

015307

THE LIBRARY
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION
& LAND MANAGEMENT
WESTERN AUSTRALIA

INTERVIEW WITH HELEN HALLIDAY OF
HJM CONSULTANTS
CANBERRA, ACT
JUNE 1991

Colin Ingram
CALM

Transcript
MEETING WITH HELEN HALLIDAY

Helen: The brief that we had was to investigate innovative strategies for financing native species conservation in Australia. That was the brief. This was our proposal to Parks. We agreed to look at identification and assessment of existing funding at all levels of Government so we've looked a bit like you at the Grants Programs and come to the conclusion that there are some which are potential sources which haven't been tapped and there are others which probably are not applicable but might be a bit on the periphery. We did a questionnaire to State authorities and NGOs and some Government departments as you know as we did one for CALM.

Govt. depts who are already involved in fundraising or involved in native species conservation were canvassed seeking how much they spend and where they get it from currently, and we did a whole range; the zoos, universities, NGOs, etc.

We then said that we would identify and assess initiatives outside of Australia and to that end we have looked at the United States so far and Canada. I'm going to New Zealand in a couple of weeks time and we have had correspondence with the UK. Identification associations with corporate sector through either grants, donations or sponsorships all of which are slightly different and at that end we have talked to corporate sponsors that we have used in the past who may be interested. We've talked to people like AMATIL, UNITED DISTILLERS, JONES LANG WOOTTON, JAMES HARDIE and a couple of others we've used. I can't remember exactly; Peter has the file notes with him at the moment.

Colin: You say you have used?

Helen: Oh, companies that have been forthcoming with money, either to us wearing our National Trust hats or to other organisations for whom we (HJM Consultants) have fundraised and just assessed their attitude to giving money to this particular area. It has been an interesting response. An identification of the potential to involve philanthropic foundations here and overseas. That's been a very interesting exercise. Identification of other financial incentives like tax incentives, resource taxes - that sort of stuff. And looking at legislation in Australia that might have been useful or not and then we go through in our proposal in detail as to exactly what it is that we are going to do. We are getting close to the end of that now. We've provided a progress report to the Parks Service with our preliminary recommendations as to the avenues that they might explore. We will be, as a result of our trip to America, revising that quite considerably.

Colin: The report that you will provide to ANPWS - will be for ANPWS' exclusive use?

Helen: That's for ANPWS to decide. I would hope and don't quote me on this, that what Parks will do with it, is take what they want and make the thing public. That's what I hope they will do, but I don't guarantee they will do it. I believe that we will certainly be making recommendations. What we are planning to do and what we have done is said "here are all of the options that we can come up with, but don't do the following things". Then they can choose to do them if they want to because they will have the options in front of them but it would be our strong advice that they don't certain things ...

Colin: You can't tell me what those things are???

Helen: Well I'm prepared to talk to you confidentially about some of them but that might be some questions that you ask Parks this afternoon. I mean I can give you some educated questions to ask. But there is a complication in that the Australian Wildlife Fund, Jim Jude's outfit, is already in existence and is the Park's fundraising arm, no matter what they might like to think or say, it is clearly identified as their fundraising arm by the public.

Colin: Its the only fundraising arm they have isn't it?

Helen: That's a very good question. If you read the Act, there is an allowance to establish a foundation, but it has not been established, OR. There seems to be differing views within the Parks Service about this particular matter. We have had long discussions and very frank discussions with Jim Jude and are working co-operatively with him but we see the relationship of Parks and the Australian Wildlife Fund as being a key to any future fundraising that Parks does because it cannot go out in competition with it. So somehow it's got to be part of the whatever it is they decide to set up and we will be offering them 2 or 3 options as to structure, format and charters and deed and all of that stuff. But they have to resolve what it is that they want Wildlife Fund to do and how they want Wildlife Fund to do it before they even start looking at other fundraising avenues.

Colin: A lot of the duck stamp money, ie. the Australian Wildlife Fund money, is external at this stage isn't it?

Helen: Yes, It's United States-based.

Colin: Most of the money is coming externally, so any ANPWS foundation that was set up, that would concentrate on donations within Australia wouldn't compete with it at this stage, would it?

Helen: Well it would because they're selling duck stamps and they're selling koala stamps here and Jim is also going to the corporate sector. You see he's just got James Hardie to sponsor his art prize. If Parks are going to go the corporate sector wearing a different hat, it is our view that would be extremely damaging. We believe that it has to be speaking with one voice to the corporate sector and unless it speaks with one voice to the corporate sector, they are going to say to Parks "go away, get your act together and then come back to us". It's not a problem, I mean it's a solvable problem, a very solvable problem but it won't be until Parks actually focus on it and there seems to be ..

Colin: Who are you presenting your report to?

Helen: We report to one of Barry Revel's sub-ordinates, John Hicks. He doesn't know yet that the progress report he's has is going to have a major revision. It really has changed dramatically since we've been to America - we've come back with some very different ideas.

+ ~~Did~~/Can I point you to some information and then perhaps we can explore that a little bit further, in fact, I'm happy to go through these things with you if you want - your main points with you to tell you what we've got.

+ In terms of Commonwealth grants we looked at *SAVE THE BUSH, NATIONAL SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAM, MURRAY DARLING BASIN* (which doesn't apply to you). We looked at *NATIONAL STATES GRANTS PROGRAM* and one other other. And I think probably our recommendation on all of that is simply that there should be a representative from Parks on the Endangered Species Advisory Committee making the grants so that there is no duplication across these grants programs.

What I did, as part of the national review I mentioned earlier, was go back and see where the money's gone over the last two years and pick up and see if any money's gone into endangered species out of any of these grants programs. It has, but the interesting thing is that a lot of it has been duplicated. A lot of them are making fund applications to the same sorts of projects with different people doing them and nobody talking to each other.

What I'm saying is, there are different people working on the same animals. I mean, that's fine, I don't have a problem with that. But what I'm saying is that there might be the frog in South-eastern South Australia habitat that in fact has been worked on by the University of Adelaide people getting money from somewhere. Same species, South-western Victoria, somebody else is working on almost exactly the same project and are getting funded from somewhere else. When in fact, there really needs to be one project done on what is the habitat requirement of this particular frog and yet it's being duplicated.

Our initial advice to Parks has been, and I'm not sure that they particularly like this advice, is that they have a representative sit in on the grant-making committees, not as a voting member but as an advisory member. So that they can say "hang on, but we funded that project last year" OR "we know that this is being funded somewhere else", OR "but that work's already been done, now we should concentrate the money somewhere else". So a co-ordination role. Either that, or get all the granting people to send a copy of the applications to them so that they can look at them, pick up that duplication stuff. In my view, a lot of money is being wasted.

There has to be some mechanism whereby they are consulted so that the limited money that is in the area, and we all know it is extremely limited, isn't dissipated. Not even necessarily being wasted because I'm sure the work is good but why would you fund two projects on the same thing when one of the projects will give you the answers you need. So it is a co-ordination role - we see it is absolutely essential that they co-ordinate activities. They have been given the role of overseeing native species conservation in Australia by the Federal Government. They have been given that brief by the Government and really need to carry it out. So they're the sorts of things that we have been looking at the grants programs.

We basically found that there are very few State or Local Government grants that ANPWS can effectively tap into. It's a different matter if it's a State Parks Service. Different ball game, but for ANPWS to tap into it, they don't really need meet any of the criteria and there's not a lot of money there anyway.

So that covers your State government grants stuff.

Now in terms of foundations, did you know that there is a thing called the 'Australian Association Philanthropy'? (Colin - yes I've heard of it.) Right, did you know there's a foundation directory?

Colin: I have a book called "The Australian Philanthropic Trust" 1988 edition - I haven't seen the most recent.

Helen: But did you know that there are very few of them that actually make grants to environmental causes?

Colin: I've found about 3, mostly Victorian.

Helen: Yes, 80% of them all are based out of Victoria and so can only grant money within Victoria.

Colin: Do you know where that's available?

Helen: Yes, the most recent edition was published in 1990 and the address is on the book. You can either get it from them or from the Publishers, Thorpe.

Australian Directory of Philanthropy
DW Thorpe - Publisher
P.O. Box 146
Port Melbourne
Vic 3207

You might also be interested to know that there is a journal of Philanthropy called "Philanthropy". You get that from AAP.

Australian Association for Philanthropy
8th Floor, 20 Queen Street.
Melbourne, Vic 3000

It comes out quarterly. I don't know if you knew or not, but these people have just published a survey about where they are giving money and why. It's a survey that AAP commissioned because they wanted to know about where money was going, why, to whom, what for and etc. It also describes the attitude of the Philanthropic Association, so it's an attitudinal and quantitative survey and we did a quick survey of them as well as part of our project and that will summarise those findings in our report.

The survey was carried out by REARK Research (Downes/Venn). Downes has also written a book on fundraising called

Downes on Fundraising (1987)
92 Denmark St
Kew 3129

You've got a couple of big ones in the West though. (Colin - they're not in there.) No they're not, because they don't belong to the Association. (Colin - do they want to remain anonymous?) No, two biggest ones that I can think of are THE HOLMES A COURT FOUNDATION - Janet runs it. There's another one. The other escapes me at the moment. You know there's a Feilman Foundation in Western Australia. (Colin - yes I have that one.) Margaret's an old friend of mine and her sister is immediate past president of the Philanthropy Association.

Margaret Feilman
Feilman Foundation
75 Malcolm Street
West Perth 6005

Colin: Is she on the Victorian Conservation Trust? (Helen - yes)

Helen: When I remember this other one from the West, I'll write it down and send to you. They basically only fund things in Western Australia.

Are you aware of the U.S Foundation Directory? (Colin - No)

To get into this directory you have to have assets of \$23M or more. (Colin - did you pick this up in the States?) No, we ordered it, mail order, costs a couple of hundred dollars but it's worth it if you want to take the the time to sift through it.

Now we spoke to half a dozen foundations when we were in America. Just try to give you an address.

Colin: What's their attitude to funding a project outside the United States?

Helen: Some of them are specifically set up for projects outside the States. (Address found and given to Colin.)

A number of things about foundations. One is that any approach to an American foundation must have the support of the Australian Government. And I would urge you strongly to co-ordinate any of this activity with the ANPWS because of one of our, and this has to be kept confidential, one of our recommendations will be that they make major approaches to US foundations. But it won't happen; the money will not be forthcoming for a number of years because there is so much groundwork to be done. American foundations think that Australia is a rich country - they do! They can't possibly understand that why we would want to ask them for money and so it's going to have be a role for Foreign Affairs to get their consuls to start talking to these people.

Now there's been a move in the States within the foundations to set up mega environment foundations which is a combination of some of the existing foundations joining together to fund specifically environment projects. And we're talking Rockefeller joining together with MacArthur. We're talking not a couple of hundred thousand, we're talking \$52M.

Colin: What do you feel about the situation of who controls the funds-seeking process. What it seems to me is Western Australia, ANPWS, we're both chasing the money, at the moment but we won't be the last. South Australia, Victoria and NSW will all end up doing the same thing and we'll all duplicate the same process. Each will re-invent the wheel and we'll all be competing against each other for the same money. What are your feelings about a conservation-type organisation that is similar to United Way? In other words, an organisation that becomes the umbrella organisation for seeking funds for conservation in Australia and then they disperse the money to the various States.

Helen: There is one in America and the idea has lots of merit.

It seems to me that on the international scene, the only person that's going to get any money is ANPWS.

Colin: They want to give to the government, the Australian Government.

Helen: They want to give to something which is Australian. I don't think Parks is going to be able to spend it and I think they're going to have to give it to the states to spend it. That's how I think it's going to work. And I think, and this is just my own personal view... I see the role of ANPWS as being one of co-ordinator. Funding people to do the work on the ground. Not getting involved. They don't need to get involved. They need to know what's going on! Now that's the way I see it going.

Colin: Would you see that the provision they have in their Act to set up a foundation; would that be that over-riding body?

Helen: Possibly, but they also need money for some of their activities so that would be a long term aim of the foundation. I mean they also need to get out there and get the money for themselves to start with so I don't think that would be the short term goal. That might well be what it becomes in the long term.

Colin: Well what would some of that money be used for?

Helen: There is no reason why,; but I think you would have a bigger argument to try to start out by establishing I mean it would take longer to get the thing up and running if you put States in there in the beginning, that's my view having worked with the States before.

I reckon a large potential source of money for you is your lotteries. Have you spoken to your lotteries man yet? (Colin - No.) Now all you need is an amendment to the Lotteries Act to allow some of that money to be siphoned off into environmental projects across the board, both to government and community groups.

I would amend it so that they can fund environment programs. If CALM sets up a separate fundraising arm and you structure your fund or foundation the right way, it is automatically a community group, and as such could seek funds from the Lotteries if it was restricted .

Colin: You see the Lotteries already give to community groups, they give a lot of money to sport and the arts and you're saying we should add to that, conservation. (Helen, yes) They are giving money to the Gordon Reid Foundation. That is their primary source of funds.

When do you hope to have the report finished?

Helen: We are hoping to have our report to Parks by the second week in July, so it's not very far away. And there are some very interesting things. In terms of what you're doing, you may be interested in the Canadian experience of the Parks Partnership Association. Have you heard about them?

Colin: Partnerships are also part of my brief .

Helen: Well it sounds to me that Parks Partnership, Canada is in fact what you've been trying to do with the volunteers. But what they've turned them around into is very effective fundraisers. I've got a contact if you want to pursue.

Colin: I've written to the US Forests Services - they started partnerships. I've not had any response from them at all.

Helen: You'll definitely get a response from this guy, he's wildly enthusiastic!! Yes, they've gone into merchandising and licensing in a huge way using the Canadian Parks Partnerships. But he's terribly enthusiastic.

Douglas Davidge
Product Development Coordinator
Environment Canada
Postal, Ottawa Ontario
K1A 0H3
Phone (813) 997-4939

2nd Floor, Les Terrasses de la Chaudiere
10 Wellington Street
Hull, Quebec
CANADA

Colin: I think there's so much potential in Partnerships, but I don't know enough about it yet. As far as I can ascertain it involves economy's of scale and getting community groups involved in doing small but important tasks, providing recreational services and facilities. Is that basically what you have found?

Helen: No it's much more than that.

Colin: Is it more than recreational facilities? Do they tender out their work. That's why I wrote to US Forests Service because I wanted them to give me information on how they run their Partnerships Program. The way I saw it running was that they get a list of projects that they can't do that aren't high priority, say like building a walking bridge across a creek in a walking trail and ask community groups to tender, sort of tender for it, and then they fund it on a \$ for \$ basis. Parks Services puts up a \$ and the community group puts up a \$.

Helen: Well that's a very different concept, but it works very well. Who did you write to in US Parks? (Colin - I didn't have a name, I just wrote to the head office.) Okay you need to write to a chap called Mr Robert MILNE. I'll give his address and his full title.

Rob MILNE, 1100 L Street,
Washington DC
(US Parks Service).

Colin: They're (ANPWS) still going to have some external fund management within the States.

Helen: The problem you've also got is that once you move into the corporate sector, once you move into other areas that are outside your normal fundraising activities, you are seen, even if you are not, you're seen to be in direct competition with the conservation groups.

Colin: Yes I know, that's why Ray Nias doesn't want to help us that much. He said yesterday that it's getting really tough out there.

Helen: That's right, it's almost impossible to get money now. I mean I'm trying to do some fundraising now and I'm having so much trouble. I've got a product that I ought to be able to walk into somebody's office and walk out the door with the money and I can't get them to even think about it.

Colin: Funny you should say that but Ray said to me "what do you think your chances are of raising money through corporate sector". I said "I'm really confident." He said "are you? That really surprises me, I don't think the money's out there". (Helen - oh, I think the money's there.) He said "I don't think the money's out there for Government departments" (Helen - no, I don't think it is either.) He said "from my contacts with the corporate world, they don't want to give money to Government departments." (Helen - that is why you have to have^a separate trust or foundations.)

✶

χ

I said to him (Ray Nias) yes that's why we should put it through Foundat^aion

Helen: Yes that organisation must have an office not in a Government department building, it must be physically separate, must have a completely different staff, can't have public servants as staff.

Colin: Our Bill has just gone through, provides for CALM to provide the Nature Conservation Trust of WA. CALM has to staff it.

Helen: Unless you can hire new people I think it's a mistake. Fundraising is a specialist art and I don't claim to have very many of the skills. People who have got them are just superb at fundraising. I couldn't do it - I could not do it. (Colin - you've got to be a seller, because you're selling a product basically.) You have special skills in fundraising. You've got to have the personality to go with it, you have to have all of those things.

I think the money's out there, I think we've just got to work harder at it, but I don't think there's a much corporate money for Government departments.

I've discovered two things on this trip so far that one is that it is imperative One, that we shouldn't be involved in sponsorship deals with companies we regulate.

I don't think that is as big a problem as you think. If you are putting it through your foundation, that's not a problem. (Colin - we haven't got one set up at this stage.) Yes, but once you do, I mean I don't think you need to say to your department "we can't accept money that has come from X Company.". If in fact you can't accept it directly, that doesn't matter because it's coming through your foundation anyway, because you're taking money from the foundation not from the company.

Colin: The new trust that's been set up can only take money for threatened species and the land acquisition. (Helen - this is what the Act says is it?) Yes, so all the money that would come from say Alcoa, should be for timber research, or for forest research or money coming in looking at value adding timber products, could not go into the WA Conservation Trust

Helen: Were you responsible for this Act?

Colin: No it was a member of Parliament who had been to the United States and saw the Nature Conservancy and said "that's what we want for WA" and came back, put an amendment to the CALM Bill

Helen: He obviously didn't look at the US Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

Colin: As far as I know he didn't look at anything except the Nature Conservancy . And we tried to change the amendment because we felt that it was too narrow and it wasn't going to achieve what we really wanted it to do.

Helen: Is there any chance of you getting any amendments to this Act?

Colin: It still has to go through the Lower House. Basically, it's gone through. We can amend it, but it might take another two years. This one's been sitting there for two year because it's not a high priority it kept on getting reshuffled back down the list.

Helen: There's another way. This is a foundation for CALM is it? What's it called? (Colin - WA Nature Conservation Trust). Fine, set up another one, but set it up as a company.

If you wait for our report, you'll find you'll have less work to do after you've seen our report.

Colin: I have a paper here which is an overview of some relevant trusts and it compare each, including the ones in WA . Basically what it says is that the Gordon Reid Foundation which is set up to provide money for conservation projects for community groups in WA. Environmental project, public awareness, etc but only for community groups so that sort of leaves us out. Then there is the new Nature Conservation Trust which is set up under the CALM Act and is primarily for land acquisition and for threatened species however broad that might be but I still think that a need for something else.

Helen: What I mean, in the best of both worlds it would be sensible to either prevent the Nature Conservation Trust from going through or to amend it, but if you want to move quickly and I suspect you have to move quickly given the Government position on funding, then that's a problem with ANPWS, you really do have to move fairly quickly. Then your best bet is to set up a new one. I mean you can have a company set up in about less than 6 months; you can have it up and running.

How far down the track are you going to go with bequests?

Colin: Not very far - what I'm going to do is I'm just going to make recommendations that basically there is bequest money there and that it should be sought through a foundation and the Department shouldn't be seen to be collecting it.

Helen: Very wise recommendations. This is off the record, but my view is that is the greatest potential source of money for such an organisation. It's long term money and what you do is set yourself a target, put it into an endowment fund and that funds your activities. It will take you ten years to reach target and you won't see any benefit for 10 years but after that you probably won't have to do any more fundraising.

You need experts in the field, it can't be done by anybody who doesn't know anything about it; it requires a very special sort of person to do it; has to be done in-house; can never be farmed out. (Colin - can't it be done through a consultancy?) My view would be NO. I would.... (Colin - employ an expert at it.) Well that would be my recommendation, I would not farm it out to an insurance company.

Colin: Fundraising Management Consultants have approached us saying "look we are experts in this field".

Helen: No, I might hire them to set it up, I might hire them to set your program up but I wouldn't let them go anywhere near the people. Because they've got a commercial vested interest and death is a very difficult thing to talk to people about and it gets a bit crass if "I'm a consultant working for.... and I've come to help you make your will". It's a bit difficult.

Colin: So you'd see that the foundation actually employed this person? (Helen - YES. and not involve the Department at all.

Helen: The foundation has got to be right away from the Department. It's physically got to be miles away. It can't be anywhere in the same building. It's got to be responsible to the Department in terms of its reporting but it's got to be free in its day-to-day activities to get on and do it. Because Governments and Government departments are, by their nature, driven by the political process which has a 3 to 5 year cycle and the best you can possibly hope for is a 6 to 10 year cycle in that process. And if you go down the road of a bequest program you are not going to see any results in 10 years but you're going to see a hell of a lot of activity and a lot of money going out the door but you're not going to see any return. And its only a board which has set a policy and a long term policy that will stand up and protect that policy that's going to get you there. But it is my view that it is probably the greatest untapped area of money in Australia.

Colin: When you consider that 50% - 1 in every 2 Australians die without a will.

Helen: That's right. You've only got to tap into 10% of that market and they've only got to give you a \$1,000 each. That's a lot of money. I don't think it will come as any surprise to anybody that we'll be recommending that to ANPWS. Now they might not like that because it's such a delicate area.

Colin: Well again that is another reason why you feel they should be using foundation provisions.

Helen: But it's not a high profile thing, it can be done quietly. And as far as I can see there aren't many of the conservation groups that are into it yet so they can't be accused of competition. Conservation groups do it but in a very low key manner. But you see, and I'll give this piece of information in total confidence. The Wilderness Society have just made a major effort to go into this area. This is the Wilderness Society US. And they are aiming for \$25M in three years. They are half way there. A different population base, but if you took 10% of that \$2.5M is a lot of money. A hell of a lot more money that's going into these things now.

Yes, you see hospitals and stuff are just getting into it but it's a difficult thing to do and it has to be done properly. You actually have to leave that person alone to get on and do it. (Colin - that's their sole task.) That's it. The Wilderness Society in the US have 6 full-time people doing it and that's all they do. So, it may not be something that you recommend they pursue actively but should keep on the back burner. Because you can't do everything at once. Perhaps you can make it a strongish recommendation but one that can be considered in the long term. I don't know.

There's a report I should point you at. I'm trying to get a copy of it myself but it's probably far more relevant to you than it is to ANPWS. It's a report by the Dept of Forests, New Zealand written by a person called ACKERMAN which looks at entrance fees and licence fees and has been grabbed with open arms by the US Parks Service as being "*THE DIFINITIVE DOCUMENT*".

The report was commissioned and published by the NZ Forest Department. Its about park entrance fees. That's my understanding. And I really don't have any more information than that.

So we're looking at all these things for ANPWS and I think they should approach corporate sponsors but we certainly will be saying to them that it takes a lot of energy, a lot of work, there's not much out there now anyway that shouldn't be your number 1 priority. You should be looking at these other things as your number 1 priority then when the economy picks up a bit start looking more to corporate sponsors. Because there will be corporate sponsors who will come out of the woodwork anyway.

Colin: Yeh, there'll be a lot of companies out there that are seeking it for whole range of different reasons. Not all of them are honourable.

Helen: Yes, as the man from the Nature Conservancy in the US said "there taint no untainted money".

Colin: Yes, I read that in the Nature Conservancy News.

Helen: They don't have a policy about receiving money. They'll take it from anybody.

Colin: They're unashamed that all the money they get goes into conservation so therefore they don't care, they feel that if the money's coming from an oil company, fine, doesn't matter. At least it's going to nature conservation. Because they don't have to be responsible to a political master or the taxpayer or they don't have conflicts of interests because they're not managing anything else.

Helen: No it's very interesting. Of all the conservation groups we spoke to in the United States, only 1 of them said they would not accept corporate money. One only because they felt compromised.

Colin: It's interesting here, Worldwide Fund for Nature says "the World Wildlife Fund has two main reasons for dealing with industry
a. does recognise that industry is one of the major contributors to environmental degradation therefore if WWF is to arrest this degradation it must co-operate with and encourage industry to adopt policies and practices that are environmentally responsible.
b. to raise money from industry and commerce WWF's international and national conservation education communication programs."
They are saying that by involving themselves with industry in sponsorship they can change industry; it's the only way that they can have long term effects. (Helen - sounds like something Ian Higgins would write.) Well I mean that's their rationale. Whether you accept it or not.....(Helen - yes that's right, how very interesting.)

Helen: Well, so, without giving too much away out of our report we will be looking at all of those things that I said that I explained to you in the beginning and some other things as well, but our main thrust and I suspect our major recommendation will be the establishment of a separate autonomous fundraising arm. Without a doubt. (Colin - how would you fit Jim Jude in that?) We have ways and we've actually asked, and this is confidential, we've asked for a round table between Parks, Jim Jude and us. So that anything we recommend is acceptable to everybody but Parks have backed away from having that meeting, so we're going to have meeting with Jim separately.

Colin: Jim's interested in introducing the duck stamp. He wants all the States to get involved. That's obvious. I mean, I think that's great. If we're going to have duck shooting, then it's a user pay system that money should go back into wetland conservation and it's a great concept, the whole thing's a good idea but he's saying also, and I agree, if the States are to be involved, they need some incentive. And the incentive should be that 50% of the money goes straight to the States. (Helen - couldn't agree more.) And I said to him well what chance have you got of convincing ANPWS of that. He said "I run things - they'll do what I tell them." (Helen - well I'm not sure of that, but he does run the thing.) I think that he's got them over a barrel because he just says. (Colin - I've got the money).....

Helen: Well he has and he hasn't and that's part of the problem.

So, at this stage, I would like to give you all of the stuff I've got and I would be happy to do that. But it's the same cause. This is what annoys me, it is the same cause we're all working for.

Colin: I know now though that I won't be able to finalise my report and recommendations until I get a copy of your report and I know that there's information in there that I will need to finalise things.

Helen: In our report we will be targeting and identifying the specific people to go to. What I will show you but what I can't give you a copy of just yet, but I should be able to quite soon is this document.....(Colin - so this is a direct extract from the Foundation Directory)
No, it's more than a direct extract because it's been done by the fundraiser from Brookfield Zoo in Chicago and these are people who have given money. And who have expressed interest in continuing to do so. So it's slightly more qualitative.
(Colin - so did you say I can have a copy of that?)

It will be an appendix in the report.

Colin: It's difficult to know how to approach each of those without knowing what the conditions of the foundations are.

Helen: That's right, but I've got guidelines for most of them somewhere. But you see I can't see any reason why they can't be joint; CALM and an ANPPWS Foundation. This is what I was getting back to in my original statement about co-ordinating things. Co-ordinate rather than duplicate or compete..

Colin: Well that's going to be the key and I would favour that because quite frankly if we're going to bring on board any more than a couple of sponsors into the Department, we are not going to be able to manage them. That then will have implications for effective fundraising in other areas. A national fundraising organisation concentrating on donations, trusts and bequests would allow States to concentrate on local sponsorship. Because just in terms of servicing sponsors, if we don't service them properly

1. we are going to lose them and
2. we are going to tarnish our image.

Helen: Exactly, because word gets round the corporate community very quickly. As part of the report we will be preparing for Parks we're actually going to give them a bible about what they should and shouldn't do with corporate sponsors. Do not do this, do this, do not do this....etc. Which is a guide book I wrote for my State national trusts when we had some major corporate sponsors going. I would just send it out every now and then and say "do you remember me sending you this? Have you read it lately? Have you done any of the things on the list lately?" Because there are things you have to do. You have to make sure they get invited to everything. You have to make sure they're on every possible mailing list. You have to make sure they have a drink with the Minister once every six months or whatever it is you are going to do for them. And people just forget, they just simply forget.

Colin: So that document was purely on how to service your sponsors? (Helen - yes, how to look after them.) And that's going to be in your report?

Helen: Yes, so hopefully this report is going to be useful to some people anyway. It will be interesting to see. There seems to be an enormous amount of interest having been generated. US Parks people want a copy of it, Canadian Parks people want a copy of it, so it will be very interesting.

Colin: ANPWS will have the right to it, so will they be in a position to.... (Helen - they'll hold the copyright.) They might make more money out of it than you!!

Helen: But there will be some parts of it that will remain confidential for a short period of time anyway because we've got some information from Canada which they've asked us to keep confidential, but like I said, we can give it to our clients and asked that confidentiality be passed on. That is something which you might want to pick up when we eventually release the material because it's for a simple but very effective fundraising exercise/program they've put in place. So that sort of stuff.

Have you spoken to the ACF? (Colin - NO) You should speak to the ACF about their green bonds. They've just marketed them; they launched them on Wednesday, World Environment Day. Very very clever idea. They use an established financial institution to sell them. And I'm not sure how it works but I think that they're just taking a percentage of the management fee. They should in fact, I reckon, be taking half of the interest. (Colin - they are a bond are they?) They are a straight forward financial bond. (Colin - just like Telecom would sell a Telecom bond?) Yes, yes but a green bond and their financial institution is re-investing it.

Colin: So you go in and buy \$100 worth of green bonds and you get 10% interest on them or whatever the going rate is ... about that I guess.

Helen: Apparently they're investing them in conservation projects which have to be approved by both the ACF and the financial institution and so you as an investor know that your money is going into environmentally friendly projects which make money and the ACF gets a spin off in terms of either a percentage of the management fee or a small percentage of the interest. Very nice concept.

Colin: As long as the projects make money and that they're viable.

Helen: That's up to the financial institution. Financial institution has a veto over any project on financial grounds; the ACF has a veto over any project on environmental grounds. It seems to me to be a very very good way of doing business.

I guess the best person you could try to see Paul Rutherford who is the ACF Liaison Officer here or you could try and talk to Philip Toyne.

Paul is the NLO for Canberra same building as Greenpeace . His telephone number is 2473013. He may not know very much about them but he should have some information in his office and he should have a name because otherwise you would need to talk to Philip in Melbourne. I would talk to them about the green bonds because you might want to include something like that in your report. No reason why you couldn't do it just for WA and use one of the WA based building societies. (Colin - good idea.) Yes well if your foundation... nothing to stop your foundation going into that commercial stuff.

We will in fact be suggesting a company structure for a Foundation

Did you know that these people (AAP) put out a "How To" Establish a Foundation"

Colin: No - it's a separate document is it? (Helen - I'd ask them, just when you write to them get their list.) Is that Thorp publish that?

Helen: This is DW Thorpe but the Australian Association Philanthropy put out that booklet. (Colin - so I should write to them?) Yes, I'd write to Australian Association Philanthropy.

Once you get your foundation established I would become a member of that organisation if I were you. Well the foundation should become a member of that.

Colin: Yes, yes..... I thought you were talking about membership to the foundation. (Helen - now that's an interesting subject) I say that's a classic - all the statutory bodies don't have memberships and the biggest contribution of funds say to the Nature Conservancy, both the Nature Conservancy and the NPWS do a breakdown of their income is memberships.

Helen: However, did they tell you how much they spent on servicing their members? (Colin - NO) Well find out, it's huge, it is huge.

Colin: What, in terms of postage and all that sort of stuff?

Helen: Journal, newsletter, postage - it's very large. (Colin - does it outstrip the membership fee?) No it doesn't leave much out of it. You really only start to recoup dough from that sort of thing after 2 to 3 years. They are a great source of income and they're good for other things too but you need to be aware that servicing membership is very expensive. Just trying to give you an example; I've got some good examples.. how much it costs to service... I think the Wilderness Society was the best example which has a million members. (Colin - how much do they pay for membership?) Anything from \$5 - \$999 but they have a set fee but you can pay any fee that you like. (Colin - so they have a minimum fee?) And then they have categories of memberships. So the people who pay the basic membership fee, you still have to service them equally as someone who pays you three times that. Catch 22. You see the national trusts used to spend at least 75% of the membership fees servicing the members. Not unusual, so you need to be little bit wary that's all and try to extract that information from them. The WWF's a very good test case. (Colin - something that didn't occur to me.) Because if you look at WWF they actually send out a lot of stuff to their members. (Colin - there's Earthwatch.) Just an interesting question, because they would always say to you we get X dollars from membership. It looks really good and you have lots of members and there's lots of activity; there's no doubt about any of that. What you've really got to look at is how much it costs servicing. How many staff members are allocated just to membership.

Colin: That comes back to the point too, raises the point of servicing the sponsors and putting in place in a sponsorship deal whether you go for building into that sponsorship deal a servicing component to say like we're asking for \$100,000 but to look after you as a sponsor we need a bit more money. So you actually add that into it. (Helen - they'd accept that usually.) They will usually accept it or you go the other way and say we accept \$100,000 but to service you can you pay a PR relations company or one of your people to do that work.

Helen: Yes, and they're usually quite happy to do that. As a rule of thumb it's always been our view that once you've got a sponsorship the company should then put a minimum of 10% of the value of that sponsorship into its promotion within their own company for it to work and that can be paid advertisements in newspapers saying "we've just given this money to, or we've gone into partnership with", or have dinners with members of the recipient organisation of the donor organisation. Its to have a launch of whatever it is that you're launching, it's to have a celebration of the close of whatever project it is. And the minimum that's needed is 10%.

Colin: Ray Nias said 15%. He said even up to 20%. He mentioned one organisation that spends up to 70%.

Helen: Oh yes, the more they put in the better mileage they get but our baseline was always 10%. (Colin - well you're raiding the amount of money you've got left to be able to do anything.) Oh no, that's over and above - you get your million dollars and then you say to the corporation "you must, within your own corporation spend \$100,000 promoting this sponsorship". Now the recipient organisation should do that as well. Quite often you can get away with spending less than 10% if can convince the corporation to spend 10% because you can quite often do joint things and piggyback. But they need to spend... and the argument is for you to get the best benefit and the most mileage, you need to spend money promoting it. They understand that very much.

Colin: Yes they do because it's two pots that you get your sponsorship money from, one's the advertising budget and the other one is the charity budget and the charity budget is usually quite insignificant compared to the advertising budget.

Helen: National Wildlife Federation - has \$100M annually revenue. 40% of that comes directly from membership but they say, and I mean this is really over the top stuff, they have 6 million supporters and have 4 million on their mailing list. And they say it costs them 2/3 of the fee to service their members. So, and if it's 40% of their gross income.....

Colin: The other thing is that it's hidden there, is how many of those supporters those 6 million - you said 6 and 4???? (Helen - yes 6 million is what their total list is, 4 million are paid up.) Yes, well of that 6 million, how many of them are not only providing their membership fee but are also donating them? That's the extra bit that's hidden there, isn't it?

Helen: Yes, so you've just got to be careful when you're looking at all these numbers, but it's a very interesting exercise. But when you think about the 4 million, it's just mind-boggling. A quarter of the population of Australia.

Have you heard about programmed Credit Cards - it's where you get a percentage of the credit card, it's not a new idea but was very successful one. (Colin - how does that work?) Well you sell you soul to a credit company - credit card issuing agency and in return for promotion of their credit card through your membership lists or whatever, or organisation, they give you a percentage of membership and a percentage of sales on those cards. Pretty painless way of doing it. Or you just go on in association with them on a particular promotion like a holiday promotion or something. Diners Club do it, American Express do it. We, National Trust did with Diners Club. I think the Koala people did it with American Express. Remember the koala people, Jim Jude... But a couple - the Nature Conservancy did it with American Express in US and somebody else did it with one of the other big... could have been Visa in the US too. But nobody's actually done it with Bankcard yet and that's the biggest market.

(Colin - is Bankcard still the biggest credit card?) Bankcard and Mastercard.

Well I'm not sure there's much more I can give you.

7/6/91