialogue to identify a better match between what donors want to fund and what CSOs seek to

accomplish. CSOs should be able to influence donor priorities rather than the other way around.

CSOs must invest in four areas of relevance to institutional/organizational development.

- 1) *Human Resource Development.* There is a need to retool CSO skills to respond to demands in the development market. There is also a need to increase the knowledge base on civil society trends and what impacts its work. CSOs should be challenged to develop into stable, effective intermediaries.
- 2) *Advocacy.* On information technology, CSOs must accelerate the production of the civil society-managed Development Information Portal project. On advocacy for more development-oriented spending by government, CSOs should participate in the Arroyo Administration's open budget consultations to exert influence at the national level, leading to opportunities for influencing local government units (local councils and other special bodies), where it is more critical that citizens be involved. People should know the public service budgets of their barangay (smallest political unit) and hold government officials accountable and transparent.
- 3) *Community Empowerment.* The need to increase projects is more critical than ever, yet NGOs lack effective community organizing skills. Community organizing can help communities identify their needs and sensitize donors to these needs. New and more effective models of community organizing should be explored.
- 4) *Citizenship Programs.* Citizenship programs should be supported in the long term by a cadre of development leaders who can do joint agenda-setting with government officials in order to encourage more value-based leadership and demand accountability from institutions. Through volunteerism and internships, CSOs can work on building a greater constituency for responsible citizenship.

RESPONSES AND NEW DEVELOPMENTS

There are some exciting prospects for sustainably financing development efforts in The Philippines. One prospect builds on two perpetual NGO-managed financing mechanisms that were established through debt swap arrangements in order to finance sustainable enterprises and the environment. The Foundation for the Philippine Environment was set up in 1993 through USAID with a US \$22 million fund, while the Foundation for a Sustainable Society, Inc. was similarly set up in 1996 with a US \$17 million endowment. Currently, there are initiatives for more NGO consortium-managed endowments by foreign donors who are interested in supporting the Philippines, even though they plan to phase out their development assistance in the country.

Another prospect is a serious exploration among civil society organizations, especially CODE NGO, to float development bonds worth P 10 billion using market-based mechanisms to make funds available in perpetuity for poverty alleviation initiatives. This

could be a potentially large local source of development financing. Negotiations with the government and the investment banking community are proceeding rapidly.

To respond to these prospects, the Philippine Philanthropy Steering Committee is recommending the pursuit of four major areas: Knowledge Networking, Capacity Building, Civic Education and Critical Engagement/Advocacy.

(a) *Knowledge Networking* – to build relevant knowledge

- Access to information and information analysis should be provided by databases and other research. The Development Information Portal should be made operational to integrate and link existing complementary databases.
- Case studies should be used for program implementation and evaluation, policy development, and capacity building and training.
- Linkages with the academic community should be established for development management courses in collaboration with the Department of Education, Culture and Sports.

(b) *Capacity Building* – to build stable, effective intermediary institutions that are more independent of donors

- For the financial sustainability of CSOs, standards for transparency and accountability must be observed. These standards can only strengthen organizational management and credibility in the community. Both the government and civil society sector should encourage the certification process of the Philippine NGO Council for Certification, as it establishes management and organizational standards that provide credibility not only to organizations, but also to the entire sector.
- Volunteer/internship programs should be developed to enlarge the constituency for development work. Volunteer and internship programs help others recognize the value of civil society's work, which may result in more resources for the sector, both from corporate and individual philanthropic activities.
- The successor generation program should be accelerated to ensure that a cadre of development leaders is maintained, in order to sustain the hard-earned gains of CSO interventions. The present leadership's knowledge, skills and passion for social change must be "passed on" to provide continuity in development work. New modes of mentoring should be developed for civil society staff, in order to create successor generation leaders in civil society.

(c) *Civic Education* – to build a constituency for responsible citizenship

- Civic education programs should be formed to produce community and elected leaders with a sincere service orientation. They should also increase active citizen participation in community government.
- New models for community organizing should be sought; perhaps models that work more quickly and could effectively identify community needs and concerns.

(d) *Critical Engagement/Advocacy*

- The present government provides a venue for engagement with civil society and business at the national and local levels. CSOs should learn to maximize tri-sectoral

- dialogues and joint ventures with government and business, as well as learn to hold regular forums with donors to influence donor programming.
- Work with the media is critical, in order to popularize CSO activities.

CONCLUSION

At the national level, the Philippine Philanthropy Steering Committee has formed sub-committees to study program priorities and develop more concrete action agendas on the four major areas identified above. The action agendas are expected to be completed by mid-2001.

At the international level, linkages that must be developed between national and international players and for philanthropy in general should utilize consultations and the agenda prepared by the Steering Committee. There should be greater utilization of electronic media for international networking and to establish solidarity. The Development Information Portal project is critical in this regard. E-groups and websites should be more widely used by CSOs to engage international counterparts in dialogue.

Emphasis should be placed on strengthening regional networking because of the shared geographical and political milieu. Needed skills should be carefully identified and brought in from the larger international sphere.

PARTICIPANTS OF THIS PAPER

This paper was developed from a meeting held by the Philippine Philanthropy Steering Committee on March 13, 2001 at the Eugenio Lopez Training Center in Antipolo City. The meeting was organized by the Ayala Foundation and co-facilitated by the Ayala Foundation and the Philippine Business for Social Progress. Fifteen (15) heads and representatives of NGOs, networks of NGOs, corporate foundations and academic institutions participated in the meeting, including the Synergos Institute, the Japan Foundation and The Asia Foundation. Discussions began with a refresher on what participants had set out to do three years ago (what they called the “unified agenda”). The paper includes information provided at a subsequent meeting of the Steering Committee (held May 23), specifically the Venture for Fund Raising’s informal report on its follow up survey. The paper also draws from information made available by recent documentation and studies about giving in the Philippines, although a comprehensive and organized study about giving was not available. Last but not least, several heads of NGOs, a church leader and a government official gave their input and reflections on the subject.

The paper was prepared by Rory F. Tolentino, Executive Director of the Ayala Foundation, and Eugenio Caccam, Jr., Associate Director of the Philippine Business for Social Progress. Cristina V. Pavia of the PBSP-Training and Consultancy Group provided assistance.

List of Participants

Celine Agas (League of Corporate Foundations)
Alan Alegre (Foundation for Media Alternatives)
Maribel Buenaobra (The Asia Foundation)
Eugene Caccam (Philippine Business for Social Progress)
Irma Cosico (ABS-CBN Foundation)
Lydia Enrile (Sarmiento Foundation)
Oman Jiao (Association of Foundations)
Jean Laguerder (Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement)
Madeleine Nicolas (Japanese Foundation, Manila Office)
Trin Panganiban (Venture for Fund Raising)
Fely Rixhon (Children and Youth Foundation of the Philippines)
Fely Soledad (Philippine Council for NGO Certification)
Dan Songco (Caucus of Development NGOs)
Rory Tolentino (Ayala Foundation)
Gina Velasco (The Synergos Institute)

End Notes:

ⁱ *Investing in Ourselves*, Venture for Fund Raising, Mandaluyong City, 2001.

ⁱⁱ This section relies heavily on the discussion of the context of Philippine NGO work in Alan Alegre's "Trends and Traditions, Challenges and Choices: A Strategic Study of Philippine NGOs," Ateneo Center for Social Policy and Public Affairs, Quezon City, 1996.

ⁱⁱⁱ The following section synthesizes the survey findings of the Venture for Fund Raising Project 2000. See *Investing in Ourselves*, Venture for Fund Raising, 2001.

^{iv} Informal report by Jaime Faustino at the meeting of the Philippine Philanthropic Steering Committee, May 23, 2001.

^v Includes contributions for Girl/Boy Scouts Membership, Girl/Boy Scouts Sustaining Membership, Philippine National Red Cross, Anti-Tuberculosis, School Publication.

^{vi} Interview with Deeda Villadolid, Director and Chief of Staff, Office of the Secretary of DECS, June 2, 2001.

^{vii} DECS Report, Decentralization of Basic Education Management, Part II Section 4 on School Finance, March 2001, p.68.

^{viii} Interview with Fr. Antonio Pascual, Quezon City, May 30, 2001.

^{ix} Notes from LCF memorandum, April 2001.

^x Paper presented by Gil Salazar at the 9th Asia-Pacific Fund Raising Workshop on *Financial Self-Reliance for CSOs: Looking at the Options*, April, 2001, Bali, Indonesia.

^{xi} *Effective Governance: A Tri-Sectoral Concern of Philippine Civil Society, Government and Business*, PBSP Technical Monograph, June 2000.

^{xii} Co, Edna. *Beating the Drums: Advocacy for Policy Reform in the Philippines*, Oxfam Great Britain, 1999.