

Dear Sir/Madam,

In regard to the review of PPF's the trustees of the Clitheroe Foundation are in agreement with the detailed submission made by Philanthropy Australia. Paul Clitheroe is a Council Member of Philanthropy Australia.

However, the Trustees of the Clitheroe Foundation would like to address some of the more subtle issues around philanthropic engagement.

The Clitheroe Foundation was founded in 2003 due to the new PPF structure. We were keen to make a more active contribution to the community both in time and money, but existing structures had a requirement to raise public funds. We did not want to ask others for money, we wanted to donate our own.

Previously, like so many Australians, we had donated money on a reasonably adhoc basis. It was difficult to commit to longer term projects as funds were available in good years, but less so in bad years.

The PPF structure appealed to us as it allowed us to make a reasonably significant donation over a number of years to build corpus and to give the Foundation the ability to research and commit to longer term giving.

The reality is that our PPF has drawn us into the world of philanthropy. We have become highly aware of the value of donations made by individuals and families, and how to make grants to far better effect. There is no doubt that the PPF structure has caused us to give away far more than we would have done on a yearly, adhoc basis. The PPF has also drawn our 3 children into the philanthropic area, and quite a number of our friends and colleagues have either started a PPF, or become more involved in philanthropy due to seeing the work of our and other PPF's.

What the Treasury Review should note is the importance of the influence of PPF's on growing a culture of giving in our country.

We strongly agree about transparency, accountability and the need for PPF's to distribute sensible amounts, but to effectively kill off this important vehicle for cultural change by enforcing a level of distribution that effectively closes down a PPF a few years after the donors are no longer in a position to continue to contribute, seems short sighted.

We also recommend caution about a requirement to provide public contact details, not because we wish to hide from scrutiny (as previously stated we strongly support transparency and accountability) but we, like most PPF's run on a cost base close to zero and prefer to ask for submissions for funding by invitation only. With no staff to deal with an influx of requests for funding, responding in an appropriate and professional fashion is likely to be time and cost inefficient.

We look forward to our PPF being able to support grants/scholarships/fellowships in medical research and the arts for many decades and to continue to draw our children, friends and colleagues in growing a strong culture of giving.

Clitheroe Foundation