

## World Café «Global Philanthropy»

Hosted by Theresa Gehringer, Center for Philanthropy Studies (CEPS)

This World Café aimed to look at Global Philanthropy from different angels: from its various understandings to developments and trends in practice as well as challenges that global programs or philanthropic activities dealing with global issues (e.g. climate change) face.

As in the economy, the borders of nations play hardly any role in solving social or ecologic problems. At the same time, there are national to nationalistic tendencies that prevent a common solution to global problems.



Silvia Bastante de Unverhau, Managing Director at Co-Impact **«The SDGs»** 

In her input, Silvia Bastante de Unverhau talked about the poor date availability concerning global philanthropic activity. She stresses the importance of data for informed decision-making, especially when philanthropic activities are

concerned with SDGs. For this reason, UBS has funded the Global Philanthropy Report, which is the first comprehensive analysis of global philanthropic practices and trends. The report was authored by researchers at the Hauser Institute for Civil Society at Harvard University. Results show, that the sector is highly concentrated [60 % of the total foundations are in Europe and 35 % in North America; 60% of foundation assets are concentrated in the US and 37% in Europe], growing [nearly 75% of identified foundations were established in the last 25 years] but without real collaboration [with rather short-term and small-scale giving]. She presents and discusses further findings of the report before the discussion starts at the tables.



Kamal Ahmad, Founder of the Asian University for Women **«Equality»** 

Kamal Ahmad gave a short introduction of the Asian University for Women and its history, pointing out the key acomplishements. He also raised the question, why he himself, a man, founded the University.



Michael Alberg-Seberich, Managing Director at Beyond Philanthropy **«Mission Fit»** 

Michael Alberg-Seberich covered some key problems concerning mission fit. Philantropist and donors are often influenced by their own biography in chosing where they want to make an impact and which projects the want to support.

This can lead to problems, because sometimes funds can be inefficiantly assigned. Professionalls trying to convince the donor of more efficient oportunities do sometimes fail, and can also lead to bad results. (He also mentioned his own experience, where he had to turn down funds because he couldn't fullfill the expectations of the donors and refused to ineficially use his funds).



## Key points of wrap-up discussion:

- Global philanthropy is a broad term which describes the diversity of philanthropic activities around the world (both giving and doing philanthropy, traditional and nontraditonal, formal and informal, religious and secular etc.) at multiple levels and with other sectors (including governments and the corporate sector)
- Country borders are irrelevant for dealing with global challenges such as climate change, migration, HIV/AIDS, etc. But for the implementation of philanthropic activity actors have to take nations and their own interests into account.
- There is a global discussion and consensus/agreements on how to solve global problems, but these lack liability and are not binding.
- A question that often came up was: Is it possible for philanthropic actors to be political neutral and 'just' provide help without engaging in the political discourse? Some discussion participants would prefer this for their work. In reality, however, at least some key values need to be aligned, because they are forced to cope with national governments to implement philanthropic programs. For this reason, philanthropy can never be purely neutral. Furthermore, philanthropic activity is sometimes fought by nationalistic groups.
- Cooperation within countries faces sometimes greater challenges than cross-border cooperation due to divers interests and agendas of different actors.
- Collaboration Incentive Systems are not in place. Some people discussed WHO should start the collaboration between nonprofits, governments and/or the corporate sector? Collaboration Incentives were compared to blockchain networks. Those are decentralized, no one is in charge, jet it still has incentives for miners to validate and contribute to the network by being incentivized to do so.
- Collaboration in general was seen as a long term investment often without instant returns. Not all players have this long-term horizon, which can lead to a misalignment of common goals.



How to collaborate across borders. • SDGs give are a global tool • Funders need to feel safe to feel safe to feel funding make partners collaborate - remove will be at risk. National partner ships as showcases Subal squattate and chiefs are good care studios Neutral broker/ facilitator treat Identify specific need for collaboration Digital tools the create Jobal problems new opportunity (more than communications plat toms) climate change retugee crisis Define more specific goals in wildbiration ig Reward smaller, short-term wildbiration

od Bouck Calassia re dels Cr PRIVETANO TFORWARD 1000 How to find approaches to national national oblems 3 ( envice at nation NSKARO 6r drivet GLOBAL (OULABORATION CLIMATE CHONGE . Co- immer = OTHUR FORME OF CLIMATE COOPERATION EVAPOREN CLIM CREATE PERieves 100 564ES THANK YOU D



Common goal/project(s) Gatu Bouck (think big) / project(s) Gatu Bouch Think Dig) / project(s) Think glocal 10000 Think Act April - Emergency - Developmen - Humai tarian Primary. tcters Beneficiories -swalqoid lequid to diopsi biogent a couriou area seconories that area are national to natio aeut sələnəpuət əttsiller olfen of lenolfen əra əradı anın əmine əra ya ieməndər Jigon of lenoiten are and the original data of lenoiten are and the original data of lenoiten are arant arant of lenoiten are arant of lenoiten are arant ar Arbitration of the seconomy of Neel for multiplier effect in Philanthop enalding ms VEST - SINILAR CHALLENGES 1 FOR PRECENTINGER (RUNS, ETC.) T WHACT DIFFERENT IN THE SATTY / BASIC SERVICES & BENEFITS NOT RUFFICADES SOUTH havest CO- IMBACT < GART FOR2 6 YOTANS bokes BUSANESS C-> MUN PROFIT WARED DIFFERENCE SS C-LS METRICS OF MONEY RS MUDICULE OF SUCCESSED IN MACT