Janina Acevedo-Yates:

So I see that we've got a few responses now from our primary technical focus from our guests. So, we do also have the gambit here. Some connecting from health, others from education. Many from the DRG space and then some from project design, and other as well. So, thank you for filling that out. Then finally, we see that some people aren't familiar at all with the community philanthropy concepts of assets, capacities, and trusts. So with that, I would love us to start our session.

Janina Acevedo-Yates:

First I would love to introduce myself. My name is Janina Acevedo-Yates. I am joined by my colleagues Ryan and Soojin, who will be our production team today. We are joined by our session moderator, who is Jessica Benton-Cooney. Jessica's the lead communications and outreach specialist for the DRG Center. We are all very fortunate to have her moderate the DRG Tipping Point Series today. With that, I will invite Jessica to please go head and start our session.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Good morning, everyone. Thank you, Janina. Before we officially get started, we're going to hear a few words from our DRG Center director, Tim Meisburger.

Janina Acevedo-Yates:

Wonderful, so in just a few moments you'll see your screen shift, and a new web browser will open. We'll give you a couple of minutes to watch that video, and then please do close that web browser and you'll be redirected back to AID Connect.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Welcome, everyone and thank you for attending our first fireside chat and first webinar of the Tipping Point Series. I'm here today with our guest speakers, including David Jacobstein. He's been at USAID for eight years, and he is a democracy specialist in the cross-sectoral programs division of the DRG Center, where he focuses on issues of capacity development, systems thinking, and political economy. Lauren Kirby has also been at AID for eight years, and has served in various DC-based offices in overseas missions. She's currently the acting division chief in the civil society and media division in the DRG Center.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Megan McGlynn Scanlon has spent the last 15 years working with and in Civil Society in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean, and the United States. As a consultant with FHI 360, she's preparing the Local Philanthropy Guide we're going to discuss during the webinar. If you can look at your screen, we're going to look over the objectives for today, and I will give you a few minutes to read those over.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

(silence)

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Lauren, I'm going to start with you today.

Lauren Kirby:

Great.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Would you please provide us a little bit of context about how this topic came to be?

Lauren Kirby:

Sure. Thank you, Jess and welcome, everyone. We at USAID view local philanthropy as one sector among many, as Tim mentioned, that's important to advancing countries on their journey to self-reliance. Here at USAID, we really see local philanthropy as both a means and an end, or as what local experts in this field might refer to as a form of and a force for locally-driven development. We want to really unpack and talk about a lot of those topics today, but just to highlight a few key points at the top, we know that local philanthropy can strengthen community capacity as well as commitment and buy-in. We also know that local philanthropy can build trust, by shifting power dynamics and placing decision-making power in the hands of communities and citizens themselves.

Lauren Kirby:

Lastly, we know that local philanthropy has the ability to identify, leverage, and build local resources. This takes on a particular importance when we start talking about how communities can actively and sustainably finance their own development.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Thanks, Lauren. Can you tell us a little bit more about what you mean by local philanthropy?

Lauren Kirby:

Sure, thanks. So we define local philanthropy as the mobilization of local assets, and control of those assets at a local or grassroots level. When we say assets, we don't just mean money. We're talking about a broad array of resources that communities and citizens have to offer, whether they be human, political, or intellectual. We can look at things like volunteering your time, donating or lending a building or physical space, as well as using political capital or social influence to help out a cause. When we go a little bit further, we want to talk a little bit about the broader local philanthropy ecosystem that we see within a society, and I want to hit on four points related to that today. The first two involve individual or corporate giving. This might mean something like personal finances or corporate profits, but it could also mean in-kind resources and donations such as using staff volunteer time.

Lauren Kirby:

We also want to consider the broader enabling environment when we're looking at local philanthropy. This can in fact, help people within a society operate. This could mean whether or not a tax regime incentivizes or doesn't affect individual or corporate giving, and it might mean something like a religious or social norm that affects social behavior within a community. Lastly, what we really want to dig into today, and David will talk in more detail about, is the concept of community philanthropy, which is at the heart of local philanthropy. We see that community philanthropy, it takes mobilizing local assets and combines it with a conscious effort to place decision-making power over control of those assets with the community that it's helping benefit. We know that this can be a foundational building block of collective power that we'll see play out when we talk a little bit more about self-reliance.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Great. Thank you. Can you tell us a little bit more about how this relates to the journey of self-reliance as what we say at USAID?

Lauren Kirby:

Absolutely. So at USAID, we think about the journey to self-reliance or the ability of a country to solve their own development challenges. When we look at local philanthropy, this directly relates to that through intrinsic approach to building local and community-based capacity and commitment to resource and manage their own development. Usually when we talk about financing self-reliance, we're thinking about the broad and central role that governments or state actors can play in mobilizing resources to finance development. This can be through tax revenue generation, or... I'm being told to speak up. [inaudible 00:10:28]. So, we can talk about things like tax revenue generation or incentives for private sector investments. We see these as central to financing self-reliance, that can and should be addressed.

Lauren Kirby:

Here in the DRG Center, we know that there's an important role for citizens in civil society to play in those processes. Whether it's through advocating for a specific change, pushing for transparency within that process, or holding their own government accountable. At the same time, we can see that through a process like local philanthropy, citizens and civil society can also be financing self-reliance actors in their own right through that process of mobilizing and controlling resources that I mentioned. We've seen research that shows if communities are in charge of their own development, the solutions proposed are more likely to be appropriately tailored to the local context, and more likely to be sustainable in the long run. So, through a local philanthropy model that places power in the hands of communities and citizens themselves, we can see how these everyday people become co-investors in their own development.

Lauren Kirby:

Through that process, we see an increased commitment to their collective interest. We know at USAID that without that type of commitment, investments and development, whether at a very local level or an international level are more likely to fail. So we see that the collective power built through community or local philanthropy is an important goal in and of itself, but also an effective means for driving local development. But, let's be honest, just encouraging local giving is not going to build self-reliance in and of itself. To look at that we really need to unpack and think about how the process of building community philanthropy itself can build the assets, and can build the capacities, and can build the trust that are necessary to mobilize and really mutually reinforce the momentum for self-reliance.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

You mentioned assets, capacity, and trust. David, can you tell us a little bit more?

David Jacobstein:

Sure, and yes I think those are all key elements of why local philanthropy matters, and what it means for it to succeed. I think first of all to be clear, when we talk about assets, we don't just mean money, financial assets. We do also mean, as Lauren mentioned, in-kind donations of time, people's connections, social and political capital, ability to influence, things like that. Also, when we talk about capacities, I think a lot of us are familiar with capacity development. Meaning strengthening the internal

management functions to be able to manage grants of an organization, but we actually mean much more here. We mean the capacity to identify problems and opportunities, and adjust to them. Learn and adapt the capacities to catalyze collective action among a larger group of people, things like that.

David Jacobstein:

Trust, I mean obviously we care a lot about trust in terms of financial accountability, and the ability to say what you did with your money. But in this case, trust is much more about strong relationships that actually will anchor the ability to get a collective problem addressed by a large number of actors. So, all of those are really central aspects of what we're looking at in local philanthropy, and as Lauren mentioned, they interrelate. They feed back on each other, and so when we're thinking about local philanthropy, we want to look at whether partners are developing their assets, capacities, and trust in the broader sense of the world and then they're putting those to use for development purposes.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Thank you for explaining what is obviously a very complex topic. Can you explain or tell us what you think is one key takeaway that you want everyone to have about how they interrelate?

David Jacobstein:

Sure. I think the best way for me to boil it down to one thing is to put a finger on the difference it makes when you actually have this local philanthropy going on, which I think is really this idea of nothing about us without us. So, it's the idea that when you have this positive reinforcement going on and you have local actors, local players, who have capacity to actually address some of the development challenge, who have assets and are themselves not just asking outsiders like USAID for help, but tackling the problem themselves and then inviting us in to help them in doing so, and they have the trust of their constituency, their community to do that, it changes the dynamics. It changes the ownership around how we're addressing issues. So, it really is a different partnership model that I think is very much consistent with a lot of our language in the policy framework, in the effective partnering and procurement reform, around how we want to be partnering with local actors.

David Jacobstein:

So really the big takeaway is all of these factors interrelate. It's not enough to just be injecting finances into an issue and helping a community tackle a problem, or even helping them raise finances. We need to be deliberately working on assets, capacity, and trust whenever we are partnering. That's because that's how that community, that group of people gets to actually say, "This is my problem and I'm tackling it and you're just helping me." So, I think that for me is the big takeaway.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

How do we take this into account with our programming?

David Jacobstein:

That's a really interesting question, and I think there are a lot of possible answers. I think part of it is just being aware that this is something we intend to have so that if we have... Most of our programs across any sector I can think of engage with communities, engage with civil society. There are opportunities to think about local philanthropy as an aspect of programming we're doing. It doesn't need to be a separate stream of work. In that sense, there's lots of ways that we can actually undertake the work

we're doing in ways where we try deliberately to leave our partners with more assets, more capacity, and greater trust than they previously had. So, some of the examples I can give is we care a lot about learning. We have a lot of learning agendas, a lot of collaborating learning and adapting practices in our programming.

David Jacobstein:

If we can invite our partners to help set what is the learning agenda they want to see, what are the questions they have, making sense of data with us, then we can be investing in their ability to learn to adjust, to course correct. This strengthens their relationships, their trust, their capacity. When we are providing funding, if we can find ways to use some of that through things like matching grants to spur partners to build their own connections, we can still be working with them. We can still be funding them to do the development programming we want to do, but we can do that in a way where we're also contributing to their ability to have more assets, and build more trust over time so that we leave them in better shape than we found them.

David Jacobstein:

There's a lot of details, and actually we have attached to this webinar some tips from a GrantCraft Guide, and from some different documents we've put together around different tools that we can use that are part of our everyday sets of donor and implementer tool kit. That you can use in slightly different ways to increase the likelihood of having assets, capacity, and trust built through the programming.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Awesome. Thank you so much, David. We're going to turn now to Megan. As someone who has worked on programming as an implementer, what else could USAID programs do?

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

Excuse me. Sorry. I have a little bit of a cold this morning unfortunately. Once the partnerships and the grants are structured appropriately to support those efforts, like David was talking about, some of the things that USAID programs can incorporate include supporting the maturation of community philanthropy organizations, which I'll define a little bit in a second, as well as strengthening the enabling environment for philanthropy. I believe Lauren talked a little bit about that earlier what we mean by that, but I'll briefly just go into the strengthening the enabling environment because, like David alluded to, there's a lot that could be done. It will depend a lot on the context [inaudible 00:18:50] course, so to go into detail could take hours and hours, and it's something I get really excited about.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

The guide that we're sharing and the different resources do go into more detail, but just to go back to Lauren's answer, some areas where there is room for some support from USAID, and we've seen this through different programming examples is support for research and learning on local philanthropy in the local context. Whether that's finding and building on existing research and learning, or doing new research and learning in places where it maybe hasn't been studied or hasn't been looked at comprehensively. Doing work on policy and governance that is supportive of local philanthropy. More broadly than that, supporting efforts that build the local culture for philanthropy, and also innovations relating to local philanthropy.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

So, things like E-philanthropy platforms. There's some examples of doing work on blockchain transfers that can help particularly in politically restricted environments, online platforms for volunteer exchanges. Things like that that are tools that can support the building of multi [inaudible 00:20:19] their capacities, assets, and trust. There's examples of each of these that we left in the guide from USAID programs.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

So Lauren had gone into some of the aspects of the enabling environment, and of course, there's some ways we can intersect with that. I think something I would highlight in particular is the role of philanthropy ecosystem actors, which is a wonky term, but essentially what it means is philanthropy peak bodies, philanthropy associations. So, foundations may join together into an association to study questions that are of concern locally. There might be policy and research work already going on by local actors. So find those actors and support the work that they are doing, concerned with the philanthropy locally. Going back to the maturation of community philanthropy organizations.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

First of all what we mean by community philanthropy organizations is not necessarily just community foundations or funds, but any civil society institution, including informal community-based organizations that take a community philanthropy approach that really look at assets, capacities and trust, like David was describing earlier. So, that can mean working with empowerment-focused community groups, particular community savings groups that take an approach that is not just about loaning out... funding to their members, but rather about adjusting community needs, and doing that in a democratic way that builds, again, the assets as well as the capacities and the trust of the members to operate collectively.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

There's an example of that by USAID in Burma, that's doing that within the DRG program to really explicitly build capacity on the village level for operating within a democracy. Then also, capacity building of civil society organizations and, like David said earlier, those capacities are going to be about collective action as opposed to grants managements. What I would emphasize on top of what David said earlier, is how important the process for that capacity building is going to be. That it's not about USAID or the USAID program arriving with a preordained list of what those capacities are, but rather working with the stakeholders, engaging in peer learning, network dialogue, et cetera, where the stakeholders themselves are identifying what their collective needs are, as well as addressing them together using local resourced people when appropriate. That kind of thing.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

Building into that process attention to inequalities within communities as well, so that it's not just about the people that already have in the community making the decisions, but rather that there are proactive steps within the stakeholders to adjust those inequalities. Yeah, again there's examples of this in the guide, and just because of time, we're not going to go into every single one, but these are all based on examples and evidence that exists both from USAID program and externally. So, those are a few different things.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Thanks, Megan. Can you tell us how all this has impact?

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

Sure. It absolutely does have impact, first of all. I can talk a little bit about the financial piece, since I know that's where a lot of people focus their attention, as much as we'd like them to think about assets and capacities, as well as... Sorry, capacities and trust in addition to this assets piece. As well as we do see it has impact in relation to self-reliance, sustainability, and community control. Again, before this, just as I mentioned at the end of my last answer, I want to emphasize how much everything we've talked about today is based in reality, is grounded in long-term observations and research in highly diverse context about the power that these approaches and this attention to local philanthropy can in fact have, while some of the... We've tried to keep it grounded during the discussion, but some of what we've talked about sounds theoretical, but it really isn't.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

It's based on a lot of great work over decades by various institutions, and individuals studying this question and looking at local processes. So I really encourage everyone to take a look at the guide and the resources that fed into it, that I believe are going to be posted on the screen for you, because there's a lot of really rich, real-world experience that we're building from to present today. Now in terms of financial impact, it's really important -- the question I always get when I'm discussing this is well, are local resources enough to make the difference, to replace government funding, or replace overseas development assistance?" I think it's really important to emphasize that local resources in USAID partner countries are unlikely to match domestic revenue mobilization, or development assistance. Even large international philanthropy doesn't come close to having that capacity, and we see that in economic data.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

On the one hand, the local assets in those countries do have significant power that goes unrecognized. We see that from surveys, the World Giving Index that is put together by the Charities Aid Foundation in 2017, found that eight of the 20 most generous countries in the world were USAID partner countries. The most generous country in the world that year was Indonesia, and more than half of Haitians had given money. So, just a few highlights from that study shows the power that does exist, even if you're just focusing on assets. With that said, I think the most important point that we want you to take away from our entire discussion today is that it really isn't just about assets. That you really do have to look at the full power of it in relation to self-reliance, focusing on local philanthropy and building those assets, those capacities, and trust for collective action and collective decision making about resources changes power dynamics between citizens, civil society, and governments and allows citizens to have a real voice in local decisions.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

The process itself increases individual, community and corporation's stake in their own development, and we see this time and time again on the ground. Again, of course, that is the goal of the journey to self-reliance that is the point of all of this. So in sum, yes, as you can tell, I believe that it does have significant and very powerful impacts.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

All right, great. Thank you so much, Megan and to David and Lauren. We're going to actually switch now to the question, the Q&A section of the webinar. In a moment you're going to see your screen shift, and any questions that have been submitted throughout this session are going to appear on the screen. You're invited to continue to type them in as we begin to answer them. The first question is local philanthropy possible in politically restrictive environments? Do you want to start?

David Jacobstein:

Sure. I think generally the answer is yes. In fact to some extent in politically restrictive environments, local philanthropy can be easier than international support. Often one of the things that's cracked down on in closing space is foreign funding flows. So if you're able to help partners actually raise money locally, that tends to be something that is seen as more authentic and there's less ability for government to restrict even in relatively closing spaces. That said, as Megan pointed out, the larger ecosystem matters a lot. Some of the tax and registration, and other rules that determine how easy or hard it is to give charity can have a huge impact. So it's obviously harder to do local philanthropy in a place where the rules are slanted against it happening. But it is possible, and in some ways it's probably more possible than a lot of more traditional USAID grant-making approaches. So, I think that's definitely, but I know Lauren and Megan, you've both worked on and in closing space.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Megan, did you want to add anything?

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

Sure. I think what I'd add is just on the flip side. Many observers and there's various, we cited a few different very well done studies about how engaging with local philanthropy can in fact not only, like David was saying, work well in those environments compared to traditional grant-making, but in addition it can help push back against closing space. So there's a lot of observers that think it's a powerful tool in the face of closing [inaudible 00:31:01].

Lauren Kirby:

I would just add that while we're talking about it in a positive way, and we believe in the positive power of local philanthropy, we do recognize that there can be instances where people might be mobilizing resources for nefarious or negative purposes too. So when you're designing your programming, it's important to keep in mind that there can be a good and a bad side to using local assets-

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

Yeah, and I think just to build on that, I think looking at, as David said, the nothing about us without us, should be not only viewed as far as international and local funding, but also within a community. So when we talk about community philanthropy and local philanthropy, we want to emphasize that part of the role for that should be examining and addressing power inequalities within the community as well. So that gets a little bit to the point of making sure that it is civil in the way that we talk about civil society being truly civil, as opposed to being used for repressive means or what have you.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

All right. It looks like the next question is for Lauren. What is your definition of collective action as it's being used in our webinar?

Lauren Kirby:

Great question. I think we're taking a pretty broad definition of collective action and I'll start, but then of course, feel free to chime in. When we look at the ability of a broad group of citizens or a community to participate in their own decision making process, that's really what I'm referring to as collective action. In the community philanthropy or local philanthropy specific instances that we're describing, we mean that to be specifically about the mobilization and control of assets for a community's own development. So both the process of creating and leveraging and raising resources, as well as control of the decision-making process for how to use those resources and who they'll benefit.

David Jacobstein:

Yeah, and I would just say this is integrally connected to the way we understand self-reliance at USAID. We talk about capacity and commitment, and no one actor holds either capacity or commitment even the prime minister or president of the country. Those are collective outcomes. How much capacity there is, how much commitment there is, is the product of millions of decisions by millions of people? So the ability to engage in that and interact in that is very directly a contributor to how we understand what self-reliance is, because that's part of the set of things that go into how much capacity and commitment around a particular issue there is in any place where we're working.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

Maybe I'll add-

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

The next question is for David. Sorry, Megan. Go ahead. Yeah, go ahead.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

I was just going to say I think a powerful example of what we mean by collective action that I've seen in my own work is just working with community savings and loans groups with people that typically go about their business just trying to survive. I was working with women in very remote villages in Indonesia, and before a facilitator came in and started the group, they would just go about their business and interact on specific needs occasionally with neighbors, but tend to keep to themselves. Then with the facilitation and the group, started making decisions together. It started about pooling resources, but then in that process, in some of the places they ended up starting community centers for the entire village. So, it starts small and it's just about interacting with others in a slightly different way, and building slowly towards big decisions made together.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

All right. For the next question, we're going to start with David. How should we measure impact so as to reinforce these concepts, and how important is the measurement process?

David Jacobstein:

Yeah, so that's a great question. I think measurement is really important, because for any large entity like USAID, what we can measure is really what defines what we do. So our ability to expand our measurement repertoire to look at assets, capacity and trust in the way it's described in this webinar is important if that's something that we actually want our programming to be doing. There are fairly simple ways to look at that. So, for example, with trust, we can look within communities. First of all, at

broader levels you have the barometer surveys and things like that, that can give you some grounding. Then within communities, you can look fairly easily at social capital through different tools, fairly light touch in most cases, and actually see whether people are better connected, whether they're sharing information and working together more.

David Jacobstein:

Assets is again, fairly straightforward to measure even the non-financial kind. Capacity, I think has long been a stumbling block for us, but we've had a lot of progress recently on how do we measure capacity. There's another webinar competing with this one going on, on our new capacity building nine indicator that's cross cutting. I'll just give a shout out to them that's we're looking up after this is done. The short answer for that is: measure performance, don't measure capacity. So, actually see if your investments are helping organizations do whatever they're trying to do better. So with some fairly straightforward tweaks, again, this doesn't need to become a separate area of your work or 20% of effort is going specifically to local philanthropy.

David Jacobstein:

This can simply be hey, we worked with these partners to accomplish some community scorecards, or some distribution of clothes for children or whatever. At the far end, did they have more social capital? Did they have more trust? Were they performing better at whatever their organizational mission was than when we started? I do think it's important to have some degree of measurement towards it if we want it to become something that we are intentional about doing.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Do you want to add anything?

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

Lauren, did you want to...

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Go ahead, Megan

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

I would just add to say that this is another area where working together with stakeholders to identify the critical things to measure is important. Just building on the principles engaged and also of course, to ensure that what is being measured - while also responding to USAID's needs for data - make sense in the local context. Some of the things that are appropriate to measure are you learn through trial and error. That goes a lot faster if you're talking to people that know the ground level realities.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Okay. This one is also to you Megan. Are there examples of tools to measure social capital?

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

There are. I am personally not very super familiar with them, but we refer to a few in the guide. So two institutions that we draw significantly from in preparing the guide were the Global Fund for Community

Foundations, which uses social capital, primarily social capital indicators to measure the effects of their work. There's links and examples in the guide for that, and I think also in the web links here. Then also WINGS, which is a global philanthropy support network. I'm not describing it exactly correctly, but they also built in some... They developed a toolkit for measuring the impact of philanthropy support, and some of those measures are around social connections, but I think the GFCF one is probably the more relevant one to this question.

David Jacobstein:

Just to add a couple of other examples, there are fairly simple surveys and network analysis tools that you can use to measure how often different organizations are collaborating. Just asking them, how often do you work with others and how often do they work with you? Then I think a really powerful one, and there's been a lot of work from Keystone Accountability on this is really closing the feedback loop. We want organizations to be accountable downward to their constituents. The way that we can get that is to actually ask their constituents, is this organization working for you? So rather than just say well, we're going to measure what you do and then we're going to tell you how you're doing, actually saying we're going to equip you with the tools to ask your constituents whether they are benefiting from your work, and you're going to get used to that being a way of working.

David Jacobstein:

That's quite typical in charitable organizations in the Global North. Ask the people they mean to be serving all the time, how are we doing? Somehow when USAID is involved as a big donor, we sometimes get it where the only person they have to keep satisfied is us, and we really want to complete that feedback loop. So just asking their constituents what else could they be doing, really makes a big difference and is a way of closing that feedback loop.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

All right, thanks. This next question is for all of you. What tools or training curricula exists for grassroots activists, and community leaders to build their capacity in identifying local resources and fundraising? Megan, do you want to start?

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

I was on mute. So again, and I see someone also asked what does GFCF stand for? So, if you look in the web links as well as the guide that should be somewhere on your screen, institution whose lessons and lessons learned and research we've been drawing from significantly for the guide and a lot of this discussion is the Global Fund for Community Foundations. Despite the name, they work on community philanthropy writ large, as opposed to just focusing on community foundations. The one product that they put out in partnership with the GrantCraft Guides, which is by Candid used to be Foundation Center, is a guide on supporting community philanthropy. The tools and training curricula exists for grassroots activists. So there... I think that exploring the GFCF, Global Fund for Community Foundations website would be a great place to start, if you are looking for tools and training curricula.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

I don't know that you'll find training curriculum, but more so tools and approaches and the guide also is a good place to start. There's a lot out there on this, so I think it would depend on exactly what you're

looking for, in what context and what specific needs you have. But I would say if you start with GFCF, that's probably a good place to start exploring. David, I don't know. Do you have other...

David Jacobstein:

Well, I would just add that I think one of the big lessons coming from a lot of effort at supporting local partners to be better at raising funds is that it's not a training skill. It's an experience. So, the thing we can do that is most useful to making that happen is to push people to get out the door, and actually do fundraising. You see this all the time in the U.S. where there are challenge grants issued and people say when I'm listening to NPR, "Hey, if you call in and donate now, somebody is matching it. $2 for one." Well, we can be the people who are doing that matching and tell our partners, "Hey, go talk to the business down the road, and see what would make them give you $500, $1,000 and we can incentivize them to do that."

David Jacobstein:

The experience of trying that out, seeing what didn't work, how they needed to communicate, who they needed to talk to, who needed to do the talking. All of that really is invaluable, and all the effort that I think has been put into training groups to write proposals or identify ideas, is much less valuable than the actual experience of doing it. So, figuring out how to make people have that experience during their time as USAID partner, rather than train them and have that be something they do after they're done is something that's a fairly simple, shift and something we can fairly easily accommodate that I think makes a big difference. We've done some research talking to I believe my colleague, Faye Haselkorn in Kenya spoke to Bulgarian organizations, who used to be USAID partners around "what did you value from the time period when you were a USAID partner," and the classic skills training in board management and human resource management and financial management was quite low.

David Jacobstein:

Most of what they really valued was either the rest of the stuff you did for us in the political arena, pushing for legal changes, pushing for policy changes, or who you connected us to and who you introduced us to. So that kind of experiential learning, I think it makes sense, but we somehow don't always translate it into the way we do our work. A classic example for me is in-kind grants. We put cost share requirements in a lot of our awards that don't push behavior change. They just get groups to put a number on the volunteers they already had instead of saying "well, rather than make you account for a 30% cost share, we're going to reserve a certain amount of money to give you as a matching grant if you can go raise some actual local funds." That would push them to do something they have not done, and stretch and learn. So little things like that, I think are ways where it's not so much a training and skills question as it is a practice question.

Lauren Kirby:

I think when we think about mapping assets in a community or a society, it's important to remember that even if we're able to do that in some way, it's going to be one snapshot in time, and it won't necessarily take into account the feedback loop that we've been describing where building the trust and the capacity within the community is going to fuel and generate potentially more assets, and mobilization of additional resources. So just keeping in mind that it could be a tool to do a baseline of that extent, but we're really trying to think about moving that momentum to have more of a snowball effect as the process and as this experience that David's describing is going on.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

I think I would add-

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Great. The next-

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

Is that okay? Sorry.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Megan, [inaudible 00:46:20]. Go ahead.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

I think I'd make two points that I'd feel remiss if I didn't. So one is the fact that again, to build on what David and Lauren said, I think, thinking going immediately to tools and training curricula is probably not the most useful. You really want to sit down with, like I tried to convey earlier, sit down with the stakeholders and hear from them what they think support might be needed, and rely on peer learning and joint learning together in addition. Absolutely the putting boots on the ground as you were, to practice and with that. Definitely want to point out also the Yetu Initiative in Kenya, which had trialed and error a few different approaches to doing capacity building of CSOs that were interested in engaging in local philanthropy. That was in the Kenya mission where Faye Haselkorn is the... that's mentioned in the guide and the link may be also up in the web links.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

That's a great example of different approaches being trialed and errored both at the program level as well as with the CSOs that were engaged. The whole purpose was to give them the opportunity to learn from doing, and then learn from each other as they did it. So, it's a really great example of what David was talking about.

David Jacobstein:

[inaudible 00:47:50].

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Great. Let's start with David and Lauren on this question. We might have already answered this, but how is this different from what we're already doing in civil society capacity building, or local governance programs?

Lauren Kirby:

I think as David mentioned, we can actually find a lot of this work already embedded within our program in different pieces, and we might not be labeling it local philanthropy because it might not be connected in this broader scope that we're talking about today, and I think that's the important point. What can be different or what we really see as an opportunity to take this next step, is making sure those inter linkages between mobilizing resources, building capacity and building trust can come together. So, we might have a traditional civil society strengthening program that's focused on capacity, but it might not

then put decision-making power for the community with that organization that we're working with. So some of the examples in our guide, whether it's in Bosnia or Serbia or Burma, really take that approach of marrying those different pieces together.

David Jacobstein:

Yeah. The other thing I would add is, and we have a whole resource page on this idea of capacity development 2.0, which is an update of where are we in the literature? How do we understand what works? I think we still often focus on capacity in terms of either readiness to receive and manage our money, which is helpful, but not really the strongest investment in capacity. Or a short term focus on the ability to deliver within the context of a project timeframe, the specific things that we need. Whereas most of the research shows, and [inaudible 00:49:24] that what really matters to an organization's ability to survive and thrive over time, is how they can adapt to changing circumstances, jump on windows of opportunity, quickly find out when things are shifting in different ways.

David Jacobstein:

That's all about who they know, who they're connected to, what their processes are to work with their own stakeholders, be it government or be it civil society. Then learn and adapt to what they're finding out. So I think we can put more emphasis in our traditional programming on how people are going to make sense of things for themselves and adapt and adjust, and take on a leadership role within programming, rather than just deliver something where the vision for what that was and why it's needed primarily came from USAID. We need to move ourselves out of the center of the spotlight, and let the local actors move more into it so that our investments in their capacity really are strengthening their self-reliance, their leadership, rather than just their execution of our vision.

Lauren Kirby:

I think that's a great opportunity just to mention the power and opportunity we have to use at USAID at least, co-creation processes to bring some of those more local voices in. Some of the mechanisms, the global mechanisms that I manage here from DC has really used the co-creation with a subset of local actors across the country, to bring in a variety of voices that we don't normally see in the design phase of the process. So, rather than waiting to when we're in implementation and trying to retrofit the needs of the community, bringing that community in right from the start, and getting their voice heard as we design and then procure that program.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

I'll just add-

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Megan, anything?

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

Sure. This doesn't help add to the excellent answers of what is different, but another resource in terms of trying to engage some of the local actors that are already concerned with local philanthropy there are again, resources in that guide of different associations and bodies that look up these questions already, that may help identify actors who can help inform your work on this, that you may not even be aware of

in your partner countries, or that you haven't maybe worked with before. So just a plug for thinking outside the box too, as you're engaging stakeholders to think about this.

David Jacobstein:

They're here.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Okay. The next question is for all of you. What role is there for international philanthropy versus local to play in development contexts?

David Jacobstein:

[inaudible 00:52:04] Megan first for once?

Janina Acevedo-Yates:

Yes.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Megan, do want to start it off?

Janina Acevedo-Yates:

Megan, make sure you talk into your microphone so we can hear you clearly. Thanks.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

Yeah, I was seeing that pop up on another screen while I was... What role is there for international philanthropy? So there... I think the roles for international philanthropy are a potential whole other webinar. There are clearly many, many roles for international philanthropy to play in developments. I think that… yeah I'm not exactly sure how to answer that question other than to say that international foundations and philanthropy certainly have a role that's different, and would lead to different impacts than focusing on local philanthropy. When we're talking in the context of looking at local philanthropy as a tool for building self-reliance, international philanthropy is a different form of outside assistance.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

One benefit of … whether that's international foundation engaging directly in overseas assistance or partnering with USAID to do it, foundations you have flexibility that USAID may not. So having formerly worked with the Aga Khan Foundation, that was certainly a benefit that we built on in some of our program to be able to have some additional flexibility in our partnerships with USAID. Not to speak for them, I do not work for them anymore, but just that was my experience. I think that the role for international philanthropy is just, it's a different question than the role for local philanthropy. Local philanthropy by definition builds local resources, and there are examples of international foundations that do focus on this question. So some of those are mentioned again in the guide. Inter-American Foundation is actually a U.S. government institution, has done this work for decades. The Global Fund for Community Foundation has been doing this work for decades also.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon:

The Mott Foundation is an institution that has paid attention to this question. So there are other... I think when you think about international philanthropy, it's a donor relationship to the partner countries. So it's different than local philanthropy.

David Jacobstein:

Yeah. The only thing I would also add is that we've talked about the importance of connections and social capital within a country. Those also matter across borders. We've seen a lot of examples of programming that brings together different civil society organizations for example, within a region and the international philanthropy can help to build that into more of a global movement, build some solidarity, help groups that are struggling in difficult circumstances to find allies. So I think a lot of it again comes back to the intentionality. If international philanthropy is substituting for a lack of local resources in the short term, that can be important because there's not enough particularly financial resources in a lot of places to accomplish everything we'd like to see done.

David Jacobstein:

Over time the intention needs to be that the international philanthropy is an ally to, and a supporter of the local philanthropy and the local collective action and self-reliance happening within communities. I think lots of international philanthropic entities and movements really play that role really well, but it just requires the intention that that is what you're doing, rather than a focus on what's the most valuable thing my money can do in the immediate term, making it more how do I work well? How do I partner well with actors who are here so that they can have more ability to matter to these problems and future problems over time, and not disappear as soon as things seem okay, but really accompany them and stay an ally and supporter over time.

David Jacobstein:

So I think that that is an important role for international philanthropy. It's not a substitution effect. It's a question of our focus being on making this happen more, and under the journey to self-reliance. That should be our focus in everything we do.

Jessica Benton-Cooney:

Great. Thank you so much. You're going to now see your screen shift, and there is going to be a new page where all the participants can leave some feedback on today's discussion. I just wanted to say thank you to everyone. David, and Megan, and Lauren, for being able to share that expertise and their thoughts with us. On behalf of the USAID DRG Center, thank you for attending today's fireside chats. We look forward to seeing you at our next Tipping Point Session on March 3rd, 2020 at the same time. We are going to be discussing Local Governance and Adaptive Management. Have a great day, everyone.

Janina Acevedo-Yates:

Again, thank you to everyone who was able to join us today. Please go ahead and read through all of the different Chat pods that you see on your screen. What did you appreciate most about the session? Then right below it, what would you like to see more of in the future DRG Tipping Point Series? At the bottom left of your screen, you'll see a variety of web links that we can redirect you to, including the tools and resources that were mentioned during today's session. Right beneath the attendees pod at the top right of your screen, you'll see the Local Philanthropy Guide that you can download directly into your device.

So again, thank you everyone so much. We look forward to seeing you for our next session of the DRG Tipping Point Series, and we hope you have a great rest of your day wherever your feet may find you.