



DIASPORA GIVING: AN AGENT OF CHANGE IN ASIA PACIFIC COMMUNITIES?

PHILIPPINES

Estrella D. Añonuevo and Augustus T. Añonuevo

Interest in the relationship between overseas Filipino migration and national development has been growing steadily for many years. Academic institutions, government agencies, and non-government organizations increasingly seek to understand the complex connections between the movement of people and the development of their home countries. Most of these efforts focus on the impact of remittances on migrants' countries and communities of origin. The largest share of remittances is sent home to support families and relatives, and this is where most research has focused. In addition, however, there are unaccounted portions of remittance transfers that are intended for the "public good." These monies are often referred to as "diaspora philanthropy", a phenomenon that has only recently begun to receive closer attention.

Opiniano (2002, as cited in Association of Foundations, 2005) defines diaspora philanthropy as the "process in which migrants

or immigrants abroad, in forging and sustaining their relations with their origin societies, allocate a certain portion of their remittances to fund development projects in the country of origin" (p.5). Johnson and Sedaca (2004, as cited in Silva, 2006) comment that although their reasons for going abroad vary, most overseas migrants maintain affinity with and keen interest in matters related to their countries of origin. The authors further say: "When this interest becomes engagement, whether collective or individual, émigré and diaspora communities can use their financial, time, and intellectual resources to help reduce poverty, contribute to the expansion of the private sector, and enhance global competitiveness of their countries of origin" (p 6).

The optimism of Opiniano, Johnson, and Sedaca in the development potential of diaspora philanthropy is shared by a number of scholars. Yet the question of whether the current practices of diaspora philanthropy have actually contributed



to the development of home communities remains an open question. Filipinos direct an important portion of overseas remittances to help those beyond their immediate families. However, it remains uncertain whether these migrant acts and contributions have developed into a more substantive engagement contributing to social change and development. It is to this discussion—migrants' current and future role in effecting social change in the Philippines—that this paper seeks to contribute.

Following a brief overview of the Filipino diaspora population, this paper aims to: 1) discuss the current practices of Filipino diaspora philanthropy; 2) highlight some best practices in strategic giving; 3) assess the current environment for diaspora giving, and 4) pinpoint challenges and offer recommendations to realize the development potential of Filipino diaspora philanthropy.

The Filipino Diaspora

Waves of migration in search of a better life

The history of overseas Filipino migration is a story of poverty, unemployment, and underdevelopment in the Philippines. Successive waves of Filipinos have migrated to other countries in search of employment opportunities and in pursuit of better lives for their families. The past century has witnessed three somewhat distinct waves of Filipino migration.

The first wave began in the early 1900s, when Filipino workers began to migrate to Hawaii to work in sugar plantations. A steady stream of Filipinos moved to Hawaii—and later, to the United States

mainland—to work in agriculture and in the fish canneries of Alaska (Pilipinong Migrante sa Canada [PMC], 2008; Center for Migrant Advocacy [CMA], 2006).

A second wave of Filipino migration began in the 1960s and was largely composed of more highly educated and skilled professionals, including nurses, doctors, and medical technicians. As in the first wave, these emigrants were responding to labor shortages and opportunities, finding employment in the United States, Canada, and several European countries (PMC, 2008). During this period, the U.S. government's scholarship and exchange programs attracted more Filipinos to the United States as students, many of whom stayed and worked as professionals and later became American citizens (Garchitorena, 2007a).

A third wave of overseas Filipino migration began in 1974, when the Philippine government, under President Marcos, institutionalized a new overseas employment program intended as “a temporary measure to generate foreign exchange and ease the country's unemployment and underemployment problems” (CMA, 2006). Encouraged by the government, Filipinos migrated in large numbers to fill labor shortages in many countries. The majority of Filipinos migrating in the 1970s was less skilled than their immediate predecessors and often found work as construction workers, nannies, domestic workers, nurses, and entertainers. Perhaps most prominently, Filipino men found employment with construction companies in the Middle East while Filipino women were hired for domestic work in Saudi Arabia,

Kuwait, Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan, and Malaysia (PMC, 2008).

It was during this third wave of migration that Filipino women began to migrate overseas in proportionally greater numbers than their male compatriots. CMA (2006) reported that in the 1970s, women made up only 12% of the overseas workforce. In 1987, they comprised about 48% of overseas deployment; in 1993, about 55%, and in 2000, around 64%. Today, Filipino migrant women often work as domestic workers, caregivers, professional and technical employees, nurses, clerical and sales workers, and entertainers.

According to the PMC (2008), the increasing volume of migrant remittances and the widespread unemployment in the country motivate the Philippine government to continue its labor export policy. The program was entrenched and enhanced in the administrations of Presidents Corazon Aquino, Fidel Ramos, Joseph Estrada, and Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo.

A diverse group of overseas Filipinos

The Philippine government's Commission on Filipinos Overseas (CFO) estimated that there are about 8.2 million overseas Filipinos living in

193 countries, comprising about 10% of the total Philippine population. It is an immense and diverse population—difficult to describe with generalizations—and includes permanent residents (43%), temporary contract workers (46%), and undocumented migrants (11%). (See Table 1).

Permanent residents are legal residents of other countries, and their residence in these countries does not depend on work

Table 1. Stock Estimate of Overseas Filipinos As of December 2006

REGION / COUNTRY	PERMANENT	TEMPORARY	IRREGULAR	TOTAL
WORLD TOTAL	3,556,035	3,802,345	874,792	8,233,172
AFRICA	553	71,503	17,742	89,798
NIGERIA	18	13,428	700	14,146
LIBYA	75	9,475	680	10,230
OTHERS/UNSPECIFIED	460	48,600	16,362	65,422
ASIA, East & South	196,968	789,110	237,600	1,223,678
JAPAN	124,722	103,555	30,700	258,977
MALAYSIA	26,001	88,372	125,000	239,373
OTHERS/UNSPECIFIED	46,245	597,183	81,900	725,328
ASIA West	3,523	1,723,911	112,250	1,839,684
SAUDI ARABIA	247	1,001,330	18,000	1,019,577
KUWAIT	94	133,361	11,500	144,955
OTHERS/UNSPECIFIED	3,182	589,220	82,750	675,152
EUROPE	229,132	534,748	124,380	888,260
UNITED KINGDOM	62,606	93,358	9,600	165,564
ITALY	23,108	84,972	20,000	128,000
OTHERS/UNSPECIFIED	143,418	356,418	94,780	594,616
AMERICAS/TRUST TERRITORIES	2,887,129	333,763	356,400	3,577,292
UNITED STATES	2,443,269	128,440	156,500	2,728,209
CANADA	396,054	38,886	3,000	437,940
OTHERS/UNSPECIFIED	47,806	166,437	196,900	411,143
OCEANIA	238,730	74,813	26,420	339,963
AUSTRALIA	218,425	15,100	3,000	236,525
NEW ZEALAND	19,549	742	120	20,411
OTHERS/UNSPECIFIED	756	58,971	23,300	83,027
SEABASED WORKERS	0	274,497	0	274,497

Prepared by the Commission on Filipinos Overseas from CFO, DFA, POEA and other sources covering 193 countries/territories.

Source: POEA (2006)



contracts. It is estimated that, in 2006, there were about 3.6 million Filipinos permanently residing abroad. The United States, Canada, and Australia, Japan, and Germany—in descending order—have the largest numbers of Filipino permanent residents, with about 2 to 2.5 million living in the United States (CFO, 2007).

Many permanent residents are professionals or spouses of nationals of the host countries, and significant numbers of them have acquired citizenship in their host countries. They often hold well-paying jobs and have attained relative wealth. As a group, they have also integrated socially and culturally into their host countries. A number of them have brought family members and relatives to their host countries. Many have raised families in their country of residence, resulting in a growing number of second-generation overseas Filipinos.

Temporary Filipino workers, often referred to as Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs), are estimated at 3.8 million. OFWs are persons working outside of the Philippines, whose stay in other countries is tied to their jobs, and who are expected to return to the Philippines at the end of their labor contracts (CFO, 2007).

Overseas Filipino Workers are further classified as land-based and sea-based workers. The National Statistics Office (2004) reported that land-based workers hired from 1992 to 2005 were primarily laborers and other unskilled workers. Professionals, technicians and clerical workers comprise a minority (Population Commission, 2007). Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, the United States, Hong Kong

and China, Qatar, Japan, Malaysia, Italy, and Taiwan (in descending order) employ the highest number of land-based OFWs (CFO, 2006 as cited by Population Commission, 2007).

Sea-based workers are those working in any international fishing, passenger, or cargo vessel (Talento, 2004). The Philippines stands as the world's top supplier of seafarers around the world. About 30%, or around 274,000, of the total maritime population of 913,000, is composed of Filipinos (Samante, 2007).

Undocumented overseas Filipinos are Filipinos residing in other countries without proper documentation, including valid residence or work permits. Most undocumented Filipinos left the Philippines as tourists, but have remained in the countries to which they traveled and have gained employment there, albeit illegally (Talento, 2004). The population of undocumented Filipinos is estimated at 874,000 (CFO, 2007) but most observers consider this to be a very conservative estimate. Most undocumented Filipinos live and work in the United States, Malaysia, and Singapore (CFO, 2007). Because of their status, undocumented Filipinos often work in what are sometimes referred to as “3D jobs”—dirty, demeaning, and dangerous.

The size of the Filipino diaspora is expected to continue to increase. The now-entrenched government policy of sending overseas workers abroad, the perennial political and economic crises, and the country's intractable poverty and hopelessness will continue to fuel Filipino emigration in the foreseeable future.

Record-high levels of remittances

Attendant to the steady growth in the number of overseas Filipinos is the annual increase in remittances, which in recent years has reached record-high levels. According to the World Bank, the Philippines ranks fifth in the world in terms of remittances received, following India, China, Mexico, and France (Tetangco, 2007). The Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (BSP) reported that annual OFW remittances increased from US\$103 million in 1975¹ (about the time the Philippines started its overseas employment program) to US\$12.8 billion in 2006 (Agence France-Presse, 2007). The BSP expected 2007 remittances to top US\$14 billion.

These figures, astounding as they are, significantly underestimate total remittances to the Philippines. Official estimates reflect only remittances transferred through banks. However, transmitting money through banks incurs high fees; thus, many overseas Filipinos send money through informal channels, including door-to-door and courier services and the *padala* system (sending money through a relative or friend who is going home) (Commission on Population, 2007). It is estimated that, including remittances sent through informal channels, OFW remittances in 2007 will total close to US\$20 billion. This would represent almost 15% of the Philippines's estimated gross economic product of US\$137 billion (Lucas, 2007).

Table 2 shows the breakdown of the 2005 and 2006 overseas Filipino remittances in terms of source continents, and Table 3 lists the top 10 source countries. Noteworthy to efforts to tap diaspora phi-

lanthropy is the portion of remittances that come from the United States—over 60% of the total.

Table 2. OFW Remittances by Origin For 2005 and 2006

World Group	OFW Remittances*		
	2005	2006	% Change
Asia	1,172,373	1,496,120	27.6%
Middle East	1,417,491	1,909,208	34.7%
Europe	1,433,904	2,061,067	43.7%
Americas	6,605,231	7,198,212	9.0%
Trust Territories	-	-	0.0%
Africa	4,546	10,272	126.0%
Oceania	54,573	85,610	56.9%
Others	887	819	-7.7%
Landbased Total	9,019,647	10,812,018	19.9%
Seabased Total	1,669,358	1,949,290	16.8%
Total OFW Remittance	10,689,005	12,761,308	19.4%
<i>Monthly Remittance Average</i>	<i>890,750</i>	<i>1,063,442</i>	

Note: Data are not truly reflective of the actual country of deployment of OFW's due to the common practice of remittance centers in various cities abroad to course remittance through correspondent banks mostly located in the U.S.

* In Thousand US dollars

Source: DER-BSP as cited in POEA (2006)

Table 3. Top Ten Sources of OFW Remittances For 2005 and 2006

Country of Origin	OFW Remittances*		
	2005	2006	% Change
1. United States of America	6,424,848	6,526,429	1.58%
2. Saudi Arabia	949,372	1,117,915	17.75%
3. Canada	117,061	590,627	404.55%
4. Italy	430,071	574,662	33.62%
5. United Kingdom	300,725	561,670	86.77%
6. Japan	356,659	453,398	27.12%
7. United Arab Emirates	257,429	427,246	65.97%
8. Hongkong	338,895	413,723	22.08%
9. Singapore	240,149	285,126	18.73%
10. Taiwan	86,551	168,998	95.26%

Note: Data are not truly reflective of the actual country of deployment of OFW's due to the common practice of remittance centers in various cities abroad to course remittances through correspondent banks mostly located in the U.S.

* In Thousand US dollars

Source: DER-BSP as cited in POEA (2006)



*A problematic government
policy on migration*

The Philippine government has an explicit strategy to export the country's labor. This policy, initiated in 1974, has become part of the Philippine development strategy, primarily viewed as a means of easing domestic unemployment, having a healthy balance of payment accounts, and stabilizing dollar reserves (Economic Resource Center for Overseas Filipinos [ERCOF], n.d.; Wescott & Brinkerhoff, 2006). Many scholars view this as a flawed policy. Newland and Patrick (2004) pointed out:

The policies of the Philippine government appear to treat the financial contributions of diaspora and temporary workers alike primarily as income flows rather than potential investment stock. As income flows, they relieve poverty directly. But the Philippine government does not seem to have a strategy to maximize the developmental potential of established communities of Filipinos overseas, which might have a more lasting impact on poverty reduction (p.16).

Newland (2003, as cited in Anonuevo, 2005) further observes that migrant-sending countries like the Philippines have difficulty transforming income from migrant remittances into productive capacity. The government also fails to recognize and appreciate the duality of overseas Filipino migration. Migration may represent enormous financial resources and development potential. However, it has concomitant

social costs, including its adverse effects on the families, marriages, and children of migrant workers. The growth in the proportional migration of Filipino women may only increase these and other social costs (CMA, 2006; Dizon-Anonuevo & Anonuevo, 2006). The benefits of migration will only be realized if the Philippine government takes more decisive action to address these issues.

Practices and Patterns in Filipino Diaspora Giving

A small but significant portion of Filipino remittances is intended for the benefit of individuals and organizations beyond the sender's immediate family. In recent years, both scholars and practitioners have begun to try to better understand these philanthropic flows and their impact on the people and communities of the Philippines. This section reviews what is known about current patterns and practices of Filipino diaspora giving, exploring the volume and type of contributions, the sources and beneficiaries of charitable gifts, and the channels or vehicles used for donations.

It must be noted that there is a paucity of quantifiable data on the magnitude of philanthropic contributions—of money, knowledge, skills, or material—from overseas, and only limited analysis of its impact. The scarce data on diaspora philanthropy come from reports of government agencies, facilitators, and intermediaries of diaspora giving and from earlier studies on Filipino diaspora philanthropy, which in large part have relied on anecdotal accounts. The available information clearly falls short in

its portrayal of Filipino diaspora giving. Going forward, empirical research on Filipino diaspora philanthropy will be essential to realizing its potential.

Financial contributions

It is impossible to account for the total volume of philanthropic capital from the Filipino diaspora. The Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (BSP) has been unable to identify the total amount of donations from overseas Filipinos that pass through the formal banking channels. Raul Dimayuga, Senior Vice-President for Global Remittance Division of the Bank of the Philippine Islands, explained that tracking charitable donations from Filipinos separately from the billions of dollars in overseas transactions would be tedious and complicated. Moreover, the significant number of donations that pass through informal channels

or that are given directly to beneficiaries are not accounted for by any official means. Citing BSP as source, a number of studies including Opiniano (2004), Association of Foundations (2005), Silva (2006), Powers (2006), and Garchitorena (2007a) have noted that available data estimated charitable contributions at US\$218 million in 2003. However, in a recent interview, Rosabel Guerrero, Acting Director of the Department of Economic Statistics of BSP, explained that this figure includes both charitable gifts and remittances. Under its old reporting format BSP placed the remittances of overseas contract workers under Compensation Income and the remittances of overseas Filipino residents under Workers Remittances. Also included under Workers Remittances were gifts and donations coming from the United States.

Table 4. PHILIPPINE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS CURRENT TRANSFERS in million U.S. dollars

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006 r/
CURRENT TRANSFERS	5784	5643	6860	7680	8386	9160	11391	13180
RECEIPTS	5969	5909	7119	7948	8626	9420	11711	13511
PAYMENTS	185	266	259	268	240	260	320	331
General government	433	442	471	497	555	387	437	313
Receipts	495	503	533	563	620	460	530	424
Payments	62	61	62	66	65	73	93	111
Other sectors	5351	5201	6389	7183	7831	8773	10954	12867
Receipts	5474	5406	6586	7385	8006	8960	11181	13087
Payments	123	205	197	202	175	187	227	220
Workers' remittances	5212	5161	6328	7167	7681	8617	10668	12481
Receipts	5212	5161	6328	7167	7681	8617	10668	12481
Payments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other transfers	139	40	61	16	150	156	286	386
Receipts	262	245	258	218	325	343	513	606
Payments	123	205	197	202	175	187	227	220

r/ Revised to reflect: a) late reports; b) post audit adjustments; and c) final data from companies.

Source: BSP, <http://www.bsp.gov.ph/statistics/sdds/boprevs/bop99-06.htm>



Under BSP's revised format, adopted in 2004 to comply with the International Monetary Fund standard, remittances from overseas Filipinos are categorized as: 1) compensation of employees, seasonal and other workers (those with contracts of less than one year); 2) workers' remittances (those with employment contracts of more than one year) and 3) gifts and donations coming from overseas Filipinos (reflected under Receipts from Other Transfers). However, Receipts from Other Transfers also includes donations from overseas institutions (e.g., private and corporate foundations) providing financial assistance to not-for-profit organizations in the Philippines (R. Guerrero, personal communication, January 29, 2008). As shown in Table 4, Receipts from Other Transfers have increased from US\$262 million in 1999 to US\$606 million in 2006. However, it cannot be determined how much of the increase is due to donations from individual Filipinos abroad.

Knowledge transfers

In addition to the financial and material contributions of overseas Filipinos, there are important transfers of knowledge and skills from the diaspora population to the Philippines. Most of these non-monetary transfers are undocumented, and their impact has not been empirically measured. This is unfortunate if we consider the view of Kapur, et. al. (2004, as cited by Najam, 2007), who say that "diasporas have much more to offer than just their money and, as we find other cases, it may well be that the bigger contribution they have to offer is their knowledge and experience rather than just their resources" (p.123).

The Philippine government, international agencies, and overseas Filipinos themselves have initiated knowledge-transfer activities. Wescott and Brinkerhoff (2006) observed that while there was some success with knowledge-transfer programs begun by the Philippine government and by the United Nations, most of these programs have been discontinued. The government's Science and Technology Advisory Council established chapters in several countries to engage overseas Filipino scientists, but only the chapter in Japan remains. The Transfer of Knowledge through Expatriate Nationals (TOKTEN) program, jointly administered by the Filipino Department of Foreign Affairs and the United Nations Development Program, funded short-term knowledge transfer visits of overseas Filipinos from 1988 to 1994. TOKTEN included programs benefiting the solar energy sector, the tilapia industry, and irrigation systems in the Philippines (Wescott & Brinkerhoff, 2006).

The Commission on Filipinos Overseas (CFO) also posted 233 overseas Filipino students, scholars, scientists, and other professionals with expertise in science and technology, education, agriculture and other fields in various programs in the Philippines. These advisors conducted lectures and workshops, and provided consulting services to academic institutions, government agencies, and private enterprises in the Philippines (Cabilao-Valencia & Colasito, 2007). Meanwhile, the Department of Science and Technology, through its BALIK Scientist Program, funds short- and long-term assignments for overseas Filipinos in universities, hospitals, government agencies, and private companies in the Philip-

pinas (Wescott & Brinkerhoff, 2006). The CFO and the Balik Scientist programs are still being implemented.

Overseas Filipino organizations have also initiated several knowledge- and skills-transfer programs in the Philippines, and this type of philanthropic activity appears to be increasing. Some of the noteworthy initiatives include the following:

- The Association of Filipino Teachers implements a teacher training program in cooperation with CFO.
- The Philippine Institute of Certified Public Accountants conducts continuing education seminars for fellow accountants in the Philippines.
- The Philippines Canada-Trade Council promotes trade and business relations between the two countries through networking and referral (Wescott & Brinkerhoff, 2006).
- The Brain Gain Network (BGN) of engineers, scientists, and high-technology organizations taps overseas Filipinos in the field of science and technology to conduct online consultancies and mentoring to individuals and organizations in the Philippines (Garchitorea, 2007a).
- The Massachusetts Institute of Technology-Philippine Emerging Start-ups Open (PESO), established by a student group, holds a yearly competition of business plans and feasibility studies for investment in the Philippines (Bo, 2007).
- The Overseas Filipinos Federation, Inc., an association of migrant returnees and their cooperatives and enterprises,

holds business seminars for returning migrants (Wescott & Brinkerhoff, 2006).

Future analysis of the reach and impact of these programs will further illuminate the role of diaspora philanthropy in social change.

Sources of philanthropy

Do overseas Filipino permanent residents, temporary migrant workers and undocumented workers all give back to the Philippines? There is no available data, but there are indications that all of these groups give to people in need, to their home communities, and to support social issues and concerns. There is also reason to believe that **the largest share of donations comes from overseas Filipinos who are permanently settled in different countries.**

As pointed out by the Association of Foundations (AF) (2005), giving by overseas Filipinos is influenced by salary level and immigration status. Permanent residents, a number of whom have attained relative wealth in their host countries, do not have to send money regularly to family members in the Philippines because most of their immediate family members have already joined them overseas. Thus, this group is in a position to give to broader issues and concerns in the Philippines. Temporary workers, on the other hand, are most often supporting families in the Philippines, with little excess income to support organizations and social issues. With these additional and more basic financial requirements, it is not expected that their level of charitable giving would approach that of permanent residents. Undocumented overseas Filipinos are an even more



economically disadvantaged group because of their immigration status and their generally low-skilled jobs. They, too, have more basic personal financial needs and obligations to address before they can help others in the Philippines (AF, 2005).

CFO (2007) reported that Filipinos and Filipino-Americans in the United States have been the major source of donations for the LINKAPIL (Lingkod sa Kapwa Pilipino/Link for Philippine Development) Program. LINKAPIL is a program of the CFO that mobilizes donations from permanent Filipino residents in North America, Australia, and Europe in support of community projects in the Philippines. Over the past 17 years, they have donated about US\$44 million in financial and material assistance. Donations also come from Filipinos in Canada (US\$1.9m), Germany (US\$1.5m), Australia (US\$1.2m), Japan (US\$847k), the Netherlands (US\$420k), Korea (US\$228k), Belgium (US\$169k), Sweden (US\$125k), and Italy (US\$77k). Notably, the top five source countries of donations are also the five countries with the most number of permanent Filipino settlers: the United States, Canada, Australia, Japan, and Germany (see Table 1).

The largest portion of charitable donations comes from Filipinos in the United States. The Filipino population in the United States is distinguished by its large size, its high level of income and education, and its relatively long residence in the United States. These characteristics were found by studies of Kapur, Metha, & Moon Dutt (2004) and the Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy (2005) to be indica-

tors of a diaspora population's propensity to give.

The U.S. Census Bureau (2005, as cited in "Income of Filipinos", 2005) estimated that about 2.4 million Filipinos live in the United States. They rank third among Asians in terms of median annual family income (at US\$65,189). The Bureau also reported that, since 1999, Filipinos have had the lowest poverty rate among Asians. Filipino-Americans are also well-educated and highly skilled; 39% of Filipino-Americans aged 25 and older have at least a bachelor's degree, compared with 23% of all Americans (Cacas, 1995). Most Filipinos in the United States hold management and professional jobs. About 30% are in sales and office jobs, while 17.5% are in service occupations ("Income of Filipinos", 2005).

More than Filipino migrant workers in other countries, Filipinos in the United States, Canada, and European countries enjoy substantial savings that could be invested in or donated to causes in the Philippines. Some have established linkages with professional groups, institutions, and foundations, whose resources could also be tapped. In addition, their expertise in various fields could also be tapped for the country's benefit.

Channels of giving

Overseas Filipinos make financial and material donations, and transfer their knowledge and skills to the Philippines, through channels that include: 1) personal and family ties; 2) overseas Filipino organizations; 3) facilitators; and 4) not-for-profit affiliates of Philippine-based organizations.

Individual giving through families, relatives and friends

There is an unverified but widely shared belief that a large number of overseas Filipinos send charitable donations to their families, relatives and friends, who, in turn, give these donations to individual beneficiaries. This belief is indicative of **a strong preference of the Filipino diaspora for individual giving over institutional giving**. This preference should not be regarded as an expression of an adverse attitude towards non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or government agencies, which is the case, according to Najam (2007) in the South Asian experience, and particularly with the Pakistani diaspora. Although expressions of mistrust of NGOs, private foundations, and government programs do exist, they do not seem to be strong or widespread among overseas Filipinos. The CFO, the Ayala Foundation USA (AFUSA) and other private foundations, and many NGOs continue to enjoy support from overseas Filipinos.

The prevalent view among overseas Filipinos seems to be that giving directly to individuals in need is preferable, and that its effects on beneficiaries more tangible and more easily monitored. Kapur, Metha, & Moon Dutt (2004) note that providing money through families, relatives, and friends, during their occasional visits to their home countries is also the easiest way for migrants to give.

The beneficiaries of these personal and direct gifts are diverse. Individual Filipinos give to relatives in need, to friends who ask for help, and to neighbors who are sick and needy. They give gifts to the poor

during Christmas, help victims of calamities, and support the education needs of children in their communities of origin. Individual giving also benefits churches and local governments through the intercession of priests and other religious leaders and government officials, who have been abroad or who have asked for help through migrants' families and friends in the Philippines.

Organizations of Filipinos

The next most important channel for Filipino diaspora giving is the growing number of Filipino organizations in countries around the world. It is estimated that there are around 12,000 overseas Filipino groups (Bagasao, 2003) encompassing a wide range of interests and members (Garchitorea, 2007a; Alayon, 2006; Silva, 2006; AF, 2005). Table 5 lists the various types of organizations, describes their composition, and cites some examples of the organizational categories.

Generally, these overseas Filipino organizations are loose, voluntary social groups that conduct occasional fund-raising and solicitation activities in support of specific projects and causes in the Philippines. Most of the fund-raising activities are not held regularly. With the exception, perhaps, of the not-for-profit foundations, most of these organizations were not originally formed as conduits or channels for diaspora giving. In fact, most of them coordinate a wide variety of social, cultural, and professional activities for their members' benefit. A number of them, though, have acknowledged the need to facilitate giving back to the Philippines.



Table 5. Types of Overseas Filipino Organizations

Types of Organization	Membership Description	Examples
Hometown Associations	Organizations whose members hail from common hometowns in the Philippines or have the same regional, ethnic/language affiliations	Abra Tinggian Ilocano Association (Hong Kong), Samahang Sampablenyo of Toronto (Canada), Ilongo Integrated Association (New Zealand), Boholanos of Las Vegas (US)
Community or Area-Based Organizations	Associations whose members live in the same community, city, or region in the host country	Bayerische Philippinische Gessellschaft (Germany), Filipino Association in Toledo, Filipino Association of Ottawa Valley (Canada), Filipino-Swiss Thurgao Circle in Frauenfeld (Switzerland), Filipino Limburg Community (Belgium)
Alumni Associations	Associations whose members graduated from the same school, college, or university in the Philippines	UP Nursing Alumni Association, UST Medical Alumni Association, San Beda Alumni Association, Arellano University Alumni Association, Notre Dame Cotabato Alumni Association
Overseas Filipino Not-for-Profits/Foundations	Groups formed to address various causes in the Philippines	ANCOP (Answering the Cry of the Poor), Overseas Filipino Worldwide-Mutual Benefit Corporation; Feed the Hungry, Inc. (US); Stichting Habagat, Damayan (Netherlands), Concerned Canadian Filipino for International Foundation, Pinokyos Welfare (Singapore)
Church/Faith-Based Groups	Members who bond together and engage in various religious activities	Winnipeg Filipino Alliance Church (Canada), Couples for Christ, Philippine Medical Mission of St. Charles Borromeo Parish in Virginia (US)
Professional Organizations	Associations whose members are of the same occupation/profession	Philippine Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Association of Filipino Teachers, Association of Philippine Physicians in America (US), Philippine Dental Association of Manitoba (Canada), Philippine Association of Metropolitan Washington Engineers (US)
Migrants/Women Rights and Welfare Organizations	Organizations formed to pursue migrants' or women's rights and welfare advocacies	OFW Congress-Middle East, Filipino Women Council (Italy), Babaylan-Europe, Samahan ng Manggagawang Pilipino sa Belgium
Business Groups	Groups that pursue business opportunities and interests	Filipino American Chamber of Commerce, Philippines Canada-Trade Council
Federations/Networks	Composed of organizations of overseas Filipinos of the same interests in a given country or region	National Federation of American Associations, Commission on Filipinos Overseas-Europe, Brain Gain Network, Global Entrepreneurs Network-Philippines
Virtual Overseas Filipino Organizations	Virtual groups whose members "interact" and support causes mainly through the Internet	Romblon Discussion List; Progressive Times Action Group, FilAm Forum, Gugma han Samar, Association of Bansalenos Worldwide
Others	Groups whose members serve basically specific interests of its members	Student groups, cultural associations, sports clubs

Source: Silva (2006); Garchitorena (2006); Alayon, (2006); Association of Foundations (2005)

The most important—and the most numerous—among these organizations in terms of diaspora giving are the hometown associations. These organizations raise and collect funds almost exclusively for their home communities, towns, and provinces.

The alumni associations and overseas Filipino not-for-profits come next in importance. A number of schools and hospitals have benefited from the relatively generous contributions of their alumni. In a sense, this giving is also “local” because donations are directed to their “home” schools, hospitals, and universities.

An emerging and potentially important variation of this model is the virtual overseas Filipino organization. These organizations make full use of information technology in discussing national and local issues in the Philippines and in soliciting funds for various projects. There are virtual hometown associations, such as Romblon Discussion List and Gugma han Samar, which exclusively support projects in their communities of origin. There are also virtual Filipino organizations, such as Progressive Times Action Group (PTAG) and Filam Forum, which are composed of Filipinos based in different countries and from different regions in the Philippines. These organizations serve as discussion forums for various national issues and concerns and as channels for supporting projects in the Philippines.

In terms of knowledge and skills transfer, the most important conduits are the professional organizations, which, among others, initiate activities to help those in the same profession in the Philippines.

Often overlooked in earlier studies on diaspora philanthropy are those organizations that focus on migrants’ and women’s rights, and welfare advocacy. These organizations, too, have engaged in fund-raising activities whose proceeds have benefited needy groups and social causes in the Philippines.

Intermediaries/Facilitators

New channels of Filipino diaspora giving that are receiving growing recognition are facilitator agencies, often called “intermediary organizations,” whose mission is to raise funds from a variety of donors and distribute donations to a range of beneficiaries in the Philippines. Two prominent examples of such intermediaries are the government’s CFO and the Ayala Group of Companies’ AFUSA. While CFO receives donations from overseas Filipinos in different countries, AFUSA operates only in the United States.

The CFO runs the LINKAPIL program. Since 1990, LINKAPIL has mobilized donations from overseas Filipinos for the benefit of myriad organizations and beneficiaries in the Philippines. It recommends to donors projects that they can support and also identifies and coordinates with government agencies and local partners to implement projects. Moreover, LINKAPIL monitors the projects and submits regular progress reports to the donors (CFO, n.d.). From 1990 to 2006, LINKAPIL facilitated a total of 2,773 donations amounting to approximately US\$50 million (CFO, 2007).

AFUSA is based in San Francisco, California. It generates support to various projects in the Philippines from Filipinos



and Filipino-Americans. The total amount of resources that AFUSA mobilized from 2000 to 2007 is about US\$ 4.2 million (Garchitorena, 2007b). AFUSA's practice as a facilitator is further discussed in the section of Strategic Filipino Diaspora Philanthropy.

Affiliates of Philippine-based organizations

A number of Philippine-based organizations and foundations have set up affiliates in various countries to campaign for their own causes among overseas Filipinos. The most notable examples are Answer for the Cry of the Poor (ANCOP) and the Alto Broadcasting System-Chronicle Broadcasting Network (ABS-CBN) Foundation.

ANCOP generates support exclusively for Gawad Kalinga (GK), a comprehensive housing project of Couples for Christ, a religious movement in the Philippines. ANCOP's work is described later in this paper to highlight best practices of strategic Filipino diaspora philanthropy.

The ABS-CBN Foundation campaigns abroad for contributions for organizational initiatives such as *Bantay Bata* (Child Watch), a program for the rescue and rehabilitation of physically and sexually abused Filipino children, and *Bantay Kalikasan* (Environment Watch), a program that supports the protection of the Philippine environment.

Beneficiaries of Filipino diaspora philanthropy

Who has benefited from Filipino diaspora contributions? There seems to be a consensus in the literature that **there is a strong preference among overseas**

Filipinos to send their donations to their hometown, be that defined as a *barangay*, town, or province. Even overseas Filipinos who have developed sophisticated strategic philanthropic giving approaches often have a hometown bias. Najam (2007) rightly observes that "it seems that the context at both the collection and the distribution ends of (Filipino) diaspora philanthropy tend to be far more local". Further, he says, "local institutional frameworks seem to be a primary vehicle of diasporic organization for philanthropic giving" (p.126). Although many donations are given directly to local individuals and institutions, a sizeable amount is contributed to hometown associations in the United States, which pass on these donations to their hometowns in the Philippines. Additional donations to hometowns are made through facilitators and affiliates of Philippine-based organizations.

Individuals, communities, and the socio-civic institutions in these communities—such as the church, schools, hospitals, and local governments—have been beneficiaries of philanthropy from permanent and temporary Filipino migrants (AF, 2005; Powers, 2006; Silva, 2006). Garchitorena (2007a) categorizes recipients of Filipino diaspora philanthropy as individuals, relatives, friends, and neighbors in need; church and other faith-based organizations; universities and colleges; hospitals; NGOs and foundations; and government, especially local government units. Data are not available on how much the beneficiaries have received from the Filipino diaspora through the years. But given the propensity for local giving, it is likely that local gov-

ernments and churches often benefit from overseas contributions.

Examples from two communities—Mabini, Batangas and San Pablo City, Laguna—illustrate how philanthropy has helped these two institutions. In Mabini, it is estimated that a *barangay* can easily solicit US\$5,000 to US\$12,500 annually for *fiesta* celebrations and various projects from town citizens who are working abroad (R. Hernandez, personal communication, September 15, 2007). A former parish priest in Mabini estimated that he raised approximately US\$142,000 over a ten-year period for church renovations and for the procurement of a church bell from Rome (E. Pagcaliuangan, personal communication, September 15, 2007).

According to Lingap sa Pitong Lawa leaders in San Pablo City (L. Prudente, V. Prudente, and K. Javaluyas, personal communication, September 26, 2007) the city receives an average of US\$50,000 annually from the diaspora community. City leaders suggest that the bulk of donations come from Seven Lakes International, a federation of organizations of people who came from San Pablo City and now reside in the United States and Canada. Donations go to a variety of community programs, including feeding programs, scholarships, and the construction of public facilities such as *barangay* halls, recreational facilities, and a library.

In addition to the perceived preference for supporting local issues and entities, overseas Filipinos appear to prefer to engage in giving that has a tangible impact, that contributes to immediate relief, and that is short-term. **There is preference to**

support education, health, and disaster relief—causes seen by overseas Filipinos as the most pressing needs of the Filipino people (Opiniano, 2007).

These preferences are reaffirmed by CFO data. In its LINKAPIL program, health services and medical missions received the bulk of donations, about US\$32 million or 63% of the total. The breakdown of other projects supported is as follows: relief/calamity assistance, US\$7.3m (14%); education/scholarship and related projects, US\$6.65m (13%); livelihood/micro-enterprise projects, US\$4.45m (9%); and infrastructure projects, US\$299.5m or 1% (CFO, 2007).

There are indications that some overseas Filipinos are beginning to look more closely at the strategic importance of their charitable gifts and the programs they support. In a study by Fabian (2003, as cited by AF, 2005), Filipino-Americans indicated that “education, economic development and job creation, political reform, and poverty issues (food, shelter, health, and other basic services) are the areas of greatest need” (p. 18). Such views reflect some knowledge of the country’s fundamental challenges, and hopefully bespeak a desire to confront these problems together with others. There are recent examples of overseas support for causes and programs that are larger in scale, more strategic in scope, and of higher impact than traditional philanthropic causes. To date, however, traditional charitable giving remains dominant, with more strategic philanthropic investments remaining the encouraging exception.



Strategic Filipino Diaspora Philanthropy

The Asia Pacific Philanthropy Consortium (APPC) defines strategic philanthropy by diaspora populations as “investments that fund longer-term and sustainable solutions and social change in home countries, as opposed to charitable giving that addresses immediate needs, and beyond remittance transfers that fulfill familial obligations” (APPC, 2007). Ayala (2006) emphasizes that the term “strategic” is not meant to denigrate what is often called “charity,” because such donations are just as important, especially to people who are in need of immediate assistance. However, it suggests that philanthropy must also attempt to address the underlying issues creating the need for charity.

Filipino diaspora philanthropy remains predominantly characterized by traditional charitable giving, focused on providing immediate assistance and relief to those most in need. There has been no significant, widespread shift to a more strategic approach to giving that would focus on underlying issues, sustainable solutions, and social change. Silva (2006), in a study of Filipino hometown associations in Canada, commented:

Because of the irregular nature of the collective remittance flow to the Philippines, the development impact is not as great....While development projects undertaken are typically tangible in nature, they are not targeted towards a specific objective within a community. Projects end up as small contributions to an array of different

problems, which do not entirely provide holistic impact on development (p.42).

Strategic philanthropy to the Philippines appears to be limited in large part by: (1) a donor’s desire for swift and tangible results, and (2) the lack of access to partners in the Philippines who are committed to sustainable development approaches and outcomes. Silva (2006) observed that Filipino migrants want to see that their contributions are used for the intended purpose and want to be able to distinguish concrete outcomes. “Consequently,” according to Silva, “projects geared towards economic development are quite rare since results relating to this type of programming are often difficult to measure and observe by migrants themselves” (p.37).

Strategic giving is further limited by the lack of information on potential partners and development initiatives readily available to donors. For the most part, the migrant population is unaware of the many worthy development initiatives, programs, and projects in the Philippines. Few donors have links or partnerships beyond those within their own village. Tessie Alarcon, president of Feed the Hungry (FtH), a foundation based in the United States, said in an interview on October 20, 2007: “We would like to fund more sustainable projects such as livelihood projects and micro-finance projects, but our problem is the lack of partners who will monitor these projects and ensure their sustainability.”

There is no centralized clearinghouse or database of evaluated or endorsed NGOs and their programs. In the absence of such a coordinating system, only a few indi-

vidual NGOs are able to directly engage with the diaspora. Discussions with NGO leaders point to the following obstacles to more widespread engagement:

- Most NGOs are familiar with and focused on traditional funding agencies and have not yet recognized the Filipino diaspora as a source of funding;
- Most NGOs do not have the social capital, skills, and resources required (e.g., mounting fund-raising campaigns in diaspora communities) to mobilize donations from overseas Filipinos.

Emerging practices in strategic philanthropy

Although the lion's share of overseas contributions is directed to traditional charitable endeavors and local communities, there are several examples of diaspora organizations—in partnership with NGOs, foundations, and/or local and national government agencies—engaged in strategic philanthropic investment aimed at sustainable development and social change. It would be presumptuous—or premature at best—to suggest an “emerging trend” of strategic diaspora giving, but cautious optimism for the future of diaspora giving may be appropriate.

Notably, the CFO is actively encouraging more strategic and sustained giving from their donors. In 2006, the CFO shifted its focus to fewer, more sustainable projects. Regina Angela Galias, former project director of LINKAPIL, has said: “We do not encourage and facilitate any more charitable giving from our donors except during cases of calamities where provision of relief is important. In our campaigns abroad, we

emphasize the need to support sustainable projects. In 2006 we campaigned to our donors not only to provide relief to those affected by typhoons and other disasters but to provide funds for rehabilitation of their means of livelihood” (M.R.A. Galias, personal communication, August 17, 2007). This policy shift was responsible for the significant increase in donations going to livelihood projects. In 2006, US\$3.6 million of the US\$4 million generated went to livelihood programs (CFO, 2007).

Several smaller-scale initiatives further illustrate the emergence of strategic philanthropic practices among diaspora communities and their local partners.

- The NGO Atikha engages the Filipino diaspora in social enterprise projects. Its Save a Tree of Life campaign mobilized diaspora donations to start up a community-based business enterprise, Coco Natur. The campaign was undertaken in partnership with the Overseas Filipinos Worldwide-Mutual Benefit Corporation (OFW-MBC), an organization of professionals based in San Francisco, California and Seven Lakes International, a federation of overseas Filipino hometown organizations with members from San Pablo City, Laguna. The initial US\$17,500 investment from the diaspora has leveraged an additional US\$95,000 from the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) and individual donors. Coco Natur has developed into a fair-trade social enterprise of coconut farmers and overseas Filipinos, and coconut farmers have become producers, instead of just being suppliers, of coconuts. The U.S.-



based Filipino partners help to market products and mobilize additional investments (Atikha, 2006).

- Romblon Discussion List - Culture Livelihood Educational Assistance for Romblon (RDL-CLEAR) is a virtual hometown association of former and current residents of Romblon, with about 70% of its members residing outside of the Philippines. RDL-CLEAR organizes and engages the dispersed hometown population through the internet and occasional *sanrokan* conferences in Romblon, which bring together local government officials, the academe, and NGOs to discuss and propose interventions to key problems facing the province. One of the key priorities recently identified was the preservation of coral reefs in the town of Calatrava in Tablas Island, Romblon, which were being destroyed by rampant dynamite fishing. With a donation of US\$2,900 from the diaspora community, RDL-CLEAR coordinated the participation of the local government, the academe, and the fishermen in protecting the coral reefs. While the investment was modest, it increased the municipality's 2005 coastal management budget of US\$4,800 by 60%. (Powers, 2006). The area has now been declared a fish sanctuary; a growing variety of fish are seen on the coral reef; and fishing in the area has become more abundant (N. Fajutagana, personal communication, October 5, 2007).
- The Damayang Pilipino sa Nederland (DAMAYAN), an organization which aids Filipinos in the Netherlands and

in the Philippines, and the Association of Bansaleños Worldwide (ABW), a virtual hometown association of former Bansalan residents, launched a joint fund-raising drive among Filipinos in the Netherlands to promote both micro-enterprise and literacy in Mindanao. DAMAYAN and ABW provide mothers with start-up capital so that they can set up small micro-enterprises, increase their household income, and eventually send their children to school. The two organizations were able to raise a total of US\$5,265 from the Netherlands-based diaspora. This initial contribution leveraged several other contributions for the program. First, this amount was matched by The Wild Geese Foundation in the Netherlands. (L. Rispens-Noel, personal communication, September 15, 2007). Second, DAMAYAN worked with the local government to develop a "one-for-one program," which means that for every child sponsored by DAMAYAN, the government sponsors another child. And third, in November 2007, Governor Oscar Moreno of Misamis Oriental in Mindanao pledged to match the funds raised by the organizations for micro-finance projects in the province.

Two additional organizations provide further examples of strategic philanthropy. The AFUSA's support of the GILAS Project and the ANCOP-Gawad Kalinga (GK) partnership are considered exemplary because: (1) the supported programs represent strategic interventions to problems of national scope and concern; (2) the resource mobilization

campaigns for the projects are able to integrate national needs with donors' preference for hometown or local giving; and 3) the organizations have successfully used diaspora funds to leverage additional contributions from local governments and private corporations, allowing projects of a far greater scope and scale. These two strategic organizational efforts are described below.

Ayala Foundation USA: mobilizing philanthropy for a 21st century education

The AFUSA was established in 2000 to broaden the U.S. donor base for social development programs in the Philippines. In its initial years of operation, AFUSA was fairly "donor-driven," with most contributions directed towards the preferences of individual donors. In a departure from this pattern, in 2005, AFUSA began campaigning among the diaspora for support of a specific program of national importance, the GILAS (Gearing up Internet Literacy and Access for Students) initiative.

The GILAS project was initiated by a consortium of corporations, government agencies, public schools, NGOs, and overseas Filipinos to address the acute scarcity of technology resources in the Philippines's public high schools. The program aims to put computer laboratories with Internet access in all 5,789 Philippine public high schools by 2010 (Garchitorena, 2007a). According to Ayala (2006), "(t)he rise of the call center, business process outsourcing industries, software development, and other ICT related companies made it even more imperative that we prepare our high school students in these (computer and Internet literacy) skills."

AFUSA actively promoted GILAS through presentations and networks throughout the United States. Volunteer groups composed of about 100 Filipino-Americans in 10 states raised funds for the program through events such as golf tournaments, benefit dinners, marathon runs, grant proposals, and book sales. Individuals requested that their friends donate to GILAS in lieu of personal gifts. Others requested that their companies, such as Citigroup and Microsoft, match individual contributions to the GILAS project. Some high-net-worth individuals donated generously; for example, the venture capitalist Eric Manlunas donated US\$100,000 to the GILAS project through the Manlunas Foundation (C. Cruza, personal communication, January 21, 2008).

Filipino-American companies also helped AFUSA raise funds. Seafood City, a Filipino-American owned supermarket chain, assisted through donation boxes and co-branding of their "Pamana" brand products. The amount raised was matched by Seafood City management, resulting in contributions of over US\$37,000 in two years.

AFUSA's success in mobilizing resources for GILAS, according to Garchitorena (2007a) "is based on its capacity to respond to the priorities and aspirations of the Filipino donor" (p.18). The campaign was able to convince donors of the critical need to equip Filipino students throughout the country with computer and literacy skills. The donors were also given a free hand to support and become involved with a particular school in their hometown. Through the new computers, they could communi-



cate with their beneficiaries and could even opt to be online mentors to teachers and students in the Philippines.

The GILAS consortium has also used the diaspora contributions to leverage government funds, convincing officials to match funds raised from the private sector and overseas Filipinos. According to Mario Deriquito, Executive Director of Ayala Foundation (personal communication, January 21, 2008) the total amount generated for the GILAS project from January 2005 to December 2007 was US\$3.75 million, which benefited 1,670 public high schools and approximately 800,000 underprivileged youths in the Philippines. Of the US\$3.75 million, Chiara Cruza, Senior Development Officer of Ayala Foundation (personal communication, January 21, 2008) said that AFUSA raised US\$564,187, or about 15% of the total, directly from Filipino-Americans.

AFUSA's GILAS campaign is an impressive example of mobilizing diaspora philanthropy for a remarkably strategic initiative. Introducing computer technology to individual schools enhances students' learning and increases their opportunities for better paying employment.

*ANCOP and Gawad Kalinga
(GK): addressing poverty and
transforming communities*

Johnson (2001) defines global social investing as "the strategic and systematic investment of private philanthropic resources to address complex, inter-connected manifestations of chronic underdevelopment" (p.4). An example of social investing within the context of the Filipino

diaspora is ANCOP's mobilization of resources for GK, an ambitious project designed as an integrated, sustainable, and holistic program to alleviate poverty in the Philippines and transform communities of the poor and homeless. The former director of GK, Tony Meloto, explained in a television interview that because the problems of homelessness and poverty are so widespread, the response must also be massive in scale. The GK 777 program aims to build 700,000 homes in 7,000 communities in 7 years.

ANCOP (Answer for the Cry of the Poor) was established by the Couples for Christ, a faith-based organization in the Philippines, to generate awareness and mobilize resources for the GK initiative. ANCOP USA was established as a 501(c)(3) organization in 2003 and the organization has established additional bases in Australia, Canada, and other countries. ANCOP USA has four staff members, but the bulk of ANCOP's work is done by about 100 volunteers, most of whom are members of Couples for Christ.

The GK initiative constructs houses, builds villages, provides economic opportunities, and addresses other needs of the homeless, such as health care and day care services. A GK village is established to house a minimum of 30 poor families.

According to Eleonor Chichioco (personal communication, December 7, 2007) Program Director of ANCOP USA, ANCOP has developed a variety of different ways in which donors can support the GK initiative. A donor can support a house for US\$1,500 or a village for US\$59,000 (aside from house construction, this

amount includes funds for day care, health services, and other projects). Small donors pool their donations to collectively sponsor a house or a village, which can be named after the donors. Donors can also choose the location of the house or the village they wish to support. In addition, ANCOP raises funds through special events such as WOW-GK (a concert where well-known movie and entertainment personalities from the Philippines perform), marathons, and benefit dinners.

From 2003 to 2007, Chichioco reported that ANCOP USA raised approximately US\$12.45 million to build over 300 GK villages. Rhona Cuaresma, Coordinator of ANCOP Australia, reported raising US\$1.583 million, which established 23 villages. Manette Acero, Coordinator for Finance of ANCOP Canada, stated that they raised around US\$2.5 million and established 82 GK villages (personal communication December 7, 2007). From just these three countries, ANCOP has been able to generate US\$16.53 million and establish about 405 villages since ANCOP was established in 2003. According to Myra Ortega, ANCOP's Officer-in-Charge of Coordinating International Affairs, ANCOP has chapters in about 28 countries, but 95% of donations comes from the US, Canada, and Australia (personal communication, January 23, 2008).

ANCOP also encourages non-monetary support from its donors. Volunteers and partners are asked to assist directly in the construction and in the activities of GK villages. For example, in addition to sponsoring 10 villages, members of the University of Sto. Tomas (UST) Medical

Alumni Association have helped to establish community-based health care projects in GK villages. Successful Filipino-American entrepreneurs are encouraged to assist residents in starting businesses and linking their products to the market. ANCOP encourages the participation of the second-generation Filipino-Americans through its GK Youth Great Adventure Tour (GK YGAT). After visiting the Philippines, the youth often become volunteers of ANCOP in the United States (E. Chichioco, personal communication, December 7, 2007).

As of June 2007, GK had built and transformed more than 1,200 communities in the Philippines and had provided homes and economic opportunities to approximately 26,299 families (R. Cuaresma, personal communication, December 7, 2007). About 35% of these GK communities were established with donations from the Filipino diaspora.

Several factors have likely contributed to ANCOP's success in raising money: (1) GK builds on the donors' charitable impulse to provide assistance to the poor and the homeless; (2) Couples for Christ has a solid overseas membership that contributes directly and serves as volunteers; (3) as a Christian group, it has also been able to readily attract donations from other Christian groups; and (4) GK's early, tangible community-based accomplishments have raised confidence among donors.

Diaspora members as agents of social development and change?

The foregoing examples of strategic philanthropy illustrate the growing role



of the Filipino diaspora as change agents in communities in the Philippines. Many of the Filipino diaspora have accumulated relatively substantial financial and social capital; have gained expertise in specialized fields such as finance, business, health care, development and the environment; and have been exposed to new philanthropic practices. They are poised to play an important role in the development of their communities of origin.

Overseas Filipinos have not only mobilized resources for development, but they also have at times leveraged additional aid from development agencies and corporations in their host countries. For instance, Tessie and Pabito Alarcon, together with other Filipino-Americans in Washington, D.C., raised US\$1.57 million for various Feed the Hungry projects in depressed communities. About 30% of the funds they raised annually came from corporations and organizations such as World Bank, Microsoft, and CISCO (T. Alarcon, personal communication, October 20, 2007). These contributions have comprised critical resources that have rehabilitated communities in Baler and Aurora—provinces that were devastated by storms (Feed the Hungry, 2007).

Overseas Filipinos can be catalysts for change by making full use of their acquired knowledge and skills for the benefit of their communities of origin. Innovative ideas, new technologies, international networks, and new markets are all critical resources that the Filipino diaspora bring to these communities. Micro-enterprises in rural areas are able to develop innovative products, improve product packaging, and

become linked to the global market through the ideas and networks of the Filipino diaspora. For instance, Leila Rispens Noel, who is based in the Netherlands, helped to establish the virtual organization of Bansalan residents and mobilized her townmates abroad and the local government to support sustainable development projects. The organization is now using the Internet to globally promote the products of community-based enterprises in Bansalan. Another example is Dr. Eurfemio Barcelon, who has a PhD in food technology and was based in Australia. He has returned home as a Balik Scientist and is currently helping small enterprises develop innovative and globally competitive food products.

Diaspora communities also have the potential to contribute to their home communities in less direct ways. They can influence local politics, encourage transparency and accountability in government and community organizations, and even promote local activism. The RDL-CLEAR experience shows how virtual hometown associations (HTAs) are able to influence policy makers and local government executives in crafting policies and programs that are responsive to the needs of the community. RDL-CLEAR is now engaged, together with other organizations in Romblon, in stopping mining operations in one of the province's islands.

Another important role of the Filipino diaspora in effecting change in communities is through investments in enterprises, at times seeking a combination of financial and social return on their investments. Nestor Duldulao and Art Claveria, entrepreneurs based in San Francisco, mobilized Filipino

diaspora donations in Northern California to develop community-based coconut enterprises in Laguna, whose intention is to provide jobs for coconut farmers and their families. Others are investing in credit cooperatives and micro-finance organizations to provide much-needed capital for micro-enterprises in the rural areas.

These experiences remain few, but it is hoped that the number of overseas Filipinos actively engaged in strategic giving will continue to expand. One critical ingredient for growth will be the development of an enabling environment to encourage and facilitate such giving. This challenge is examined in the following section.

Creating an Enabling Environment for Strategic Diaspora Philanthropy

Orozco (2007) states that “(t)he efforts of diaspora alone cannot guarantee success. To be successful, policies and conditions external to the migrants need to exist” (p.240). For diaspora philanthropy to become an effective tool for development, an enabling environment that encourages and harnesses the contributions of overseas Filipinos is necessary. This section provides an assessment of the current enabling environment in the Philippines.

Supportive government policies and programs

The Philippines is often cited as a model in managing migration flows (Association of Foundation, 2005). The Philippine government has created various agencies and programs that assist Filipinos in myriad migration-related issues and concerns. It has set up agencies for the protection and

the welfare of OFWs. It has developed programs that extend help to overseas Filipinos and their families in various stages of migration, from pre-departure to on-site to reintegration. It grants dual citizenship and absentee voting to Filipinos abroad. Based on Sidel’s (2007) characterization of state engagement towards the diaspora, the Philippines can be considered a strongly supportive state.

The government has established several government agencies for the protection of migrants abroad. Two agencies have been set up under the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE): the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA) and the Philippine Overseas Employment Authority (POEA). The OWWA provides various welfare services—including health insurance, repatriation, welfare service at the job site, scholarships, and livelihood assistance. POEA formulates and implements employment standards, regulates foreign employment, and issues licenses to private recruitment agencies. The Office of the Undersecretary for Migrant Workers Affairs (OUMWA) under the Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA) was created to assist in matters of diplomatic and foreign relations that affect the welfare of migrants. The Commission on Filipinos Overseas (CFO) was established directly under the Office of the President to handle concerns of permanent residents abroad (Commission on Population, 2007) and to manage the operation of the LINKAPIL program.

The legal framework that seeks to ensure the safe deployment and protection of Filipinos and to increase the political participation of migrant workers abroad



was established with laws such as the Migrant Workers and Overseas Filipinos Act of 1995 (Republic Act 8042), the Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act of 2003, and the Overseas Absentee Voting Act of 2003 (Commission on Population, 2007).

In addition, the Philippine government has passed laws and instituted programs that directly encourage the participation of overseas Filipinos in Philippine affairs and in the use of their resources and skills for the country's benefit. Among these efforts are the Dual Citizenship Law or the Citizenship Retention and Acquisition Act of 2003; the Classroom Galing sa Mamamayan Abroad (CGMA) project, which solicits support from overseas Filipinos in constructing classrooms to address the shortage in the Philippines; the National Reintegration Center for OFWs (NRCO), which endeavors to develop economic and social programs to facilitate reintegration of overseas Filipinos; road shows and "town hall" meetings conducted by embassies and consulates, which discuss opportunities for investment and philanthropy; and matching of diaspora funds by some local government units in the form of land and additional funds for GK and GILAS.

Limitations of government policies and programs

The Philippine government's policies and programs are, in theory, protective of the rights and the welfare of its migrants, but much is still to be desired in terms of their implementation. The government has also created programs that facilitate donations and technology-transfer of its nationals abroad, but the programs are very limited in scope and scale. The main

problem is that these efforts are not part of a coherent development strategy.

The government's LINKAPIL program mobilizes donations of overseas Filipinos, but the government does not have a comprehensive strategy for directing these resources towards sustainable social change. The government's housing program, for instance, will pale in comparison with what ANCOP/GK has accomplished in four years.

The government is also more involved in facilitating its own programs, such as the CGMA classroom adoption program, than in providing mechanisms for various stakeholders to coordinate, upscale, and replicate best practices developed in the not-for-profit and philanthropic sectors. The scale of implementation of government programs is also limited. The Balik Scientist Program, for instance, has mobilized only 297 scientists and experts since it was established in 1975.

In addition, the Philippine government's fiscal framework is not supportive of diaspora giving. The Value Added Tax Law (Republic Act 8424) does not exempt foreign donations to the Philippines. Four government agencies are involved in the approval of tax exemptions of in-kind donations (Department of Finance [DOF], Office of the President, National Economic and Development Authority [NEDA], and Bureau of Customs), making the process of philanthropic giving tedious and difficult (CFO, 2007).

Not-for-profit and business sector involvement

It is only recently that overseas migration has caught the attention of the

business sector in the Philippines. Not-for-profits that are involved in sustainable development programs are just beginning to understand the impact of migration and development issues on their work. They have neither programs that address the social costs of migration nor projects that tap the resources of overseas Filipinos for development.

There are, however, recent commendable efforts from the NGO and not-for-profit communities. The Association of Foundations has conducted research and consultations on Filipino diaspora philanthropy. The Institute on Migration and Development Initiatives has created a portal on Filipino giving. NGOs like Atikha and ERCOF have conducted road shows to tap donations and investments of overseas Filipinos. The International Network on Alternative Financial Institutions, a network of 18 micro-finance organizations in the Philippines, has mobilized resources of overseas Filipinos to fund micro-finance operations in their communities of origin. The Philippine Social Enterprise Network, composed of 38 social enterprises, encourages overseas Filipino philanthropic contributions and investments to help scale up those enterprises. The Philippine Consortium on Migration and Development (Philcomdev), a network of 50 NGOs, micro-finance organizations, cooperatives, social enterprises and overseas Filipino organizations, was formed in June 2007 to mobilize diaspora philanthropy for the upscale of social enterprises and to provide services that address the social cost of migration.

Financial, telecommunication, airline, and real estate companies look at overseas Filipinos primarily as a market for their products. Some, however, have initiated programs that address the social and economic concerns of overseas Filipinos. The Bank of the Philippine Islands (BPI) Foundation funds the production of a training manual on value formation for children of overseas Filipinos. Globe Telecom supports a program on computer literacy for overseas Filipinos and their families. Associated Shipping Management underwrites a financial literacy and psychosocial intervention program for its seafarers and their families.

Information and telecommunication companies (ICTs) could play a significant role in creating an enabling environment for strategic diaspora philanthropy; they have the reach and the influence to encourage and facilitate it. ABS-CBN International established The Filipino Channel (TFC) in 1994. It has more than 200,000 Filipino subscribers in North America and is also beamed to Canada, Australia, Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. (ABS-CBN International, n.d.). Global Media Arts (GMA) launched its GMA Pinoy TV in February 2005. It is beamed to the United States, the Middle East, Japan, Singapore, and Papua New Guinea (GMA Pinoy TV, n.d.). The news and public affairs programs of these telecommunication companies are instrumental in updating Filipinos abroad on the developments in the country. Television has also become an effective tool for fund-raising. Fund-raising for disaster relief and rehabilitation by the ABS-CBN Foundation and GMA Kapuso is done through their tel-



evision programs. ABS-CBN has also integrated, in its popular programs, solicitation of donations from its program contestants, many of whom are overseas Filipinos who have come home for vacation.

To create an enabling environment for strategic philanthropy, the challenge is to combine the expertise of the not-for-profit organizations in crafting and implementing sustainable development programs with the capacity of the business sector and the government in providing the requisites for broadening the scope of development projects. These stakeholders should coordinate their efforts and work together to craft a coherent development strategy that harnesses overseas Filipino resources for development within the Philippines.

Issues and Challenges

Strategic deployment of Filipino diaspora philanthropy remains limited in scope and scale. Although there are several exemplary efforts, as this paper illustrates, these remain few and far between. Much must be done—by the government, NGOs, and the business sector—to create an enabling environment for a widespread and consistent interest in strategic giving. In addition, the following issues and challenges need to be addressed to generate a significant shift from charitable giving to strategic giving by overseas Filipinos:

Broadening the donor base

The diaspora donor base for strategic giving remains relatively small. Efforts have not reached a significant number of overseas Filipino organizations. Facilita-

tors and not-for-profits have not engaged a substantial number of overseas Filipinos to give back to the Philippines. Furthermore, knowledge and skills transfer from the Filipino diaspora remains scarce and limited.

The challenge is to engage a broader section of the Filipino diaspora—especially second-generation Filipinos, those who are not associated with groups, and those involved in traditional charitable giving—to contribute to strategic causes in the Philippines. This challenge calls for creative forms of reaching out to Filipinos overseas (e.g., making full use of the ICTs and informing them of the needs of the communities and the development initiatives in the Philippines). This challenge entails finding “...means and ways that will make it easier to give, offer sufficient choice and options to diaspora donors, and make it possible to track the impact of what was given” (Najam, 2007, p.146).

Building partnerships

The Association of Foundations (2005) stressed that because overseas Filipinos are “absentee investors/donors/entrepreneurs,” they are in need of reliable partners that will help them identify development projects, viable investments, and businesses opportunities in the country. Since migrants are not by nature development-oriented (Orozco, 2003), the challenge is to find development partners in the Philippines who will assist them in project identification, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

Another challenge is to build partnerships among the various stakeholders—including overseas Filipinos, NGOs, government, and business—and merge

their initiatives towards strategic giving. This challenge will require new forms of cooperation, collaboration, and mechanisms through which to pool efforts and resources.

Accommodating donor preference

Powers (2006) viewed the philanthropy of overseas Filipinos with its hometown bias as a “highly inequitable funding mechanism for development (that may) overlook the areas most in need of assistance” (p.54). Yet the Filipino diaspora should not be expected to take the place of government and development agencies in ensuring equitable development. At best, the Filipino diaspora should augment government and development agencies’ efforts towards “equitable” development.

The challenge is to craft “equitable” development programs and projects that accommodate Filipino donors’ hometown bias and preferences. In addition, this means encouraging hometown beneficiaries such as the church and local governments to develop projects that strategically address the problems in their communities that their townmates abroad can support.

Pooling and leveraging of diaspora funds

There is a need to both pool and leverage diaspora philanthropy in order to attain scale and have a significant impact on the lives of people in their hometown communities. Vasconcelos (2007) pointed out that if migrant remittances and—we might add—diaspora donations are not leveraged, economic activities and employment opportunities in these communities will remain low.

The challenge is how to pool the resources of the Filipino diaspora and leverage them with development agencies, foundations, and the Philippine government. This challenge entails convincing overseas Filipinos, who are more comfortable with handling their donations themselves, to give to a pooled fund. It also requires efforts to help development agencies and government units in recognizing the importance of complementing diaspora philanthropy for social and economic development.

Recommendations

Diaspora philanthropy should be linked to a comprehensive strategy of harnessing diaspora resources to sustainable development. For diaspora philanthropy to achieve significant scale and scope, as well as create meaningful impact on development, the following key recommendations are proposed:

Create a GO-NGO working group on migration and development

There should be a coordinating body composed of government and NGO representatives—a “GO-NGO” partnership—that crafts strategic programs and projects and coordinates initiatives of the various stakeholders on migration and development both in the Philippines and abroad. Representatives from the Department of Foreign Affairs, the Department of Labor and Employment, the Commission on Filipinos Overseas, and the Department of Trade and Industry should participate in this working group. NGO representatives could come from alliances of NGOs involved



in migration and development, such as the Philippine Consortium on Migration and Development, the Association of Foundations, the League of Corporate Foundations, the International Network of Alternative Financial Institutions, and Philippine Social Enterprise Network.

This working group could facilitate coordination and complementation of initiatives to avoid competition and duplication. It could also promote the development of strategic projects, such as GK and GILAS, that could be implemented in various towns and provinces.

Build networks of overseas Filipino organizations and NGOs

Considering that overseas Filipino organizations are relatively small and informal, and usually give small contributions, building networks of overseas Filipino organizations is key to the pooling of diaspora efforts and donations. These networks could spearhead advocacy of strategic philanthropy and reach out to the broadest section of overseas Filipinos. They could use Filipino television channels to reach out to overseas Filipinos. They could also help devise mechanisms for pooling diaspora contributions. Since the organizations lack resources for organizing and capacity-building, facilitators such as AFUSA and CFO could initiate networking among the various organizations. They could also equip the leaders with skills in organizing and fund-raising.

At the same time, networks of NGOs in the Philippines advocating for strategic philanthropy should be forged. These networks, such as the Philippine Consor-

tium on Migration and Development, should reach out to overseas Filipinos, NGOs, government organizations, and the business sector; advocate for the leveraging of diaspora philanthropy from the national and local government units and development agencies; and assist in crafting development programs that could be funded through diaspora philanthropy. They should link NGOs in key communities with high concentrations of overseas Filipino families with hometown associations in different countries. These networks should also help identify development-oriented local governments and executives, and assist in identifying social enterprises that could be scaled up and replicated in various provinces.

Establish community foundations and develop community-based ICT materials

Community foundations that recognize the hometown preference of overseas Filipinos should be established. “A community foundation (CF) is a private, [not-for-profit] organization, which mobilizes local resources for grant-giving in a defined geographic area. A CF aims to improve the quality of life in a particular community by addressing its diverse and changing needs in a participative manner—building community spirit and strengthening community leadership as local citizens come together to solve problems and create a common vision for the future” (AF, 2004, p. 6). There is a dearth of information on the important role of community foundations and on the mechanisms of setting them up in the Philippines. The Association of Foundations could spearhead the advocacy of and

help set up community foundations in areas with high concentrations of overseas Filipinos.

Community foundations could work to become the recipients or intermediaries for HTA giving. They could leverage these donations with the local government and with other sectors of the community. They could also assist HTAs in selecting strategic projects and in ensuring equitable distribution of resources in a given community.

The setting up of a community foundation should be complemented by the development of communication materials and mechanisms that can reach the families of overseas Filipinos and other members of the community. Hometown websites, local radio stations, and cable televisions hooked to the Internet will help update the HTAs on community issues and initiatives.

Conduct research and develop databases of stakeholders

There is a need for empirical studies on Filipino diaspora philanthropy and on the migration and development nexus, so that strategies can be established to mobilize diaspora resources towards sustainable development. Projects funded by the Filipino diaspora should be evaluated to gain insights on strategic philanthropy practices and their impact on the communities. Results of such evaluation should be disseminated to the various stakeholders. In addition, databases of various stakeholders in the Philippines and abroad should be developed as mechanisms to link overseas Filipinos with partners in the Philippines.

Listed in Table 6 are specific recommendations to overseas Filipino organizations, the Philippine government, NGOs,

Table 6. Challenges and Recommendations

Challenges	Action Recommendations		
	Overseas Filipino Organizations	Government	NGOs and other stakeholders
Broaden donor base for strategic philanthropy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Create database of their organization (membership, activities, capacities, etc.) and provide the information to the embassies and consulates in the host countries * Maximize use of The Filipino Channel, Pinoy TV, ICT, and other creative forms of information and education to reach the largely unorganized segment of the Filipino community * Develop exposure programs for members on the realities of development work in the Philippines, especially for second-generation overseas Filipinos * Empower members in organizing, fund-raising, and strategic philanthropy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Charge diplomatic posts to develop a system that will regularly update their databases of overseas Filipino organizations * Strengthen programs of the CFO: Migrant Social and Economic Integration, Filipino Education and Heritage (promoting Filipino education programs overseas, as well as continued exposure of younger generation of Filipinos overseas to Philippine language, history, culture, and institutions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Conduct research on migration and development and strategic diaspora philanthropy * Evaluate strategic philanthropy projects and disseminate experience of best practices * Develop Internet-based information materials on community development initiatives * Charge Institute of Migration and Development Initiatives to strengthen its Filipino diaspora portal and Philcomdev to develop a portal of NGOs and other stakeholders involved in migration and development initiatives * Ask Philcomdev to create Alternative Development Tourism Programs to expose overseas Filipinos to development projects and alternative social investments that need support * Charge facilitators and development agencies to conduct seminars/fora on Philippine realities, organizing, fund-raising, and strategic philanthropy for overseas Filipinos



DIASPORA GIVING:
An Agent of Change in Asia Pacific Communities?

Challenges	Action Recommendations		
	Overseas Filipino Organizations	Government	NGOs and other stakeholders
Forge partnerships and merge initiatives of various stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Invite HTAs to organize, with partners in the Philippines, “Town Hall Meetings” where development plans and projects in various provinces are discussed * Periodically invite development organizations in meetings and coordinate possible roadshows of development organizations abroad * Visit existing development organizations and their communities during vacation and explore possibilities for partnership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Develop GO-NGO Working Group on Migration and Development as a mechanism to direct migration and development programs, coordinate initiatives, and pursue joint projects on strategic philanthropy * Include migration and development in career advancement seminars of diplomatic corps, and their role in facilitating investment and philanthropy for development * Charge diplomatic posts to conduct regular meetings with Filipino community to update on development initiatives in the Philippines * Include initiatives of development organizations and social enterprises in roadshows that are conducted abroad by DFA and CFO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Participate in GO-NGO Working Group on Migration and Development, composed of government and NGO representatives, to discuss issues and possible joint activities on migration and development * Strengthen capacity of Philcomdev, CODE-NGO, Association of Foundations, and other consortia of NGOs to provide information to other NGOs on migration and development issues <p>Facilitators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Forge partnerships between NGOs working on migration and sustainable development projects with overseas Filipino organizations * Develop simpler system of accrediting, monitoring, and reporting of NGOs to facilitate partnership with OF organizations
Pursue sustainable development projects that integrate/accommodate hometown bias and other donor preferences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Learn about needs of the hometowns * Coordinate with AFUSA, CFO, Philcomdev, Association of Foundations, CODE-NGO, and other development organizations who are implementing sustainable development projects * Identify assistance that OF can provide to community projects, i.e., resource mobilization, marketing, skills and technology transfer, and other needs of the partners * Other than conducting medical missions for overseas, in partnership with the Department of Health and community-based health programs (CBHPs), create programs that would capacitate and compensate barangay health workers in providing health care services in the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Ask CFO’s LINKAPIL program to evaluate impact of its work on sustainable development, and craft strategic philanthropy projects that could be replicated in pilot provinces * Expand Balik Scientist Program. Returning scientists should be assigned to help in local development initiatives and projects * Create database of Filipino experts who can be tapped for various projects of community development agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Develop strategic projects that can be packaged into smaller components and implemented in various hometowns and provinces * Provide information to beneficiaries: NGOs, church, HTAs, schools, and other sectors on situation of overseas Filipinos and strategic diaspora philanthropy; and capacitate them in developing, packaging, and managing sustainable projects that can be supported by overseas Filipinos * Charge INAFI-Philippines and other micro-finance organizations and cooperatives to package programs on diaspora philanthropy, savings, investment, and micro-finance * Invite Philippine Social Enterprise Network, CODE NGO, Association of Foundations, and other organizations involved in social enterprise development to merge enterprises in similar sub-sectors to identify strategic intervention that could be supported by diaspora philanthropy and investment, covering towns with large concentrations of overseas Filipinos * Tap resources of overseas Filipinos in technology development and management of enterprises

Challenges	Action Recommendations		
	Overseas Filipino Organizations	Government	NGOs and other stakeholders
Pool and leverage diaspora funds to attain larger scale and scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Identify and partner with community foundations, development agencies, and corporations that are interested in matching Filipino diaspora donations * Organize events to facilitate exchange of views on best practices in strategic giving and possibilities for upscaling and replicating these practices * Establish networks among overseas Filipino organizations and explore mechanisms for pooling of diaspora philanthropy funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Formulate coherent development strategy on migration and development * Charge Department of Foreign Affairs and Department of Labor and Employment to sponsor International Conference on Migration and Development and craft multi-stakeholder programs on diaspora philanthropy and investments * Pilot local government units to enter into partnership, leverage resources of diaspora, and integrate diaspora contributions as additional resources in their development plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Ask Association of Foundation, in partnership with Philcomdev and other networks, to set up community foundations in areas with high concentration of overseas Filipinos, and provide vehicles for pooling of diaspora philanthropy and leveraging of funds * Charge NGOs to pool donations of Filipino diaspora and leverage these resources with partner government and development agencies to underwrite key strategic pilot projects

and other stakeholders in addressing the challenges of strategic diaspora giving in the Philippines.

Overseas Filipinos can contribute substantially to change and development in their communities of origin. With their monetary resources, knowledge and skills, they are, without a doubt, an important development resource. However, the development potential of diaspora philanthropy can only be realized if government and development organizations step forward with the commitment and the resources and are able to create an environment conducive to strategic giving, investment, and development.

References

- ABS-CBN International. (n.d.). ABS-CBN International, North America. Retrieved January 3, 2008, from http://_www.abs.cbni.com.
- Agence France Presse. (2007, February 21). Remittances of Philippines' overseas workers. *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, B8.
- Alayon, J.R. (2006, December). Diaspora philanthropy: New Zealand Filipino communities and the practice of international community development. Paper presented at the Biennial Conference "Southern Perspectives on Development: Dialogue or Division?", Otago University, Dunedin, New Zealand.
- Añonuevo, A. T. (2005, June). *Social capital, philanthropy, GO-NGO relations and community development*. A Bienvenido Gonzales Professorial Chair Lecture delivered in the University of the Philippines at Los Baños.
- Asia Pacific Philanthropy Consortium. (2007, December). Writers' Terms of Reference: Conference Background Papers "Diaspora giving: An agent of change in Asia-Pacific Communities?"



- Association of Foundations. (2004). *What you should know about a community foundation*.
- Association of Foundations (2005). *Diaspora philanthropy by Filipinos*. Quezon City: Association of Foundations.
- Atikha (2006). *Atikha progress report 2005: Mobilizing overseas Filipino resources for the development of overseas Filipinos, their families and communities in San Pablo City*. Laguna and Mabini, Batangas. [Unpublished material].
- Ayala, J.A.Z. (2006). *The challenges of Asian philanthropy in the 21st century*. Retrieved January 10, 2008, from http://www.wingsweb.org/forum06/presentations_zobel.cfm.
- Bagasao, I. F. (2003, October). *Migration and development: The Philippine experience*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Migrant Remittances: Development Impact, Opportunities for the Financial Sector, Future Prospects, London, United Kingdom.
- Bo, J. (2007, November). Four UPLB bids make it to PESO challenge semis. *UPLB Link*, p. 2.
- Cabilao-Valencia, M. & Colasito, J. (2007, September 28). *Harnessing altruism: The Linkapil experience*. Paper presented at the Round Table Discussion on Creating an Enabling Environment for Strategic Diaspora Philanthropy, Asian Institute of Management Conference Center.
- Cacas, S. (1995, July 14). Magandang deal! Cashing in on the Filipino American market. *Asian Week*. Retrieved December 5, 2007, from <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P1-106219959.html>.
- Center for Migrant Advocacy Center for Migrant Advocacy. (2006, April). CMA working paper on overseas migration. Retrieved January 5, 2008, from http://www.pinoyabroad.net/img_upload/9bed2e6b0cc5701e4cef28a6ce64be3d/wkng_ppr_printed_online_verse_.pdf.
- Commission on Filipinos Overseas (2007). *Lingkod sa kapwa pilipino/Link for Philippine development program: Harnessing overseas Filipinos as partners in national development*. [Unpublished material].
- Commission on Filipinos Overseas (n.d.). Republic of the Philippines, Commission on Filipinos Overseas. Retrieved January 10, 2008, from <http://www.cfo.gov.ph/>.
- Dizon-Anonuevo, E. & Anonuevo, A. (2006, May). *Realizing development potential of overseas Filipino migration*. Paper presented at the INAFI International Conference on Migration and Development, Development Academy of the Philippines, Tagaytay.
- Economic Resource Center for Overseas Filipinos. (n.d). *The development potential of migration*. Retrieved September 5, 2007, from <http://www.philsol.nl/org/ercof/DevPotential-mar00.htm>.
- Feed the Hungry. (2007). *Feed the hungry performance report 1993-2006*. [Unpublished material].
- Garchitorena, V. (2007, May). *Diaspora philanthropy: The Philippine experience*. Retrieved October 1, 2007, from http://www.tpi.org/downloads/pdfs/Philippines_Diaspora_Philanthropy_Final.pdf.
- Garchitorena, V. (2007, September 28). *Philippine diaspora philanthropy: The Ayala Foundation, USA experience*. Paper presented at the Round Table Discussion on Creating an Enabling Environment for Strategic Diaspora Philanthropy, Asian Institute of Management Conference Center.
- GMA. (n.d.). GMA Pinoy TV. Retrieved January 3, 2008, from <http://www.pinoytv.com>.

- Income of Filipinos in US tops US\$65,000 per year. (2005, January 14). *The Filipino Express*. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P1-106219959.html>.
- Johnson, P. (2001, May). *Global social investing: A preliminary overview*. Retrieved December 28, 2007, from http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~acgei/PDFs/PhilanthropyPDFs/Phil_Global_Soc_Investing.pdf.
- Kapur, D., Metha, A., & Moon Dutt, R. (2004), Indian diaspora philanthropy. In P. Geithner, P. Johnson & L. Chen (Eds.), *Diaspora philanthropy and equitable development in China and India* (pp.177-213). Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Global Equity Initiative.
- Lucas, D. (2007, December 26). Dollar remittances fuel new affluence among Filipinos. *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, p. B1.
- Najam, A. (2007). Diaspora philanthropy to Asia. In B. Merz, L.Chen & P. Geithner (Eds.), *Diasporas and development* (pp.119-150). Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Global Equity Initiative.
- Newland, K. & Patrick, E. (2004, July). *Beyond remittances: The role of diaspora in poverty reduction in their countries of origin*. A scoping study by the Migration Policy Institute for the Department of International Development. Retrieved September 1, 2007, from http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/BeyondRemittances_0704.pdf.
- Opiniano, J. M. (2007, August). *Development aid from well-meaning amateurs: a scoping study of the status and prospects of Filipino migrant philanthropy*. Paper presented in the Second National Conference on Filipino Migrant Philanthropy, University of Sto.Tomas, Manila.
- Opiniano, J. M. (2004, October). Biggest donors to RP. *APPC Post*, p. 5. Retrieved January 10, 2008, from <http://www.asian-philanthropy.org/pdfs/post/appcpostissue18.pdf>.
- Orozco, M. (2003). *Hometown associations and their present and future partnerships: New development opportunities?* Retrieved December 1, 2007, from <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~7001/Events/conferences/Morelia/briefing/HTAManuelOrozco.pdf>.
- Pakistan Centre for Philosophy. (2005). *Philanthropy by Pakistani diaspora in the USA*. Islamabad: Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy.
- Philippine Overseas Employment Agency. (2006). OFW global presence: A compendium of overseas employment statistics. Retrieved January 5, 2008, from <http://www.poea.gov.ph/stats/2006Stats.pdf>.
- Pilipinong Migrante sa Canada. (2008, January 6). Filipino Migration: A Brief History, Retrieved January 5, 2008, from <http://pmscontario.tripod.com/id1.html>.
- Population Commission. (2007). *Filipinos beyond borders, population and development dimensions of overseas labor migration. A primer on the state of the Philippine population report 4*.
- Powers, S. (2006, May 31). *Bayanihan across the seas: Diaspora philanthropy and development in the Philippines*. Retrieved September 3, 2007, from <http://www.filipinodiasporagiving.org/Attached%20files/Shawn%20Powers%20study.pdf>.
- Samante, M.T. (2007, February 16). *Filipino seafarers, world's most sought*. Retrieved January 5, 2008, from http://www.ofwguide.com/article_item.php?articleid=566.
- Sidel, M. (2007). Focusing on the state: Government responses to diaspora giving and implications for equity. In B. Merz, L.Chen & P. Geithner (Eds.), *Diasporas and development* (pp.25-54). Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Global Equity Initiative.



- Silva, J. (2006). *Engaging diaspora communities in development: An investigation of Filipino hometown associations in Canada*. Unpublished manuscript, Simon Fraser University, Canada.
- Talento, R. (2004, September 15-16). *Measurement of the migrant workers in the Philippine system of national accounts (PSNA)*. Paper presented at United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division, Meeting of the Technical Subgroup of the Task Force on International Trade in Services, Movement of Natural Persons –Mode 4, Paris, France. Retrieved January 5, 2008, from <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/tradeserv/TSG%2009-04-Paris/tsg0409-21.pdf>.
- Tetangco, A. (2007, March 15). *Migration, remittances, economic development and the role of banks*. Paper presented at the 13th Meeting of the World Savings Bank Institute Asia-Pacific Regional Group, Sofitel Philippine Plaza, Manila. Retrieved September 30, 2007, from <http://www.bsp.gov.ph/publications/speeches.asp?id=275&yr=>.
- Vasconcelos P. (2007, November 7). *Sending money home, migrant remittances to developing countries: Remittances as a development instrument*. Paper presented at the International Network of Alternative Institutions International Conference on Micro-finance, Remittances, and Development. Contonou, Benin.
- Wescott, C. & Brinkerhoff, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Converting migration drains into gains: Harnessing the resources of overseas professionals*. Manila: Asian Development Bank.

Notes

- ¹ The exchange rate of dollar to peso fluctuated has between US\$1: PhP35 to US\$1: PhP55 during the period covered. In this paper the exchange rate of US\$1: PhP40 is used in converting the original peso values.

Mai Añonuevo

Mai is the Executive Director of Atikha Overseas Workers and Communities Initiatives, Inc. She obtained her B.S. in Nursing from the University of the Philippines and her master's degree in Entrepreneurship for Social and Development Enterprises from the Asian Institute of Management. She worked as a researcher at the Frankfurter Institut für Frauen Forschung (Frankfurt Institute for Women Research) in Germany and co-authored the book, *Ein Traum vom besseren Leben (A Dream for a Better Life)*. Based on a 1995 study that Ms. Dizon-Anonuevo led, the Center for Women's Resources published the book, *Migration of Women: The Social Trade-off*. She co-edited the book, *Coming Home: Women, Migration & Reintegration* which discussed the findings of an action research that, among others, explored possibilities for the reintegration of migrant women. She is the interim chairperson of the Board of the Philippine Consortium on Migration and Development.

Augustus T. Añonuevo

Augustus Anonuevo is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of the Philippines at Los Banos (UPLB). He obtained his B.S. in Psychology and M.A. in Sociology from the University of the Philippines. He is a member of the Pi Gamma Mu International Social Science Honor Society. He delivered the U.P. General Education Professorial Chair lecture entitled "Woes of Children, Wails of the Community: The Social Cost of Overseas Migration and the Need for Reintegration of Filipino Overseas Contract Workers" in 2002 and the Bienvenido Gonzales Professorial Chair lecture entitled "Social Capital, Philanthropy, GO-NGO Relations and Community Development" in 2005. He co-edited the book, *Coming Home: Women, Migration & Reintegration*.