

executive summary

transforming philanthropy

mapping of independent grantmaking
organizations for civil society in the
areas of socio-environmental justice and
community development in Brazil

1ª ed. August, 2023

introduction

Philanthropy that drives change

Graciela Hopstein and Mônica C. Ribeiro

In 2020, when the Brazilian Philanthropy Network for Social Justice (Comuá Network's name at the time) was invited to join the Giving for Change (GfC) Alliance within the context of the Dutch Cooperation, we decided to include in the work plan the development of a survey to map local socio-environmental justice and human rights funds – grantmakers to civil society initiatives – as, in our opinion, that is a key strategy to learn more about the field of independent philanthropy in Brazil.

In our view, the study would be crucial to expand the knowledge of and provide visibility to a number of grantmaking organizations that started emerging in the country 20 years ago, helping to fund initiatives by grassroots groups and social movements that work to expand the access to and the recognition of rights in the fields of socio-environmental justice, human rights and community development.

Our starting point to develop the study was to examine the field of philanthropy as a complex space, where various initiatives and forms of action coexist because, in fact, there is not just one, but several philanthropies, and this allows for the acknowledgment of multiple actors and dynamics in the field.

Based on these initial ideas, the mapping, which was developed through a partnership between Comuá Network and ponteAponte, was conceived not only as a study aimed at gaining new knowledge about a different way of doing philanthropy – perhaps not yet well known, but innovative – but as an instrument of advocacy, capable of raising new reflections, questioning power relations – including from the perspective of the #ShiftThePower movement – and the colonial practices of philanthropy. It is also our intention to be able to contribute to the field by pointing to new forms of collaboration between multiple actors (international, corporate, family and independent philanthropy).

This study was developed to introduce political thinking about the field of philanthropy. The inclusion of this dimension is crucial to understand its connection with the real, material world, and to reflect on the role played by philanthropy in the processes of transforming realities and territories. This is because transforming means breaking preexisting pacts (based on colonial logic, patriarchy, male chauvinism, racism, sexism, etc.), recognizing differences and diversity as core principles.

And as the study shows, we can say that the independent funds mapped here, which operate from the perspective of community philanthropy and socio-environmental justice, have made a significant contribution to the fight for access to rights and the construction of political agendas, with civil society as the protagonist, specifically grassroots groups

and political minorities. In short, the study provides material information about a philanthropy based on trust and on the recognition of differences, the power of diversity and the power of creating and multiplying the collective, which drive the processes of social transformation.

We believe it is a priority to transform the field of philanthropy, democratizing access to resources, branching out its distribution and connecting it with social demands, in constant dialogue with civil society. Transformation also implies advancing the process of deconstruction, pondering how to overcome and move away from colonial thinking – which is based on white, male, heteronormative Eurocentrism – and binary thinking – centered on socially constructed opposites – questioning power relations, the imposition of agendas and actions, and avoiding the reproduction of relations of oppression and subjugation.

The publication **Transforming Philanthropy: mapping of independent grantmaking organizations for civil society in the areas of socio-environmental justice and community development in Brazil** presents an unprecedented survey of organizations that show that this way of doing philanthropy is strong and present in the country, and can be seen as a movement that attempts to change power relations by supporting human rights and socio-environmental justice alongside the grassroots organizations. It is also a study that is constantly under construction, since other existing organizations may not have been mentioned here, and new ones may have been created since this publication came out, which leaves room for future expansion and development of the topic.

The mapping, which provides an in-depth analysis of 31 organizations, proposes to provide an up-to-date overview of socio-environmental justice and community philanthropy in Brazil, and is a space for the assembling and systematization of information and practices, to generate knowledge and reflection, in addition to providing visibility to organizations that are often outside the scope of mainstream philanthropy, private social investment and society in general.

The results presented throughout this publication indicate that independent grantmaking organizations are crucial in enabling for resources to effectively reach the collectives and movements (even those non-registered).

Because even if universal public policies do exist in the process of expanding Brazilian democracy, this philanthropy would not cease to exist, as it is linked to the movements that have always been and will always be engaged in the political struggle for access to rights, influencing diversity policies, advocating for the criminalization of racism and homophobia, and so many other achievements in the field of human rights.

This is the fundamental and deeply necessary contribution that philanthropy can make to such an inequitable country, marred by colonial power relations, which does not recognize the power and knowledge of political minority groups, thus perpetuating those relations and maintaining its democracy incomplete.

This is what the Comuá Network and its members work towards, supporting a variety of causes and organizations in Brazil. The philanthropy we defend and put into practice is

based on proximity, on permanent dialogue, joint construction and the strengthening of partnerships with civil society organizations and movements, which know, better than anyone else, what the territories and communities need to promote social transformation.

This philanthropy recognizes the knowledge and skills of these organizations, strengthens their autonomy to determine the projects they will support, and supports the strengthening of local and community leaders. It invests in the institutional strengthening of grassroots organizations, prioritizes issues associated with historical minorities, and streamlines the processes.

And its grantmaking is based on these principles. Because it is impossible to make progress on these agendas without effectively democratizing access to resources. The starting point to fight the structures of inequality is to work in the field of rights, contributing resources and positioning philanthropy as another actor in the transformation process.

The organizations that make up the Comuá Network have donated more than R\$ 670 million from its creation through 2022, totaling almost 17,000 grants to civil society organizations to assist their fight for access to and the recognition of rights. Initiatives are currently being developed in *quilombola*, indigenous and riverine territories, in peripheral urban and rural areas, in practically all Brazilian biomes, in all five of the country's macro-regions.

In addition to the 16 organizations that currently make up Comuá Network, there are others operating in different regions of Brazil that are guided by these same principles and promote this kind of philanthropy. This is a movement that Comuá Network, as a political actor, is committed to recognizing, bringing to light and disseminating to the national and international philanthropic ecosystem.

executive summary

The purpose of this mapping, conceived and conducted by Comuá Network, is to provide an up-to-date overview of independent philanthropy in Brazil, to determine which organizations support civil society initiatives in the fields of community development, socio-environmental justice and human rights, how they operate, how they are structured, and how they relate to the field of socio-political advocacy..

After the initial inquiries were made for this study, we chose to name the organizations mapped as **independent grantmaking organizations in the fields of socio-environmental justice, human rights and community development in Brazil**. The mapped universe involves thematic funds, community funds and independent community foundations that are engaged in grantmaking, which means that they donate financial resources (direct donations) and non-financial resources (indirect donations) to numerous civil society initiatives – groups, movements, leaders, organizations, networks – in the above-mentioned fields. The notion of independence becomes crucial to the purposes of this study in that it involves identifying organizations that rely on governance and management structures that allow them to act independently in terms of their decision-making processes. On the other hand, the idea of independence is tied to the fact that the organizations that make up this universe do not depend on a sponsoring company or family, since they all **mobilize resources from a variety of sources** – domestic and international, public and private – or from individuals – individually or through donor circles – in addition to standing out for their extensive knowledge of the fields in which they operate (actors, agendas, scenarios) and their capability to coordinate with actors and networks. Independence, as well as the implementation of grantmaking practices, were the core criteria to identify the actors operating in these fields and to be included in this mapping. It is important to note that the identification of the organizations mapped as independent and as grantmakers – especially those that are not members of the Comuá Network – was based on self-declaration, whereas the research team did not seek additional information.

This publication, which is the result of the mapping study, is groundbreaking in the field of Brazilian philanthropy, as it is surely, to our knowledge, one of the **first works developed with this approach in the country**; it is the fruit of a collaboration over the past two years or so since its planning stage. It is based on the assumption that the current context demands a (self)critical view of the dominant philanthropy in the country and the strengthening of models that challenge hegemonic logics – which often preserve structures of inequality. The **transfer of power** is one of the key elements of community philanthropy, which has been disseminated throughout the Global South, more intensely in recent decades, through research, meetings, networks and movements.

The research study is an exploratory study developed based on a **multi-method approach**, involving the gathering and analysis of secondary data, which enabled us to expand our knowledge of the themes and organizations, and the gathering of primary data, carried out between January and August 2022 and subdivided into a quantitative stage, with the use of questionnaires, and a qualitative stage, consisting of semi-structured interviews. Employing the **snowball sampling** – a technique that considers referential networks and referrals – we mapped and analyzed **31 organizations** in depth, 14 of which were already members of the Comuá Network, while 17 were not.

Our starting point

The study showed that **the majority of the mapped organizations (81%) was created as from the 2000s**, a period characterized by the **reduced presence of international philanthropy and cooperation**. On the one hand, this could signal a maturing of the field in Brazil as compared to other regions of the world, but on the other hand, this withdrawal process considerably reduced the resources available to fund civil society organizations and initiatives focused on social justice and human rights.

Despite the greater concentration in the post-2000s, the study identified the emergence of organizations with this profile as early as the 1970s. So, some of the mapped organizations were pioneers, witnesses and relevant agents within the process of reinstitution of democracy and the consolidation of civil society during this historical period in Brazil.

When we consider the geographic distribution of the mapped organizations, **we find grantmakers established in all of the five regions of Brazil, scattered throughout 10 states and 21 municipalities**. As expected, São Paulo is the state with the greatest number, accounting for 29% of the organizations. Rio de Janeiro comes in second place, with 23% of the mapped entities, followed by Amazonas and Pará, which account for 10% each. In regional terms, the **Southeast region accounts for 58% of the organizations**, followed by the North (23%),

The study also showed that, even among the organizations created before the 2000s, the majority (90%) effectively became grantmakers after the turn of the century. Please note that 23% of the mapped universe consists of “new organizations” that began donating between the years 2020 and 2022, which indicates that the independent philanthropy has gained momentum.

Northeast (13%), and the Midwest and South (each with 3%) regions. If we look at the 14 members of the Comuá Network, we find that 72% are established in the Southeast region, 14% in the Northeast region, and 7% in the Midwest and South regions. **The strong presence of the North region in second place is worth noting**, as it far exceeds the country's proportionality in terms of population and the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This could be associated with the need for support in

the socio-environmental area and the protection of traditional peoples and communities and their ways of life and subsistence, in addition to the poor management of environmental issues by the past federal government and the expansion of non-government investments in the region.

Where the donations go

The priority of the independent grantmaking organizations mapped is to **support institutional strengthening (74% of the mapped entities indicate that they donate for this purpose)**, which could be motivated by the way they operate (in collaboration with civil society and movements) and by the understanding that investing in this area is crucial to strengthen the organizations that engage in the defense of ample access to rights (socio-environmental and human rights) and their agendas. In turn, donations for institutional strengthening consist of a broad, flexible form of support, which provides the

organizations and groups with the autonomy to make their own decisions about their work. This is directly tied to the principles that underpin community philanthropy. Next, the donations **prioritize gender and women's rights and culture (both with 48%)**, community development (42%), family farming, urban agriculture, agroecology and agroforestry (39%), and indigenous, quilombola, riverine and traditional communities (35%). For the majority of the mapped organizations, the areas of support are intersectional, which surely **contrasts with the low rate of support from Private Social Investment (also known by its acronym ISP, in Portuguese) with a gender, race, ethnicity, etc. lens**. According to the GIFE Census 2020¹, only 9% of the respondents claimed to develop actions directly related to the issue of gender, and this percentile drops to just 5% when the issue is race. **This shows that the mapped organizations are not just groundbreaking, but also innovative and bold, by directing financial resources to initiatives that are often neglected by ISP.**

This mapping proves the empirical perception that independent grantmaking organizations are crucial to allow for resources to reach collectives and movements that are not registered, democratizing access to resources. **Supporting institutionalized or non-institutionalized collectives and movements is the primary strategy for grantmakers who are not members of the Network (39%) and the second most mentioned by members (32%).** In both cases, it emerges in fourth place individuals as grantees (26% among non-members and 19% among those associated with the Comuá Network). These figures contrast, for example, with the bureaucratic challenges that make it impossible for ISP to pass on financial resources to non-formalized initiatives. The GIFE Census², for example, shows that of the **13 types of partnerships mentioned by GIFE associates**, among civil society organizations (CSOs), governments and companies, **none refers specifically to collectives, movements and individuals**. Independent grantmaking organizations, on the other hand, stand out for supporting non-legalized initiatives directly in the territories, either directly or indirectly – in this case, through a formalized organization that acts as a fiscal sponsor. **This attests to community philanthropy's ability to transfer power and its potential to ensure that resources actually reach communities, engaging priority audiences and issues in the field of social justice.**

With the number and size of grantmaking organizations growing, the fields of work of community philanthropy also grow more diverse. In light of the need to resist the loss of basic rights in the wake of neoliberalism, especially in the post-1990s, and the expansion of social participation on the government agenda from the 2000s onwards, the agendas focusing on gender, the promotion of racial equity and the anti-racist movement, and community development are strengthened by the work of the mapped organizations.

Sources of funding and relationship with funders

In terms of budget, **the majority (55%)** of the mapped entities are between R\$2 million and R\$25 million, provided that 45% of them rely on a budget of over R\$5 million. However, it is worth noting that **budgets vary** significantly, with independent grantmaking organizations ranging between R\$100,000 and R\$250,000 to over R\$25 million.

We also found a **discrepancy**, which either reflects the concentration of resources

1 BRETAS, Gabriela. GIFE Census 2020. São Paulo: GIFE, 2021. Available at: <https://sinapse.gife.org.br/download/censo-gife-2020>. Accessed on: 11 Jul 2023.

2 BRETAS, 2021.

- including philanthropic resources - in the Southeast region, possibly due to factors such as time of existence and work agendas. **Among the organizations with a budget between R\$5 million and R\$25 million, 62% are located in the Southeast region, while none are located in the North region, even though this region registered the second highest number of mapped organizations.** The only organization that declared a budget of more than R\$25 million is located in the Southeast region of Brazil.

The budget difference tied to the length of time as a grantmaker is also significant and indicates that the grantmaking capacity of the mapped organizations increases proportionately to the length of time they have been active. Among the organizations that started donating before 2009 (35% of the sample), only 9% had a budget under R\$1 million in 2021, while among the organizations that started donating between 2010 and 2019 (39% of the sample), 33% had a budget under R\$1 million in 2021. Finally, among the organizations that started donating between 2020 and 2022 (26% of the sample), 63% had a budget under R\$1 million in the same year

Donations from international philanthropic organizations are still the most material sources of funding for community and social justice philanthropy in Brazil. They are the **most frequent** source of funding for the mapped organizations, for both members and non-members of the Network, totaling **43% in both cases³**. This is followed by donations from Brazilian philanthropic organizations - mentioned by 40% of Network members and 30% of non-members. Donations from individuals (with or without tax incentives) are also relevant, mentioned by 37% of Network members and 30% of non-members.

Based on the budget ranges referenced, we estimate the **total budget in 2021 of the 29 organizations** that stated values to be **between R\$276 million and R\$330 million**. Out of this total, **the 14 organizations that are members of the Network rely on more robust budgets than the non-members, administering a total of R\$254.7 million in 2021.**

This is a robust amount with excellent potential for expansion, but it is still **far less than the R\$5.3 billion** declared by the 131 organizations that responded to the 2020 GIFE Census⁴, which invested R\$595 million that year just to maintain the structures of the institutes, foundations and companies (administrative and infrastructural expenses). Also according to the GIFE Census, 64% of the survey respondents claimed that they passed on funds to civil society organizations, for example. Only 24% said they had supported independent philanthropic, thematic or otherwise, local and/or community funds, even though they stand out for their ability to receive and redirect smaller donations, to registered or non-registered groups, with the potential to add value to funders who want to reach local actors and **broaden their results.**

Reviewing the list of the main funders of the mapped entities, 47 organizations were named, whose main resources originate or are mobilized internationally (although some may have branches in Brazil), against 40 domestic organizations (including various small, medium and large companies, public bodies, mixed companies and funds), of which only 11 (12.6%) are Brazilian businesses or family institutions and foundations. One problem that emerges from this mapping is the **concentration of Brazilian philanthropy resources within just a few organizations due, for instance, to their size and/or trajectory in the field, thereby creating a scenario of inequality** in terms of access to local resources or even competition. Additionally, **the lack of trust can be seen as an element capable of**

³ This mapping opted not to survey the volume of resources mobilized for each source, just the percentages.

⁴ BRETTAS, 2021.

explaining this situation, as it is a material obstacle to the diversification of the ISP portfolio. We believe this topic should be further explored in future studies.

The mapping also shows that a large portion (76%) of independent grantmaking organizations' resources are concentrated in up to 25 funders. Few (9%) rely on more than a hundred funders, which requires a well-established strategy to handle donations from individuals. A material fact is the number of funders stated by non-members of the Network, which is between one and five organizations, reflecting smaller budgets than those of the Network's members, mostly within the ranges between 6 and 50 funders.

The pursuit of independence in the relationship between grantmaking organizations and their funders, in terms of the allocation of resources and the many forms that this takes, is one of the foundations of community philanthropy. In this sense, the mapping confirms that the majority **(68%) of the mapped organizations stated that funders have no influence** over the use of their resources, their decision-making processes or governance. Among the organizations that answered that funders have some influence over the resources and the activities conducted (32%), **four main forms of participation** were mentioned: on the organizations' boards, as equals (60%); in a specific initiative designed to afford funders a greater presence, as a form of civic engagement (20%); in the construction of the funding project (10%); and in the governance of the supported project (10%). The interviews also revealed **the importance of horizontal dialog between the parties and the value placed on the funders' participation as collaborators and knowledge builders.**

Grantmaking and the relationship between grantmakers and grantees

The mapping indicates that 71% of the independent organizations are hybrid, i.e. they make donations and carry out their own projects in their fields of work. The remaining mapped entities (29%) work solely with grantmaking, donating resources to civil society leaders and organizations.

Regarding the grantmaking strategies employed by the independent grantmaking organizations, the mapping shows five primary mechanisms: calls for proposals and project contests; direct support through emergency actions or funds; invitation letters to specific parties and organizations; direct support through donation portfolios; and spontaneous demand.

The volume of donations from the mapped organizations in 2021 was **quite scattered**, with no major concentration by the organizations in specific ranges of financial resource volumes donated. Overall, **49% of the grantmaking organizations donated up to R\$1 million, while 35% donated from R\$1 million to more than R\$25 million.**

The pandemic caused a major spike in donations. **The 14 organizations of the Comuá Network have supported 10,000 initiatives with donations throughout the course of their histories, registering a total of R\$471,960,925 in direct donations by 2021.** By 2018, half of the organizations had received support, totaling R\$183,832,410 in direct donations

During the interviews, we identified funds that defended the importance of small grants (smaller amounts), for they believe that the grassroots organizations are not prepared to handle larger amounts, or have very specific needs (e.g., acquisition of equipment), or are

unable to use the donated resources in time (e.g., R\$1 million in resources to be spent in a single year). The flipside of this is a specific organization, which increased the average ticket for donations from 50,000 to 150,000 because it understands the difficulties that the pandemic, the global crisis, and the political and economic instability in Brazil have brought.

Overall, **one in every three mapped entities had supported between 101 and 1,000 initiatives by 2021, while more than half (52%) supported up to 100 initiatives**. The members of Comuá Network operate in wide dispersion in the ranges, while non-members naturally tend to support a smaller number of initiatives.

When we cross-reference this data with the time that they have been making grants, we find a correlation between them. So, among the organizations that have supported between 1 and 50 initiatives, which is the most frequent range, we find that the time they have been donating to civil society is no more than seven years. On the other hand, among the organizations that have donated to more than a thousand initiatives, from their foundation through 2021, we find that they have at least 15 years of experience donating to civil society.

All of the mapped organizations also provide support through non-financial donations. The two forms of support, financial and non-financial, usually happen concurrently, constituting a strategy employed by the mapped organizations to establish a closer relationship with the leaderships, communities and supported organizations, since non-financial support helps to establish a relationship of collaboration, sharing of knowledge and experiences.

A fundamental characteristic of community philanthropy is the transfer of power, which, in the case of the mapped organizations, starts with **a process of involving and hearing leaders, communities and social organizations**. As part of the process to strengthen their field of action, **the majority (87%) of the mapped organizations also attempts to include the contributions of leaders, communities and supported organizations in their decision-making processes**.

As far as **accountability** is concerned, even though the mapped organizations attempt to offer the grantees greater flexibility and autonomy, the process often ends up **reflecting the demands of the funders** who allocate resources to the grantmaking organizations, by requiring detailed reports.

When it comes to monitoring the projects, the main instrument used by most organizations are the reports delivered by the supported entities. Face-to-face visits are also important, ranking in second place, followed by meetings, collective workshops and telephone follow-up. Face-to-face visits, however, are ultimately a more expensive form of follow-up, especially for nationwide organizations. So, they prove more feasible for organizations with a limited territorial scope.

Communication, knowledge building and networking

Contextual factors, ranging from the deconstruction of public policies within the context of the previous federal government administration (2019-2022) to the growth of inequalities in Brazil, as well as the fact that it is a growing, but relatively new, phenomenon as compared to mainstream philanthropy, accentuate the need for a **systemic approach** to independent grantmaking organizations.

This includes actions such as knowledge production and communication. Not surprisingly, in addition to grantmaking efforts and non-financial donations, **94% of the mapped organizations produce content aimed at building knowledge within their fields of work**. Collaboration and horizontal relationships are also principles of this process: **81% of the mapped organizations promote knowledge production in association with the organizations/leaders they support**.

In line with the search for more systemic action in the field of social justice, **87% of the mapped organizations are involved in Brazilian and international philanthropy networks** or networks connected to their fields of action. The percentile is higher among Comuá members. The newer organizations stated that they are still getting organized internally to be able to participate in networks in the future, because despite their interest, there is also the limiting issue of small teams, who focus their energies on institutional activities. The interviews show that there is still a lot of “reinventing the wheel” when it comes to creating funds. In this sense, the networks’ support can go a long way towards making these first steps less tortuous and more assertive.

How the organizations are structured

Just over half (**52%**) of the mapped entities have paid directors, while 45% do not, and 3% did not offer this information. In the case of the members of the Comuá Network, the percentage of paid directors climbs to 71%. Among the organizations that answered that they have a paid board of directors, **87% include women on their boards, while 31% of the organizations have a paid board made up entirely of women**, and 12% have only men on their boards.

In terms of **racial composition**, half of the organizations have one or more black people on their paid boards of directors, and **one in five mapped entities has only black people on its board of directors**. Indigenous people on the paid board of directors appear in one out of eight organizations and, among them, one is made up entirely of indigenous people.

More than 90% of the mapped organizations have paid staff and only 6% have staff consisting entirely of volunteers. Among the members of Comuá Network, 100% have paid staff – and teams of more than 16 people are also more commonly found in members of the Network. **In our sample, 28 of the organizations employed 719 people in 2021.**

The vast majority (89%) of the organizations answered that they have black people on their teams and 27% said they include indigenous people. Only one organization employs no black or indigenous people, while **15% of the responding organizations have only black people on their teams**. The study showed that the mapped organizations have prioritized

diversity on their teams and in management positions, but there is still a way to go – which could be potentialized by increased financial support.

Challenges and opportunities

Regarding **external challenges**, the mapped organizations pointed out that the main issues they faced were associated with the Bolsonaro **government** (2019–2022) and its political project, which did not promote incentives and dialogue with civil society organizations in recent years. The **hostile political environment** faced by the CSOs, which began when the new president took office in 2019, was intensified by the health crisis resulting from the covid-19 **pandemic** in early 2020, with consequences such as **excessive workload** (largely due to the redirection of efforts to covid-19 relief measures) in a scenario where social rights were already at risk.

Other big external challenges identified by the mapped organizations were **the dissemination and understanding of community philanthropy** as a practice by the philanthropy and social investment ecosystem itself. Organizations operating in territories distant from the major urban centers reported that it is **hard to earn recognition as relevant agents** in their grantmaking efforts within their communities.

Regarding **funding**, the organizations recognize that donations increased during the pandemic, but emphasize that **Brazil still needs to broaden and strengthen its culture of giving**, especially concerning donations from individuals.

The main **internal challenges** reported are associated with **insufficient staff and excessive workload**, which cause negative effects such as the lack of the proper conditions to allow for the execution of other activities, such as mobilizing resources, networking, etc., **lack of time and resources for the ongoing qualification of the team to execute processes**, including in terms of technology and digital security, and **difficulties communicating with external audiences**.

We note that the first point – insufficient staff and the resulting excessive workload – has emerged more strongly than the **mobilization of resources**, which is usually the main challenge for people working in the social arena. Although one issue is intrinsically related to the other, this emphasis may have occurred for different reasons, such as the accumulated exhaustion resulting from the past few years, during the Bolsonaro government and the pandemic, and as a sign that they see excellent potential to mobilize resources and expand their work, despite the challenges, but this is not always possible due to overwork and to the lack of time for the ongoing qualification of the team. The **scarcity of financial resources for operational support**, which allow for investments in the structure of these organizations, is also a factor.

In terms of **opportunities**, the mapped organizations noted the **importance of the 2022 electoral process** and the possibility of alternating governments as a way to attain a more inclusive political project in the country. The mapping was conducted in the first half of 2022, months before the elections were held to elect the new President of the Republic, as well as state governors and state and federal representatives.

In light of the challenges surrounding the understanding of the incipient field of community philanthropy, the organizations note that **social investors are now more open to learning about new philanthropic practices** and interested in agendas that were not on their radar until recently. So much so that national philanthropy emerges as the second most frequently mentioned source of funding by the mapped entities – although it is still far behind international funding.

Despite the countless challenges reported by the organizations during this mapping, in general terms, there is a strong perception that **the work they have been doing is extremely important, with excellent growth potential**, whether it consists of diversifying the mobilization of resources or improving their practices, to leverage what is going well. The mapped organizations also referenced the importance of developing their practices as a way **to strengthen the social fabric and create a legacy**, so they can go beyond one-time, emergency actions.


This publication attempted to provide a current overview of community philanthropy and social justice in Brazil, as a space to gather and systematize information and practices to produce knowledge and reflection, in addition to bringing visibility to organizations that are often off the radar of mainstream philanthropy, private social investment and even society in general.


As noted in the introduction, we believe this mapping to be an ongoing effort, as when this study is finished, new organizations will be created or others that already exist and were not included here may be recognized as such, and so there is room to expand and develop this topic in the future


Main numbers:

 **31** mapped organizations, **14** of which were already members of the Comuá Network in 2021

 **81%** of the mapped organizations were created as of the 2000s

 **58%** of the organizations are located in the **Southeast region**, followed by the North (23%), Northeast (13%), and Midwest and South (with 3% each) regions (com 3% cada uma)

 **74%** of the mapped organizations make grants **for institutional strengthening**, followed by actions focusing on the issue of gender and women's rights and culture (both at 48%)



55% of the mapped entities are in the range between **R\$ 2 million to R\$ 25 million**



43% of the donations made to mapped organizations come from **international philanthropy organizations**



The total budget, in 2021, of the **29 organizations** that reported the information ranged **from R\$ 276 million to R\$ 330 million**



The total budget of the **14 organizations that are members of the Comuá Network** was **R\$254.7 million** in 2021



76% of independent donor organizations' **resources are concentrated in up to 25 funders**



The organizations that are not members of Comuá Network **frely on funding from just 1 to 5 organizations**




49% of the grantmaking organizations contributed **up to R\$ 1 million**, while 35% donated from R\$1 million to more than R\$ 25 million



719 people were employed in 2021 by 28 of the organizations



10 thousand initiatives have been supported by donations from the 14 organizations comprising the Comuá Network throughout their histories



R\$ 471.960.925,00 is the sum total of **direct donations, through 2021**, made by the 14 organizations comprising the Comuá Network



52% of the mapped organizations have a **paid administration**; **87%** of them have included women on their boards



1 in every 5 mapped entities has only black people on its board



Comuá Network Executive Team

Graciela Hopstein

Executive director

Mica Peres

Operations coordinator

Jonathas Azevedo

Program advisor

Mônica Ribeiro

Communication consultant

Yasmin Moraes

Program assistant

Governance Council

Ana Valéria Araújo

Superintendent of the Brasil Fund

Larissa Amorim

Executive director of Casa Fluminense

Giovanni Harvey

Executive director of the Baobá Fund

Roberto Vilela

Executive Director of Tabôa - Community Strengthening

Fiscal Council

Gislene Aniceto

General manager of the Brasil Fund

Hebe da Silva

Administrative and financial coordinator of the Baobá Fund

Members' assembly

Baobá - Fundo para equidade racial

BrazilFoundation

Casa Fluminense

ELAS+ Doar para Transformar

Fundo Agbara

Fundo Brasil

Fundo Brasileiro de Educação Ambiental (FunBEA)

Fundo Casa Socioambiental

Fundo Positivo

Instituto Baixada

Instituto Clima e Sociedade (iCS)

Instituto Comunitário Grande Florianópolis (Icom)

Instituto Procomum

Instituto Sociedade, População e Natureza (ISPN)

Redes da Maré

Tabôa - Fortalecimento Comunitário

General coordination

Graciela Hopstein

Graphic design and layout

Alastra Comunica

Research and data

Jonathas Azevedo

Mica Peres

Mônica Ribeiro

Revision

Ale Rosalba

Technical coordination and writing

ponteAponte

Translation

Dayse Boechat

ISBN: 978-65-995113-7-0

All material published in this publication is licensed under a Creative Commons CCBT 4.0 license and may be reproduced without prior authorization from Comuá, as long as the original source is cited, including the author of the text or photo when applicable. For derivative works, they must also be licensed under CCBT 4.0.

Supporters



Realizador



Technical coordination

