


Where is the money for women's rights?




Assessing resources and the role of donors in the promotion of women's rights and the support of women's organizations

An Action-Research Project of
The Association for Women's Rights in Development
February 2006

By Cindy Clark, Ellen Sprenger and Lisa VeneKlasen of Just Associates
in collaboration with Lydia Alpízar Durán and Joanna Kerr of AWID

Where is the money for women's rights?



Assessing resources and the role of donors in the promotion of women's rights and the support of women's organizations

**An Action-Research Project of
The Association for Women's Rights in Development**

**By Cindy Clark, Ellen Sprenger and Lisa VeneKlasen of Just Associates
in collaboration with Lydia Alpízar Durán and Joanna Kerr of AWID**

Where is the money for women's rights? *Assessing the resources and the role of donors in the promotion of women's rights and the support of women's rights organizations* was first published by the Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID), 215 Spadina Avenue, Suite 150, Toronto, M5T 2C7, Canada and Zamora 169, Casa 2, Colonia Condesa, Mexico City, CP 06140, Mexico in 2006.

www.awid.org

Published in association with:
Just Associates, 2040 S Street NW, Suite 203,
Washington, DC 20009, USA

www.justassociates.org

Copyright ©
Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID), 2006

Graphic design and layout by Julio Blanco-Bogantes
Copy-editing Jane Connolly
Typography Arial Family
Printed and bound in Mexico by
For permission to reprint please write to awid@awid.org

All rights reserved.

Index

Executive Summary	1
Chapter 1 Introduction	7
Chapter 2 The Funding Landscape – an overview	11
Chapter 3 Trends in Bilateral and Multilateral Development Assistance	21
Chapter 4 Trends in Large Independent Foundations	39
Chapter 5 Trends in Public Foundations / International NGOs (INGOs)	47
Chapter 6 Trends in Individual Giving and Family Foundations (Private Philanthropy)	55
Chapter 7 Trends in Women’s Funds	61
Chapter 8 Trends in Corporate Giving/Philanthropy	65
Chapter 9 Womens Rights Organizations: feeling the funding shifts	71
Chapter 10 What Women’s Rights Organizations Need to be Thinking About and Doing Differently	97
Chapter 11 Conclusion	105
Annex 1 Glossary	109
Annex 2 Individuals Interviewed for the study	111
Annex 3 Our ‘Money and Fundraising’ Dreams	117
Annex 4 Funding for Women’s Rights Online Survey Results	119

Executive Summary

What would you do with 100 million dollars?

While there may be some women's rights advocates who have pondered that question in the context of winning the lottery, few have actually had the opportunity to plan their work with such a large sum in mind. Instead, the dominant sense is one of scarcity—too few interested funders, with too little money to support existing women's rights organizations and initiatives. Is it that women's rights groups are not bold enough in their fundraising strategies? Is it that donors simply don't get the urgency and importance of this work? What has really been happening in terms of funding for women's rights organizations in the last ten years and what have been the driving forces behind those trends?

This report is the result of an ongoing action research initiative launched by the Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID) to explore these questions and to draw insights into possible strategies for changing the existing funding landscape so that more resources are made available to women's rights organizations.

Yes, women's rights organizations. In the last few years, many human rights, development, and other justice-oriented organizations have taken on issues of women's rights and gender equality to varying degrees. The fact that so many organizations are now talking about women's rights reflects the success of women's rights activists and organizations over the last decades in reaching out to mixed organizations and movements. But the intent of this research was not to focus on just any organization that says it 'does' women's rights. Instead, our aim was to understand better the limitations and levers for strengthening financial support for women's rights organizations and movements in and of themselves. This is because we believe that the health of these organizations is crucial for making women's rights a lived reality around the world. Allies are essential, but we want to be sure that the heart and soul of women's rights movements are getting the funding needed to flourish.

What do we see in the funding landscape?

Challenges of the current moment are numerous; including what seems to be decreasing support for women's rights organizations among almost all sectors of funders.

As anyone who has tried to raise funds for women's rights knows, it is a complex terrain with limited available information, shifting priorities and interests, and often requires a significant upfront investment of time and resources to cultivate relationships. Challenges of the current moment are numerous; including what seems to be decreasing support for women's rights organizations among almost all sectors of funders. Mainstreaming, initially promoted by women's rights groups as key to

integrating gender equality throughout organizations and programs, has not had the desired consequence of strengthening action in respect of women's rights—we see instead cases where mainstreaming has led to cutting of gender equality specialists and women-specific programs. Donor institutions and policies are often strongly influenced by private sector thinking with a push to efficiency, results-based management, and a belief in technical fixes to social problems with often a lack of insight into the political nature of change processes.

The most prominent supporters of women's rights groups have traditionally been development aid agencies, large independent foundations and public foundations (also known as international non-governmental organizations (INGOS)). Bilateral and multilateral aid agencies that were once strong supporters of women's rights organizations are cutting back their levels of funding for women's organizations and are directing more funds through national governments rather than to NGOs. Many funding agencies that have strong policies around their support for gender equality and women's rights have shown few successes on the ground. Gender mainstreaming is perceived by these institutions as largely unsuccessful. And with growing conservatism within many donor countries, gender equality advocates within these agencies say they face an uphill battle to continue making the case for gender equality. Among large independent foundations, changes in leadership have led a handful of major foundations to move away from a women's rights agenda. At the same time, external scrutiny of foundation operations and growing frustration with limited impact have led many foundations to narrow their focus, providing larger grants to fewer, larger organizations. Furthermore, public foundations/INGOs often struggle with their dual identities as donors and NGOs with their own advocacy agendas. Some position themselves as strong supporters of women's rights and yet there can be considerable tensions between some of these organizations and existing women's rights groups as they can appear more as competitors than supporters and collaborators with the existing groups.

In what it is easy to cast as a bleak landscape, there are important opportunities. Many long-time supporters of women's rights and gender equality – especially development assistance agencies and public foundations – are revisiting their strategies and realizing that they need stronger connections and better partnerships with women's movements and organizations. New players are also coming onto the funding scene that, with some investment and collaboration, could become important supporters of women's rights groups. Similarly, corporate foundations, family foundations and individual donors are growing in both size and number, and are an important potential source of funding for women's rights groups to tap. Meanwhile, over the last ten years, women's funds have also been blossoming. Started by feminists in the Global South,

Many funding agencies that have strong policies around their support for gender equality and women's rights have shown few successes on the ground.

Central and Eastern European well as the Global North, these funds are raising money from a variety of sources to financially support women's groups in their countries, regions and internationally.

Are women's organizations thriving globally?

One participant of this project described the current state of women's rights organizations as one of "survival and resistance". That description seems to resonate with many activists. While there are nuances to the situation across different regions, the commonalities are striking. In general, over half of the women's organizations that participated in the AWID online survey for this research are receiving less funding now than they were five years ago. Among them, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Middle East/North Africa and Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States are the regions where cutbacks are most frequently reported. Amazingly, women's funds, which disbursed just USD 15 million in the previous year, were the most often cited source of support in 2004, indicating that while grants are small, women's funds are an important source of support for a large number of organizations.

The research shows that women's rights organizations spend more time on fundraising now than in past years, with unclear results. Some express frustration with presenting proposals for activities that 'fit' with the agenda of the funder yet deviate from a more political agenda for justice, accountability and transformation. Many complain they end up fulfilling a service delivery role rather than following their own agenda. Across regions, women's rights groups say they are increasingly forced to look to their governments for funding, which presents obvious challenges if they wish to take a critical stance on official positions or policies. Related to this is the sense that funding is primarily available for country-based work, with less support for regional or international work or for linking among different levels. Similarly, core organizational support is enormously difficult to secure, with most funding being for specific projects.

Strategy ideas for mobilizing more money

A key part of this research involved exploring ideas of possible strategies for mobilizing greater resources for women's rights organizations. We asked: Where are the levers for influence and change within funding institutions? What do women's rights organizations need to be doing differently to be more successful in securing resources?

As with all good political strategies, effective fundraising requires a keen analysis of the context and moment and an ability to manoeuvre the

intricate power dynamics at play. We recognize, too, that realities vary tremendously for different kinds of organizations in different contexts; therefore, few of the recommendations and ideas can be used universally. Nonetheless, some key messages came through from this research for further action.

With ***bilateral and multilateral agencies***, women's rights organizations inside donor countries need to lobby their governments to increase their financial support of women's rights agendas and organizations. At the same time, given the strong rhetoric of many of these agencies on gender equality, stronger accountability mechanisms are needed, such as a watch-dog process to monitor implementation of commitments.

For ***large independent foundations***, one or two can be very influential in taking the lead and encouraging others to support women's rights organizations. Securing a strong champion will require careful strategizing as to the appropriate message as well as the messenger who can connect with foundation leadership with the aim of expanding support for all women's rights organizations. Engaging foundation program officers and leaders where possible, in deeper dialogues around the substance of the work done by women's rights organizations, will also help to clarify possibilities for a more comprehensive funding approach.

Similarly, ***public foundations*** must be engaged in critical dialogue around their roles in promoting women's rights by encouraging them to increase their support for women's rights organizations. As there are increasing opportunities to collaborate with public foundations on shared issues of interest, it is also crucial to establish clear terms of engagement in respect of decision-making and agenda-setting powers, issues of ownership and attribution, and other fundamental elements of such collaborations or so-called partnerships.

Given the significance of support from **women's funds** for so many women's rights organizations, they should be encouraged to grow by tapping into new sources of funding (and thereby not competing with the organizations they hope to support), to continue supporting transformative work, and to clarify the larger agenda behind the funding they provide.

Finally, sources of **private philanthropy, individual donors and small family foundations** are often neglected in the fundraising strategies of women's groups yet their potential for underwriting much of the political feminist work exists. Women's organizations, including the women's funds, who already have access to these donors, as well as tried and true methods for raising funds from them, should help make connections and

leverage resources for others.

To effectively expand their resource base, participants in this research also had several recommendations for women's rights organizations themselves:

Build the skills, and especially the attitude: Many said they wanted to improve their skills for fundraising and making their case to donors. Even more important is the need to change the way they think about money (for instance, how to be bold and ask big) and come to terms with the role (both positive and negative) funding plays in women's rights movement-building.

Expand new sources: As a result of lean financial times, many women's rights organizations have had some experience with alternative sources of support. There are lessons to be drawn from both inside and outside the women's movement as well as deeper research to be done to clarify pros and cons of raising funds from sources such as family foundations, individuals and corporations.

Consolidate donor allies: There are many allies of women's rights organizations within donor institutions. Connecting with these allies, learning about the challenges they face, exploring ways to work with them to encourage their own organizations to increase funding for women's rights and act to influence other donors to increase their support are all key methods. These feminists within donor organizations are seeking answers from women's rights activists on how much of a donor's budget should go to women-specific work and how much should be integrated across other funding areas. Clarifying the level of resources needed and how best they should be focused is an important task for more effective fundraising.

Explore potential for greater solidarity in fundraising: Realistically speaking, making inroads to leaders and key points of influence within donor agencies will have to be done initially by a relatively small number of well-connected and already influential women's rights advocates and organizations. These groups need to build solidarity and transparency in fundraising, and acknowledge and use their privilege, while finding ways of influencing donors to increase support for a broad array of women's rights organizations. More groups will then have to develop an ethical political 'pact' so that those with access to donors can and do act to leverage money for a larger group of organizations. At the core, women's groups need to get beyond a culture of scarcity that breeds concerns about 'competing over the existing pie', and move to notions of 'expanding the pie' by accessing resources that were previously untapped.

Women's rights organizations need to broaden their constituency of public support by getting accurate media coverage.

Sharpen strategies: There was much analysis about the need for stronger, sharper and more effective strategies that would make supporting the work of women's rights organizations more compelling to donors. Women's rights groups admitted the need for building greater consistent presence in public debate and opinion, strengthening constituency-building and connecting the work at different levels, and opening space for deeper joint reflection among women's rights organizations regarding perspectives on effective leadership and organizational strengthening models.

Look at movement structure: Related to the questions of strategy, participants in the research were raising questions about women's rights organizations themselves—how to counter the trend toward “NGO-ization” and technification, reflecting on necessary structure for stronger movements with a more independent funding base, and whether there is a role for women's rights ‘giants’ that build credibility of the movement as a whole, such as Amnesty International does in respect of human rights.

Taking on the evaluation challenge: Evaluating the kind of change and transformation that women's rights organizations are working toward is very important. It is vital for making the case to donors, not to mention informing future work and learning. There must be an investment in developing and sharing approaches for measuring social change that both help women's rights groups monitor their progress and strengthen programs as well as aid (potential) donors' understanding of why they are worth the investment.

Leverage public support by showing the impact: Since all funding sectors are influenced by public opinion, women's rights organizations need to broaden their constituency of public support by getting accurate media coverage and projecting a powerful, compelling vision of women's rights.

Re-shape the mainstreaming debate: In the short term it is difficult to ignore the fact that mainstreaming has become an integral part of the practice of many donor agencies (particularly bilateral, multilateral and public foundations). Many commented on the need to avoid mainstreaming pitfalls by shifting from training and tool development to accountability mechanisms, bringing back concepts of power and discrimination and generating greater support for women's human rights and strong organizations advocating for women's rights. Over the longer term, donor representatives and women's rights organizations believe that gender mainstreaming has to be replaced by a concept that doesn't obscure but instead promotes a transformative social justice and women's rights agenda.

Chapter 1

Introduction

It seems fitting that in 2005, a decade after the celebration of the Fourth United Nations Conference on Women, we step back to look at how financial support for women's rights organizations has evolved.

As a membership organization of thousands of gender equality and women's rights advocates worldwide, the Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID) has become only too aware of the growing challenges for resourcing women's rights' work. Back in 2002, AWID commissioned a study to take stock of fundraising strategies and funding sources—specifically for transnational women's rights organizations¹. Since then, a large part of the correspondence we receive from members asks about how and where to raise funds. This led us to invest in this action-research initiative to gain a better understanding of funding trends for women's rights work and how best to expand the resource base for feminist movements and women's rights organizations.

One of the key tensions inherent in fundraising for women's rights organizations is that so many of the people responsible for fundraising hate asking for money. While many recognize that donors are seeking 'fundable' initiatives and approach them from a position of confidence knowing that their proposal is worthy of support, others complain about having to 'beg' for money, and see fundraising as a distraction from, rather than part of, the core work to achieve their mission. At the same time, there are diverging perspectives on the role of money in movement building and how the inherent power dynamics in a grantor/grantee relationship can be managed.

The power of money changes the dynamics of women's organizing.

According to Sunila Abeysekera, "balancing the need to have access to resources, both material and human, with the desire to maintain the autonomy and integrity of women's movements has resulted in some dynamic relationships being developed with funding agencies that have provided support for the diverse activities and programmes of women's organizations all over the world. The tensions that emerge over issues of power and control, about ownership, leadership and lead roles in the definition of agenda have led to many conflicts and confusion".²

1 AWID, Occasional Paper #10: Addressing Financial Stability: Key Challenges and Opportunities for Transnational Women's Rights Organizations (November 2002) written by Cindy Clark, Just Associates. <http://www.awid.org/publications/occasional10.doc>.

2 Abeysekera, Sunila, 2005, "The women's human rights agenda: what do funding and mainstream human rights organizations have to do with it", paper commissioned by AWID, October, 2005.

The power of money changes the dynamics of women's organizing. This has led some women leaders to question whether it is at all possible to carry forward and sustain a feminist agenda using external resources. Other activists say that they are energized to approach donors, recognizing that funders have money to spend and they have vital programs to be resourced. There is also the reality that funding and fundraising is often a source of tension and competition among organizations working on women's rights. The unfortunate truth is that most successful fundraising relies on a combination of good ideas, strong personal connections, the ability to speak the donor's language (generally English) and travel to meet and woo donors.

The tensions and competition mean that money and fundraising are seldom on the table when women's rights organizations do collective strategizing—yet they are core to their ability to do the work. As one interviewee noted, “We know that money can drive agendas, divide us, and we need to be aware of that. We need to get that on the agenda.” Who has money, and who makes decisions about how it is used are critical political issues that we cannot afford to ignore.

Therefore, this initiative aims to identify key levers for influence and change that could help mobilize greater resources for women's rights work, thereby strengthening our movements at this critical juncture. The specific objectives are to:

1. Identify key trends in funding in the past ten years (since the Beijing Women's conference) for women's rights organizations at the national, regional and global level in terms of overall quantity, regional focus, theme areas and approaches.
2. Understand what changes have occurred and why within different funding sources for women's rights work.
3. Analyze the impact of funding trends on women's rights organizations.
4. Facilitate a discussion and dialogue between and among women's movements and funders about building more powerful women's movements and effective women's rights strategies.
5. Develop an enriched strategy and new allies to promote actions to increase the amount and access of funding for women's rights organizations in different regions of the world.

This report represents the culmination of the research phase, in which data was gathered through:

Who has money, and who makes decisions about how it is used are critical political issues that we cannot afford to ignore.

- 82 interviews with a wide range of funders, representatives of organizations working on women’s rights and relevant resource persons (see Annex 2 for a list of interviewees).
- an online survey of representatives from over four hundred women’s organizations working towards women’s rights and gender equality (completed in May 2005, see Annex 4).
- a literature review of existing research and relevant reports, and
- three international meetings with groups of donors and representatives from women’s rights organizations, in Porto Alegre (January 2005), New York (March 2005) and Mexico City (September 2005).

This report is organized into 11 chapters. The second chapter presents some of the facts and figures on funding for women’s rights and gender equality as well as key political developments that impact on this funding. Chapters three to eight examine the funding landscape and identify, per funding sector, key dynamics, challenges, opportunities, and possible strategies for leveraging more support. The funding sectors, or categories, discussed are development assistance, large independent foundations, international NGOs (or public foundations), individual giving and family foundations, women’s funds and corporate giving. Chapter nine presents the findings of the online survey, interviews and consultations with women’s rights groups, and reflects on changing funding levels for women’s rights and gender equality work, overall and per region. Chapter ten explores recommendations for what women’s rights organizations should be thinking about or doing differently to leverage more funding. To help increase the conceptual clarity of this report, we have included a glossary of terms in Annex 1.

The objectives set out for this research were as ambitious as the stakes are high. Many women’s rights activists are enormously frustrated by the challenges of finding funding for sustaining critical work for the future of women’s rights. Yet there are no simple answers, and no clear map of where the funding is (and is not) available. Instead, we find a complex panorama that is shaped by global and national political dynamics, shifting leadership, individual champions of women’s rights within funding institutions, and multiple competing demands for finite resources. Nonetheless, the research also points to windows of opportunity where new information is emerging or current practices are being rethought of which both representatives of women’s organizations and funding institutions could take advantage. As we describe in the chapter on strategies, to gain from these opportunities will require investment of time and resources. The research does, however, allow us to conclude that the future of women’s movements, organizations and the multitude

A word on our commitment

This research into funding trends and realities has involved reaching out to a wide array of funders and women’s rights groups. We recognize that this can be a somewhat delicate process. We want to emphasize that this research is being carried out in order to increase the access and amounts of funding for all women’s rights organizations. Other than the funding that was directly allocated for this research, no organization has benefited financially from participating in this project. Our ethical commitment is to ‘expanding the pot’, not taking a larger serving for ourselves.

of actions, research and programs that will need resources is potentially bright with the right investments and strategic focus at this current juncture.

A note on methodology

A challenge with this research is how to define exactly what women's rights are and how they are funded. On the one hand, funders all name what we are looking at differently; from 'gender work' to 'women's programs' to 'women's rights' back to 'gender-related programming'. Some even see basic social programming as women's rights work, whereas others would only classify women's rights funding as that which went beyond practical needs to key strategic gender interests. On the other hand, because of the nature of women's rights work—that it crosses all spheres of life—it is not easily tracked let alone defined. As such, when looking at the funding organizations, we can capture trends, but it is difficult to get at specific numbers. The challenge is heightened when resource flows are not adequately tracked or when over time there are shifts in portfolio names, and methods for tracking data change. Despite this key methodological challenge, we set out to find the key trends and indicators and, wherever possible, capture the numbers that could help determine strategies to take us beyond the research in order to leverage more effective funding for women's rights organizations.

Chapter 2

The Funding Landscape – an overview

Where's the money? Some illustrative data

(based on sources listed throughout report)

- In 2003 governments spent USD 68.5 billion on development aid. In that same year USD 900 billion was spent on weapons and war.
- Of the net disbursement of Official Development Assistance in 2003 in the amount of USD 69 billion, roughly 2.5 billion (3.6%) had gender equality as a significant or principal objective. Aid with gender equality as a principal objective was only 0.6%, or approximately USD 400 million.
- In 2003, 0.04% of total European Commission aid supported women-specific projects and programs. In dollar amounts this was USD 2.5 million out of USD 6.8 billion.
- In 2003, of all US foundation giving (USD 38.5 billion, considering only grants over USD 10,000), only 8%, or roughly 3 billion, was spent outside of the United States.
- Some 7.3% of the total of US foundation giving in 2003 went to 'women and girls' programs and initiatives.
- In 2004, women's funds working internationally or in the Global South and Central and Eastern Europe disbursed a total of USD 15 million in grants – a substantial increase over the past five years.
- In 2002, UNIFEM's budget was USD 36 million, compared to UNFPA's USD 373 million and UNICEF's USD 1.5 billion.
- The Sigrid Rausing Trust, a family foundation which is one of the largest funders for women's rights, allocated 22% of its budget, or USD 4.2 million, to women's organizations in 2004. Another 42%, or USD 7.8 million, went to human rights organizations and 29% (USD 5.4 million) to environmental groups.
- Hivos, a trusted and long-term partner of women's organizations, disbursed over USD 10 million to women's organizations in 2004, still only 13% of its total grantmaking budget (USD 80 million).
- The Levi Strauss Foundation allocates its total grantmaking budget (around USD 10 million) to women and youth.

In 2003 governments spent USD 68.5 billion on development aid. In that same year USD 900 billion was spent on weapons and war.

What the women's groups say (based on AWID's survey data):

- Approximately one half of the groups surveyed say that their organization is receiving less funding now than five years ago. This is evident in all regions but most commonly reported in Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Around 25% say they receive more funding now than five years ago. For approximately 25%, funding levels have remained the same.
- In 2004 women's funds are the most frequently mentioned funding source for women's organizations globally. INGOs and bilateral and multilateral agencies are second and third highest sources respectively. Meanwhile, in 2000 the three most frequently mentioned funding sources were INGOs, bilateral and multilateral sources and large independent foundations.
- More than one-half of organizations surveyed say that it is more difficult to raise funds now than it was ten years ago. Only 24% say it is easier.
- It is perceived to be more difficult to raise funds for reproductive rights, civil and political rights, sexual rights, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered (LGBT) rights and health issues other than for HIV/AIDS. Generally work related to HIV/AIDS and gender-based violence work was easier for which to find funding.
- In terms of the kinds of activities supported, respondents from all regions indicate that it is most difficult to find funding for staff salaries, administration and capacity building. It is significantly easier to raise funds for media, technology and communications work, leadership development, and linking and networking.

Some comparisons within the non-profit sector:

- Total revenue generated by Greenpeace globally was USD 203 million in 2003. The vast majority was raised from individuals, of whom around 60% are women.³
- Total revenue raised by Amnesty International was approximately USD 234 million in 2004, 90% of which was from individuals, of whom around 60% were women.⁴
- The YWCA, a huge women's organization with 25 million members in over 122 countries, provides services through a hundred affiliated national and thousands of local YWCAs. It generates between USD 100 and 150 million in revenue annually, primarily from individuals.⁵
- Women's rights organizations throughout the world have significantly smaller budgets. The annual expense budgets for 2004 for these organizations are as follows (in USD)⁶: Karat Coalition (regional coalition of women's NGOs in Central and Eastern Europe/Commonwealth of Independent States), 70,000; Astra - Central and Eastern European Women's Network for Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights, 150,000; Creating Resources for Empowerment in Action (CREA), 200,000; Red de Educación Popular Entre Mujeres (REPEM), 250,000; African Women's Economic Policy Network, 300,000; Women in Development Europe (WIDE), 400,000; Asia Pacific Forum on Women Law and Development (APWLD), 500,000; Women Living Under Muslim Laws, 800,000; Comité de América Latina y el Caribe para la Defensa de los Derechos de la Mujer (CLADEM), 1.1 million; Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID) 1.2 million; Centro de la Mujer Peruana Flora Tristan, 1.6 million.
- And for 2003 (in USD)⁷: Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO), 1.1 million; Equality Now 2.3 million; Centre for Reproductive Rights, 6.9 million; Women's Learning Partnership (WLP), 700,000; The Center for Development and Population Activities (CEDPA), 30.5 million; Catholics for Free Choice 3.2 million.

The numbers in the boxes above give us some indication of just how challenging the funding climate is with respect to support for women's rights work.

It goes without saying that behind these numbers are many important political forces impacting funding scenarios. Throughout this report we describe factors that have influenced the ways in which women's rights organizations are being resourced and how this affects both the quantity and the quality of the goals women's rights advocates are trying to achieve.

3 Taken from <http://www.greenpeace.org/raw/content/international/press/reports/greenpeace-annual-report-2004.pdf> and communications with Greenpeace International and Canada

4 Taken from <http://web.amnesty.org/report2004/aboutai-eng>, and communications with Amnesty International Canada and the UK.

5 See <http://www.worldywca-org.ac.psiweb.com/annrpt04.pdf>

6 Based on personal communications

7 Based on <http://www.guidestar.org/FinDocuments/2003/> or personal communications

Common threads

Several patterns within the funding world have major implications for women's rights organizations and the future of gender equality work:

Fashions: Undeniably, the UN conferences of the 1990s created a special historical moment that mobilized major resources for women's rights and gender equality work with new organizations proliferating in some regions. The Vienna Conference on Human Rights and the Cairo Conference on Population and Development, in addition to the milestone event of the Beijing conference, helped strengthen international and local women's rights organizing and were accompanied by a wave of donor interest and support.⁸ Today, many groups say they are struggling to maintain donor interest. Many feel that gender equality and even women's rights was "flavour of the month" for many donors. As one respondent said, "there's a disturbing certainty among governments that enough has been done for women." While some funders, such as The Ford Foundation and Hivos, are still cited as consistent supporters, overall support from these sources has been dropping. Women's rights, many say, is out of fashion with donors. What funding is allocated for women's rights tends to focus on relatively 'safe' issues such as women's health or women's public participation, but "bottom-line issues of choice and consent are increasingly hard to get funding for."

Mainstreaming: In the last few years, many development assistance agencies, public foundations/INGOs and large independent foundations have shifted much of their support away from women-specific programs in favour of gender mainstreaming. The Beijing Platform for Action prioritized gender mainstreaming as the mechanism to achieve gender equality. As described in more detail in Chapter 3, ten years of experience and a series of reports and evaluations indicate that: 1) gender mainstreaming has created great conceptual confusion which has diverted attention away from its initial goal of eliminating inequalities between men and women, and 2) mainstreaming only works if policies are backed by strong leadership commitment at the highest levels, accountability mechanisms, allocation of sufficient resources and appropriate expertise about how to do it—conditions that do not exist in most cases.⁹ Despite these problems, many funders still bet on the mainstreaming approach and prioritize this over the support of feminist agendas and women-specific organizations. In fact, many funders have taken to insisting that any work on gender must also involve men. Funding agencies admit that they lack data about the extent to which mainstreaming actually

"There's a disturbing certainty among governments that enough has been done for women."

⁸ See Abeysekera (2005) for a full account of the conference's impact on the women's human rights agenda.

⁹ See among others Gender and Development, Mainstreaming a critical review, Oxfam Gender and Development Journal, Volume 13, Number 2, July 2005, and: Gender Mainstreaming, can it Work for Women's Rights, Spotlight Number 3, November 2004, Association for Women's Rights and Development.

contributes to the promotion of women's rights and gender equality, but it is still the most prevalent strategy for promoting gender equality in the funding world. Women's organizations are feeling the effects of this. Rather than seeing funding for women's rights as a necessary and ongoing investment as well as requirement for successful mainstreaming, it is seen as a phase where over time women's organizations become redundant.

Global framework games: In the last decade, the policy agendas of global institutions (eg Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), the World Commission on Dams, UN conferences, etc) have increasingly demanded the attention and resources of international and regional NGOs of all types with mixed results. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)¹⁰ are the most recent of these agendas. However, while gender equality is a major structural cause of poverty, it hardly factors in the MDG machinery. Goal Three, which is generally known as the gender equality goal, is about closing the gender gap in primary and secondary education. While this is an extremely important goal, it is irrelevant for the many countries, including developing ones, which have already achieved it. As a normative framework, the MDGs are a significant step backwards from already existing frameworks, such as the Beijing Platform for Action and Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). Some interviewees asked why, if the real challenge is the implementation of already existing normative frameworks, everyone should invest in the development of yet another, watered down framework. Yet women's organization feel that many of their donors are pushing them in that direction. In fact some governments and global bodies expect that the MDGs will continue to dictate the directions of donor money throughout the coming years.

Poor tracking and accountability systems: Even committed supporters of women's rights say that it is difficult to track exactly how much funding they give for women's rights and gender equality. While this is a complex matter for the funding community as a whole, it is probably even more so for an area that is not always understood (given the usual conceptual confusion about 'sex', 'gender' and 'mainstreaming') and in some cases resisted. The tracking of women-specific programs and organizations is usually relatively simple, especially at the level of inputs and questions

¹⁰ The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) reflect general targets agreed to by 147 heads of State and Government and 189 nations in total, as part of the United National Millennium Declaration in September 2000. The goals are: to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; achieve universal primary education; promote gender equality and empower women; reduce child mortality; improve maternal health; combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases; ensure environmental sustainability; develop a global partnership for development. Each goal was narrowed into more specific targets. The target for the gender equality goal is "eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005 and at all levels by 2015."

related to number of organizations supported and funds allocated. There has also been quite a few evaluations on the impact of this funding.¹¹ But the mere counting of women beneficiaries or programs and organizations with some reference to women tells us nothing about its impact and potentially inflates the contribution of the support to promotion of women's rights.

Corporatization of the funding community: The past decade has witnessed a marked transformation of funding agencies to become more efficient, specialized and outcome oriented. Corporate management models have seeped into development cooperation, charity, social justice and philanthropic organizations with both good and bad results.

At one level funders recognize that they have contributed to the development of systems with excessive procedures, databases, targets and multi-layered decision making processes, to the extent that the grantmaking process seems to be reduced to meeting spending targets, ticking boxes and filling out elaborate and standardized application forms. One foundation representative noted that foundations now hire 'expert' specialists to run their programs and that 'there are few generalists left', that is, the people who can see the big picture and make connections among the various issue boxes. It was also mentioned that funding partnerships that had developed over years were increasingly under pressure and that interactions between donors tend to be dominated by directives about administrative matters and donor agendas, rather than open dialogue about strategy, ambitions or reflection on each others' work.

Part of the shifts has also included moves away from core funding to project funding. This, together with a predominance of short-term funding, has left many NGOs, including women's organizations, struggling to keep their key infrastructure going and maintain their capacity while meeting rising demands for agility, innovation, accountability, and measurable impact. Nevertheless, there is some hope this will change in the future. A book on 21st Century philanthropic trends, called "Looking Out for the Future"¹² cites the growth of core support as an 'innovation' to watch. The authors explain the move as a response to "the bias toward project support [...] that itself emerged from an earlier call for focus and accountability in philanthropy." This study suggests that as it becomes clearer that going overboard on demands for accountability and results defeats the very purpose of the voluntary sector, the pendulum might swing in the other direction.

11 One of the more recent ones is: "The role of Women's Organizations in Civil Society Building (2003-2006), A joint evaluation of the programmes of Cordaid, Hivos and Icco in Kenya, South Africa and Zimbabwe, in the period 1998 – 2003, by Lida Zuidberg in collaboration with Patricia McFadden and Marianne Nugteren, November 2004.

12 Katherine Fulton, Andrew Blau, "Looking Out for the Future, An Orientation for Twenty-First Century Philanthropists", The Monitor Group, 2005.

Not so equal partners: Finally, the power dynamics inherent in funding relationships generate considerable frustration. On the one hand, there is strong criticism of donors who seem to use civil society, including women's rights organizations, as 'sub-contractors' to implement an agenda and program that they have more or less already designed. Then there is also frustration with the growing push by many donors that 'gender' programs must involve men. In too many cases, donors do not recognize that the choice to engage men or not in a women's rights program must be a strategic decision, not a one-size-fits-all mandate. In addition, apparent donor preferences for supporting local, grassroots work and organizations was noted by some respondents as have generated unnecessary divisions among women's rights movements between so-called 'base' and 'elite' NGOs, while action at local, national, regional and international levels is critical for advancing women's rights. There was a strong call by several interviewees for more opportunities to discuss openly the nature of the relationship among funders and grantees to recognize the power dynamics at play. As one representative of a women's rights organization explained:

"I really want to cut through the [nonsense] with funders and stop pretending we have some kind of partnership when we don't. Maybe a few we want a deeper partnership with, but it's a donor-donee relationship and there's a clear power imbalance."

Political forces and deeper dilemmas of our time

It is impossible to understand fully the donor trends influencing women's rights without situating them within the particular historical landscape. An overarching set of political forces, agendas and ideologies have significantly influenced the choices and operations of many donors and NGOs, and have shifted and constrained the space and resources for women's rights and gender equality efforts. The most significant among these interrelated 'isms' are: neoliberalism, religious fundamentalisms, militarism and as always, the ever-intractable sexism or patriarchy.

Neoliberalism: Perhaps the most dominant is the neoliberal agenda as it takes shape in the context of globalization. This economic paradigm has captured the thinking, values, priorities, agendas, policies and operations of not only the economic sphere, but the political and social arenas as well from Washington DC to Kampala and beyond. For over two decades, dominant global institutions, governments and other actors have promoted and imposed a fixed set of policy reforms that include fiscal austerity, a reduction in labour and environmental standards, trade liberalization, and the privatization of essential services. These policy reforms are shaped by and advance ideas of individualism and the free market as the centerpiece of economic growth.

While the subject of much debate, there is no doubt that neoliberal policies have contributed to deepening inequalities and the ascendancy of multinational corporations. The latter exert enormous US influence over the decision-making and operations of governments and global bodies. Corporate culture has permeated both donors and NGOs as evidenced by increased emphasis on efficiency, results-based management, professionalization, specialization and references to ‘market-share’ and clients or customers (to refer to beneficiaries or constituencies). While some of these changes may have led to improvements, they have also created many challenges for groups working on justice and rights. Among these are the tensions between the massive international NGOs (including many public foundations) and the smaller-scale national and grassroots efforts, as well as social movements, and the favouring of technical rather than political approaches to change – which has become part of the appeal of mainstreaming.

Neoliberal economic policies have gradually reduced the capacity and role of governments, particularly their capacity to distribute resources fairly, deliver basic services and protect rights. Rapid liberalization of financial sectors has left governments highly vulnerable to financial volatility—their budgets can be transformed overnight with shifts in currencies or commodity values. Similar experiences in relation to structural adjustment programs have shown that when economies are in trouble, money for women gets slashed. In response to growing inequality within and between countries, many multilateral and bilateral donors are focusing their funding on poverty eradication and low-income countries while private foundations and women’s funds devote more funding to basic economic survival and initiatives to help the marginalized or those who have fallen through existing safety nets. Many interviewees noted a shift towards direct service delivery as opposed to focusing on structural causes of poverty. Poverty in many spheres is back to being understood as lack of services.

At the same time, as the once promising wave of democratization of the 1990s has slowed or stalled in some regions, funders have less interest in strengthening civil society. Instead, development assistance is more directed at shoring up the fragile governments that have emerged and less toward civil society actors that seek to hold them accountable. In high income countries there is the added assumption that it is the private actors that will finance development, or that national and local governments should take on this responsibility. While private philanthropy is indeed growing in many emerging economies, this is generally focused on charity, and is rarely distributed to groups advocating for labour standards, environmental protection laws, trade justice, job security, access to safe drinking water or human rights pertaining to reproduction or sexuality.

Poverty in many spheres is back to being understood as lack of services.

The notion of 'failed states' only serves to further rationalize the need to invest in government replacement by focusing on services and setting aside the long-term task of structural inequalities and rights for another day. Decentralization has also affected the role of national governments in a way that creates both opportunities and challenges for women's rights advocates whose rights are only enshrined in national legislation. In terms of global governance and the changing trade landscape, it is important to keep in mind the rising influence of countries such as Brazil, Russia, India and China (also known as the BRIC countries). The emerging economies of these countries are growing fast and they have 2.6 billion of the world's 6.4 billion people and a big chunk of its mineral wealth. Some economic experts say it is likely that in less than forty years, the BRIC economies together could be larger than the G6 (US, Japan, UK, Germany, France and Italy) in US dollar terms. By 2025 they could account for over half the size of the G6.¹³ So, these are trends that ought to be followed closely, gauging their positive and negative implications, as they raise both challenges and opportunities for further advancing women's rights.

Religious fundamentalisms: In this climate, religious fundamentalisms of all varieties have flourished. Fuelled by a combination of deepening poverty, growing instability and dramatic changes happening as a result of globalization and neoliberalism (among other factors), radical conservative religious forces have rallied millions of followers with vast quantities of resources and thus increased their influence on politics and policy. A primary agenda item for conservative religions of all stripes is the rollback of women's rights and return to notions of traditional families and gender roles. Today it is undeniably more controversial and unpopular, if not dangerous, to defend and advance the rights of women, particularly reproductive and sexual rights.

Donors of all kinds are not immune to these current cultural pressures and the retreat by key private foundations from women's rights work is partly attributed to these social shifts. The influence of conservative religious trends has had very concrete impacts on funding particularly from the US government. An important example is the Bush administration's reinstatement of the Global Gag Rule in 2000, which prohibits US government funding, either directly or via UN agencies, for any group that provides abortion counselling or referrals, lobbies to legalize or expand abortion service or performs abortion in cases other than rape, incest or where the woman's life is in danger. Thus many groups working on sexual and reproductive rights have experienced drastic funding cutbacks. We discuss this and other related funding conditionalities and reductions in more detail in Chapter 3.

¹³ Wilson, Dominic, *Dreaming with BRICs: the path to 2050*, Global Economics paper No: 99, Goldman Sachs, October 2003, taken from website: <http://www.goldmansachs.com/insight/research/reports/99.pdf>

Militarization: Certain fundamentalisms (ascribed currently to parts of the Middle East and Central Asia) are used to defend an increasing focus on national security and militarization in many countries. In the wake of attacks on September 11th, the Bush administration's 'war on terror' has led to a shift in priorities and resources to military defence and national security throughout the world. This important trend has diverted development dollars and global attention away from promoting rights and legitimized efforts by many leaders to silence their critics. Indeed, the war in Iraq, a centerpiece of the 'war on terror', has been used by the US to rationalise a retreat from the Geneva Conventions and basic civil liberties at home. Indeed the entire human rights system is heavily under attack in the post 9-11 world. New US government regulations that are part of the 'war' impose new guidelines for international giving. Foundations now check grantees against a 'terrorist watch list' and some are growing increasingly cautious about international giving, supporting only known partners and not reaching out to new groups. While security is the dominant agenda, women as agents of change and their role in security and peace-building is receiving little attention. Nevertheless, many women's rights organizations are working to redefine human security, and bring their expertise to bear on critical dialogues around peace and conflict.

Patriarchy: Finally, at the core of our challenge in increasing support for women's rights is old-fashioned patriarchy. While important inroads have been made in combating the values, behaviour and institutional mechanisms that perpetuate inequality between men and women, the dominant trends of this particular historical moment have halted, if not reversed, some of the gains in many countries. Patriarchy is embedded in all our societies and is the reason why perpetual and systemic cruelty, violence and genocide of women all over the world are not met with global outrage. Patriarchy is key to shaping the financial choices individuals and funders make. The lack of understanding about the centrality of women's rights to addressing poverty and promoting democratic processes is reflected on many levels among both individual donors (illustrated by the fact that children's rights and the environment receive far more financial support by individual women in the West) and institutional donors and the NGOs they support. The challenge of ending gender inequality means we need to take on societal bias and power relations by unravelling the privileges of patriarchy in order to invest fully in the well-being and status of the majority of the globe's citizens.

Foundations now check grantees against a 'terrorist watch list' and some are growing increasingly cautious about international giving.

Chapter 3

Trends in Bilateral and Multilateral Development Assistance

Next, we look at the particularities of various types of funders. For each, we explore the characteristics and dynamics of the sector, the growing challenges to leverage greater funding for women's rights, and finally the potential opportunities for increasing funding for women's rights work.

Since the UN International Year for Women in 1975 and the subsequent UN Decade, women have been 'part of the development process.' As such, multitudes of development agencies have had a major influence on promoting gender equality in so-called developing countries as well as resourcing women's rights work around the world.

The online survey carried out as part of this research clearly illustrates the importance of bilateral and multilateral donors. In fact, these institutions factor as one of the three most frequently mentioned sources of revenue for women's organizations of all sizes in all regions in the past ten years. They were the number one source of funding in 1995, number two in 2000 and number three in 2004. The research clearly indicates that related to this gradual decrease in the prominence of development assistance funding for gender equality work, are shifts in its focus and channels of disbursement, with important implications for women's rights groups.

Characteristics and dynamics

In the international development sector the two groups of official agencies are known as either bilateral or multilateral agencies. Bilateral development agencies are those that provide grants and loans from one national government to other governments or NGOs and carry out development projects. They include organizations like the Canadian International Development Agency and the Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation. Multilateral development agencies also provide resources and implement development projects with governments and NGOs and include the vast number of UN agencies (like UNDP, UNFPA, UNIFEM, ILO), development banks (such as the World Bank, African Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank) and other inter-governmental bodies like the Commonwealth Secretariat, the European Commission or La Francophonie.

The research clearly indicates that related to this gradual decrease in the prominence of development assistance funding for gender equality work, are shifts in its focus and channels of disbursement, with important implications for women's rights groups.

How much aid relates to gender equality

What is common to these agencies is that they are official government organizations. The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), an inter-governmental coordinating body for these agencies of thirty countries of the North and the EC, estimates that the net disbursement of official development aid of this sector in 2003 was USD 69 billion¹⁴. Of this amount, around 70% was bilateral (or country-to-country) aid and 30% was channelled through the core budgets of multilateral agencies. A mere 2.4 % (or roughly 1.6 billion) was given to NGOs,¹⁵ with less than USD 400 million going directly to NGOs in the developing world¹⁶. It is unclear how much of this money flows to women's organizations.

While limited and imperfect, there are some data to illustrate the extent to which these funds are applied to gender equality. According to the OECD, in 2003 a meagre 0.1% to 0.2% of total bilateral ODA commitment to governments was allocated to the sector Women in Development, mostly for activities such as conferences, seminars and training¹⁷.

OECD research shows that other aid in support of gender equality is concentrated in the social sectors, especially basic education and basic health. In 2003, this sector represented approximately 12% of total ODA. For the last decade, many development agencies have used a methodology for tracking how much of this sector's aid flow is related to gender equality by applying what is known as the 'gender marker'. Of the social sectors, around half is marked with gender equality indicators, which amounts to 6% of total ODA. An analysis of this data over the period 1999 through 2003 shows that 50% of this (ie 3% of total ODA) targets gender concerns in some way (gender equality as a significant objective) and another 10% or 0.6% of total ODA has gender equality as

14 The OECD is a forum "where the governments of 30 democracies work together to address the economic, social and environmental challenges of globalization". Members include Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, the Slovak Republic, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States and the European Commission. DAC (Development Assistance Countries) member countries of the OECD each allocate a portion of their Gross National Income (GNI) to Official Development Aid (ODA). This varies from 0.92% of GNI (Norway) to 0.14% of GNI (USA), with 0.25% of combined GNI in 2003.

15 This amount relates to core contributions to NGOs. Different ODA sectors, for example Women in Development, may include project funding to NGOs, though in small numbers. Because of this inconsistency in reporting it hard to track the exact resource flow to NGO.

16 OECD Statistics were kindly put together by Julia Benn (OECD) for this research.

17 "OECD Analysis of Aid in Support of Gender Equality, 1999-2003", OECD, 2005 (this report reflects the DAC countries reporting on the gender markers introduced by the OECD Gender Network in 1997-1998) and "Accountability Upside Down: Gender equality in a partnership for poverty eradication", 2005, by Mirjam van Reisen (published by Eurostep and Social Watch).




Figure 1. Net Disbursement of Official Development Aid: *a snapshot*

a principal objective. In approximate dollar terms this means that while billions of dollars are flowing to transport, energy and communications and other major development ‘investments’, gender-related funding in basic education, health, including reproductive health, water and sanitation receives roughly 2.4 billion, of which 400 million has gender equality as the principal objective.¹⁸

While billions of dollars are flowing to transport, energy and communications and other major development ‘investments’, gender-related funding in basic education, health, including reproductive health, water and sanitation receives roughly 2.4 billion, of which 400 million has gender equality as the principal objective.

The data used show that aid with ‘principal and significant’ gender equality relevance has seen a U-shape trend between 1999 and 2003, with a large dip in resources for gender equality in 2001 and a small but steady increase up to 2003. This trend is most likely attributed to commitments made at the World Education Forum (Dakar 2000) and to the Millennium Development Goals, which put girls’ education and the reduction of maternal mortality as important developmental objectives.

¹⁸ OECD Analysis of Aid in Support of Gender Equality. The figures need to take into account that not all donors screen for gender equality, including the US, the largest bilateral donor. Also, while the percentages reflect averages over the period 1999 – 2003 they give a fairly accurate indication of what they might look like in 2003.

Challenges

Falling apart?

Beyond the resources, it is clear that many development agencies, particularly the ones that were champions of gender equality in recent decades like those in Sweden, Canada, Norway, Denmark, or the Netherlands, have diminished their support to women's rights. These shifts can be measured in terms of shrinking gender-related staff, policy shifts away from gender equality as a high priority cross-cutting concern, women's specific project funding being replaced with 'mainstreaming' activities, and diminishing mechanisms of accountability to ensure that gender equality is part of development. As one bilateral agency representative so passionately put it:

"Why does it now seem to fall apart? Was it the flavour of the month? There was a lot of excitement before and after Beijing but the world moved on. Right now it is about things like security, governance, conflict...and macro issues are much harder to link to gender equality. We lost our edge, are no longer sexy, and don't know how to connect with these big public debates."

Rhetoric versus resources

In fact many in the gender and development and women's human rights community are wondering, given the inspirations and promises of Beijing and other relevant global meetings and evolution of gender norms and strategies, why so few resources exist to keep this vital work going. If, as Kofi Annan, Secretary General of the United Nations, says, 'women's equality is a prerequisite for development'¹⁹ wouldn't there be more ratcheting up of resources to fund the promotion of women's rights, including the fundamental work of women's organizations on the ground? Furthermore, after decades of research and advocacy related to the centrality of gender analysis for development practice, and with even the World Bank's own research clearly indicating that gender inequality tends to slow economic growth and make the rise from poverty more difficult, why is the gender equality agenda still so weak, marginalized and underfunded?

What we know is that gender equality goals tend to be represented in overall legal and policy frameworks but 'evaporate' at the level of budgetary allocations, implementation, evaluation and measuring of impact. According to an important study published by Eurostep and Social Watch, we are seeing increasing levels of 'policy evaporation', where strong commitments by development agencies to gender equality, alongside the availability of many tools and guidelines on how to get it right, do not translate into allocation of resources, programming

¹⁹ Annan's speech to the CSW Beijing +10 meetings in New York, March 2005.

or evaluation.²⁰ This report highlights a recent study of the European Commission (EC) and concludes that the policy framework is largely satisfactory, featuring clear commitments to gender equality and support for a two-track approach of women-specific projects alongside gender mainstreaming. For example, the European Commission has emerged as a strong, progressive voice on sexual and reproductive rights and health policy in recent years. Commission policies follow the principles of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD). The Commission's response to changes in US policy under the Bush Administration, including the reimposition of the Global Gag Rule and denial of funds to UNFPA, provides another example of the EC's progressive policy stance.

Implementation of these policies is weak, however. For example, the support to women-specific projects and programs is extremely low (ie 0.04% of total EC aid in 2003, or USD 2.5 million out of a total budget of approximately USD 6.8 billion), overall plans lack a clear gender perspective and evaluations carried out by the EC hardly ever consider the impact of projects and programs on gender equality. A very recent example is the 2007 – 2013 financial framework that the European Commission is currently developing, which sets out objectives and budgetary resources for the European Union for the next planning period. Proposals presented so far do not mention women's rights and gender equality objectives, nor do they suggest any special programs for the promotion of women's rights and gender equality.²¹

The pitfalls of mainstreaming

In 1995, alongside the global convergence around the Beijing Platform for Action, the OECD Network on Gender Equality²² developed a two-track strategy of supporting women's empowerment and women's initiatives on the one hand and gender mainstreaming on the other. Interviews with dozens of donors and women's groups clearly indicate, however, that despite two intended strategies, gender mainstreaming has been the prominent one since 1995. Most importantly, actors both inside and outside development agencies have seen gender mainstreaming as largely unsuccessful. According to one donor agency representative, "mainstreaming is our worst enemy. We wanted to make it easy – a technical thing – but instead we have done ourselves a disservice."

Actors both inside and outside development agencies have seen gender mainstreaming as largely unsuccessful.

20 "Accountability Upside Down, gender equality in a partnership for poverty eradication", by Mirjam van Reisen (published by Eurostep and Social Watch) 2005.

21 See among others www.karat.org for monitoring of the EC policies and practice on women's rights and gender equality.

22 A special DAC working group, called the Network on Gender Equality, meets regularly and has a mandate to contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of development cooperation, provide strategic support to the policies and policy development of the DAC and provide members with a forum for sharing experiences and disseminating good practices and innovative approaches.

Similarly, the OECD study points out that gender mainstreaming appears to be frequently misunderstood and evaluations demonstrate that it hardly ever generates positive results.²³ Over the years many development actors have tried to make the distinction between mainstreaming as integrationist (adding a gender perspective to existing plans and programs) and mainstreaming as agenda setting, focusing on women's agendas. While both strategies are important and interlinked, evidence shows that working with women towards women's rights and gender equality often has more impact than the slow and generally confusing process of integrating a gender perspective in all other areas of work. Studies of CIDA and NORAD (in 2002), and studies of the European Union (in 2005) and nine bilateral donors (in 2005)²⁴ all confirm that after strong statements at the level of policy, mainstreaming intentions are hardly reflected at the level of programming, resource allocation, accountability mechanisms and monitoring and evaluation.

According to several interviews, gender mainstreaming strategies in many cases have resulted in gender programs being cut, both in terms of staff and budgets. Women's rights advocates in the various bureaucracies have convinced their agencies about gender mainstreaming but find it hard to produce good, practical examples and find that impact generally is very low. If anything, it has taken the attention away from the promotion of women's rights and gender equality. As one donor representative expressed:

"People [in our agencies] do not 'get' gender mainstreaming. They can't grasp it and are cynical. This is partly because there is no context for the things they hear. The answer is to do highly specialized trainings, linking gender equality to concrete topics. The other problem is that you can never take credit for gender mainstreaming. This dynamic is inherent to the process...so it makes you invisible."

Yet the resources for gender mainstreaming initiatives have become more visible. Several years ago, a red flag was raised within the gender equality community when the Dutch government pulled its long-time funding for UNIFEM in favour of gender mainstreaming within the UNDP (see box). At the Inter-American Development Bank, Norway had long been replenishing a flexible women and development fund but shifted this year to insisting that the money go to 'mainstreaming' to pay for gender

A look at UNIFEM's financial resources within the UN system starkly illustrates development agency priorities. Like other agencies, UNIFEM is 'operational' in that it has its own projects and also provides support. UNIFEM often works in partnership with governments, other UN programs and with women's organizations. Member countries pledge a certain amount to UNIFEM as they do to other UN agencies. While the budget shows a gradual increase over time, UNIFEM remains one of the smallest UN programs in budget terms. Its annual budget in 2002 was USD 36 million compared to UNFPA's USD 373 million (with USD 13.4 million for gender equality and women's empowerment as a principal objective) and UNICEF's whopping USD 1.5 billion budget.

Statistics from Organizational Assessment: UNIFEM past, present and future, prepared for the Economic and Social Council Substantive Session of 2005, New York, 5-29 July 2005, <http://www.undp.org/execbrd/pdf/a60-62e.pdf>

²³ For data on eight development assistance countries, namely Canada, France, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United States as well as the European Community, see Accountability Upside Down, gender equality in a partnership for poverty eradication, 2005, by Mirjam van Reisen (published by Eurostep and Social Watch), and "To the farthest frontiers: Women's empowerment in an expanding Europe", 2005, by Mirjam van Reisen, with Eurostep, Social Watch, Novib-Oxfam Netherlands, Wide and Karat, 2005. For data on CIDA and NORAD see an article by Gerd Johnsson-Latham, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Sweden, in: Gender Mainstreaming, can it Work for Women's Rights?, published by AWID, page 5-6.

²⁴ Ibid.

consultants on other projects. The Dutch and the Norwegian governments had joined hands to support a trust fund for gender mainstreaming within the World Bank. Since 2001, 'the GENFUND' as it is called has allocated just over USD 3 million to 68 World Bank activities.²⁵ The GENFUND selects activities to be financed on a competitive basis. Winning proposals receive a maximum of USD 50,000 to mainstream gender equality into World Bank activities. While the intention is to leverage small money for women towards larger cross-cutting results (ie "I may have a women's project of a few million, but if I mainstream it into a water project, we can be talking about a billion dollars.") a development agency representative argued that this is just as likely to fail as it is to be effective.²⁶

Throughout the 90s, gender and development literature thoughtfully examined what made development institutions more likely to achieve goals related to gender equality.²⁷ This body of work illustrated that many ingredients were required within institutions, including: strong leadership at the top; sufficient numbers of skilled (and usually feminist) staff to undertake ongoing gender and social analysis and spot opportunities when they arose; and, importantly, a transformation of the unwritten norms and values that inhibited institutions from truly tackling unequal power relations inside and outside their organizations. If anything, the gender mainstreaming agenda has obscured all of these key lessons of institutional transformation, depoliticizing the work, minimizing the role of gender equality experts inside the institutions and lending much less importance to the role of women's organizations in making change happen.

There is thus currently a very large ongoing critical debate with regards to the impact of gender mainstreaming. As Rao and Kelleher write in their most recent article "Is there life after gender mainstreaming?" it is essential for us to also consider:

"...the myriad insidious ways in which the mainstream resists women's perspectives and women's rights. Economic orthodoxy promoting unmanaged, export-led growth through competitive market capitalism, free trade and fiscal austerity – including the drastic reduction of government social spending has hurt poor women most."²⁸

25 Integrating the World Bank's Work The Role of the Norwegian–Dutch Trust Fund for Gender Mainstreaming GENFUND, World Bank Gender and Development Group, pp. 1-2

26 Interview with development agency representative.

27 See for example, Macdonald, Mandy, Ellen Sprenger and Ireen Dubel, Gender and Organizational Change: Bridging the Gap between Policy and Practice, (Royal Tropical Institute, 1997); Rao, Aruna, David Kelleher and Rieky Stuart, Gender at Work (Kumarian, 1999), Institutionalizing Gender Equality (Royal Tropical Institute and Oxfam GB, 2000) Goetz, Anne-Marie, Getting Institutions Rights for Women in Development (Zed Press, 1997) Kabeer, Naila, Reversed Realities: Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought, (London: Verso, 1994). Rao, Aruna and Kelleher, David. Unravelling Institutionalized Gender Inequality, Occasional paper 8, Association for Women's Rights in Development, October 2002.

These mainstream agendas, to which the major development money flows, such as the trade and economic reform, security and even the HIV/AIDS and violence agenda create major challenges for leveraging greater funds for women's rights work. As Rao and Kelleher write further:

"While there continues to be a focus on women's human rights, we see a shift back to a situation in which there is greater consideration for women's rights issues in the public sphere, for example, moving from violence against women to women's political participation and representation. This shift also led to much more funding being made available to governments to set up institutional mechanisms for addressing issues of women's inequality and of legal discrimination against women... Focus on women's economic rights has been also largely been reduced to programmes that focus on livelihood and employment issues, with the more thorny and contentious rights such as the right to land and to inheritance being given secondary importance in many funding policies".²⁹

Thus, almost one million of the World Bank's GENFUND has gone into mainstreaming gender into economic policy and World Bank lending instruments – potentially more than UNIFEM gave out in 2004 through its trust fund to end violence against women (only USD 900,000). Similarly, while the World Bank claims that since 1995, it has provided about USD 6.3 billion to support girls' education projects,³⁰ it has pumped billions more into structural adjustment lending and other reforms that undercut women's advancement.

In the past few years, the most striking influence by a bilateral donor on the women's rights agenda has been by the government of the United States. Through its conditionalities related to the Global Gag Rule³¹ and its withholding of UNFPA funds on one hand, to investing heavily in anti-trafficking and anti-prostitution on the other, the US government has had major influences on both women's organizations and women's rights on the ground. According to the Center for Reproductive Rights, by 2003, NGOs in 56³² countries that receive family planning assistance funds from the US were affected.³³ These NGOs are prohibited from providing abortion-related services, including counseling and referrals, and/or lobbying

28 Rao, Aruna and Kelleher, David. (2005), Gender and Development, "Is there life after gender mainstreaming?", Volume 13, Number 2, July 2005, pg 58

29 Abeysekera, 2005

30 Excerpt from the WB News Release No. 2005/PREM/: ASSESSING PROGRESS ON GENDER EQUALITY Progress made since Beijing, but more action needed to meet the MDGs

31 The Global Gag Rule is a US presidential directive which prohibits US family planning assistance for foreign nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that use funding from any source to perform abortions, to provide counseling and referral for abortion, or to lobby to make abortion legal or more available in their own country. Assistance is defined to include not just funds but the provision of technical assistance, customized training and commodities, including contraceptive supplies.

on abortion issues. Depending on the abortion laws in their countries, NGOs are feeling the Global Gag Rule's effects in different ways. They are now subject to violations of their rights to free speech, association, and their ability to participate in the strengthening of their civil societies and democratic institutions. Moreover, this US policy prevents providers from complying with basic medical ethics: in countries where abortion is legal, they cannot provide the full range of legal reproductive health care nor can they refer or counsel parties as required by medical ethics. As a direct result, the Global Gag Rule imperils women's health and lives both in countries where abortion is legal, as well as where it is illegal.

Similarly, the Global Gag Rule Impact Project³⁴ carried out a study that found that in countries such as Ethiopia, Kenya, Zambia, and Romania, health services have been scaled back and closings of reproductive health clinics have left some communities with no health care provider. Because of the gag rule, many family planning organizations have been cut off from supplies of USAID contraceptives, including condoms. The researchers also reported that HIV/AIDS prevention efforts are being impeded. In Kenya, Marie Stopes International was forced to close a reproductive health clinic in the province with the highest rate of HIV/AIDS in the country. In Ethiopia and Zambia, HIV/AIDS organizations have lost funding, forcing them to reduce services.³⁵

Meanwhile, even the big organizations have felt the effects of the Bush administration's stance. UNFPA officials said that every \$34 million withheld each year by the US since 2003 (their annual contribution to the agency represents about 12% of their annual budget) would prevent two million unwanted pregnancies, nearly 800,000 induced abortions, 4,700 maternal deaths, nearly 60,000 cases of maternal illness or disability, and 77,000 infant and child deaths.³⁶ Moreover, many women's organizations throughout the 90s, especially those working

32 Information from USAID Missions with PRH Programs Supported by Population/Reproductive Health Funding, 2003 (On file with the Center for Reproductive Rights). Countries affected are: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Georgia, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Nepal, Romania, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Jamaica, Liberia, Mali, Mozambique, Pakistan, Peru, Rwanda, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cote d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Paraguay, Philippines, Senegal, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda.

33 Center for Reproductive Rights, Fact Sheet: The Global Gag Rule's Effects on NGOs in 56 Countries, June 2003, Item: F034, Center for Reproductive Rights.

34 A collaborative research effort led by Population Action International (PAI) in partnership with Ipas, Planned Parenthood Federation of America and the International Planned Parenthood Federation and with assistance in gathering evidence of impact in the field from EngenderHealth and Pathfinder International.

35 Bush Administration's Global Gag Rule Jeopardizing Health Care, Weakening HIV/AIDS Prevention and Endangering Lives Study is the First Conducted on the Effects of the Policy in Africa and Eastern Europe, Global Gag Rule Impact Project, Press Release, September 24, 2003.

on issues related to reproductive rights, were highly dependent on UNFPA support. With its diminished budget the impact has been directly felt by these women's groups.

While the Bush administration has defunded some activities, they have heavily supported other issues, in particular anti-trafficking initiatives; in 2004 the US spent at least \$33.4 million on trafficking,³⁷ and to promote anti-immigration policies and strengthen the security related control with other governments. Some have said that the focus on trafficking is driven by the ulterior motive of tackling prostitution. In 2005, the administration took this battle head-on through their funding related to HIV/AIDS. The government developed an 'anti-prostitution pledge' in order to withhold their vast amounts of anti-HIV/AIDS funding unless organizations adopt policies that explicitly oppose all forms of prostitution. Immediately, the effects were felt by many women's and human rights organizations throughout the Global South as well as in the US who have been working directly for (even if as a very small part of their overall programs) the protection of sex worker rights and the prevention of violence against women in this community.³⁸

While the US with its unilateralist agenda has had a major influence on defining what issues get funded, through this research it has become clearer that many of the gender specialists in other bilateral agencies are putting the majority of their time and resources into improving what ostensibly are multilateral mechanisms to address mainstream agendas. These include how best to use Security Council Resolution 1325 (related to integrating women into the peace process), pro-poor growth mechanisms like the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (which have been heavily critiqued by civil society and the women's movement,³⁹ and of course, the flavour of this year, the Millennium Development Goals.

These shifting agendas of the funding agencies are related to the changing 'aid modalities' described below, but they also represent a shift away from development trends when participation, environment, food security, human rights and especially gender equality were much more central priorities of development agencies in the 90s.

36 United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA): Crucial Health Services for Women Weakened by US Funding Cut, Fact Sheet, Advocacy Programs, Pathfinder International, April 2004.

37 See Women's Edge 2004 and 2005 US government budget analysis for good overview at <http://www.womensedge.org/pages/printerfriendly.jsp?id=189>

38 Interviews with women's organizations in Thailand and the US.

39 Herz and Ibrahim, 2005, "A call for Participatory Decision-Making: Discussion Paper on World Bank-Civil Society Engagement," commissioned by the Joint Facilitation Committee.

Changing aid modalities

What is also of major importance to women's organizations around the world is how bilateral and multilateral aid – which at one point was the number one source of funding – is restructuring. Instead of direct project support where agencies implemented their own projects such as building schools or dams, or supporting civil society in the recipient countries, the emphasis now is increasingly on partner country-led strategies. The rationale behind this new approach, formalized in what is known as the Paris Declaration for Aid Effectiveness,⁴⁰ is intended to increase country ownership and donor coordination and harmonization of operational policies and procedures. This has resulted in new aid modalities such as sector wide approaches, basket funding and budget support, all geared towards the promotion of alignment between aid and priorities and programs of aid recipients.⁴¹

Advantages of these new aid delivering mechanisms are supposed to include lower management costs, better coordination between donors, ease in disbursing funds and better flexibility in use of funds (for example, the recipient country can draw funds from one operational budget vs negotiating with a range of donors individually on a project-to-project basis), and the countries are less driven by donor agendas. However, several representatives of women's rights organizations interviewed explained that these new aid modalities are in fact a cause for concern, given that they are in effect reducing the ability of NGOs to access funding. As one leader of an African women's rights group described,

“Recently we have a new funding approach called basket funding. This is based on bilateral relations with our government. Bilaterals come together and donate collectively to a government, sometimes for specific sectors. The government then decides how it is being spent (within certain parameters). This includes resources for NGOs. Since some of what we do is in opposition of our government (for example our peace-related work in the Northeast) we cannot access that money. We explained to NORAD, who has been our donor for years, that this does not work for us and they developed a special arrangement with an intermediary NGO partner in Norway that channels the money to us. We are not sure, however, how long this formula will last or whether other bilaterals will start doing the same.”

The new modalities

Sector Wide Approach

A sector wide approach (SWAp) is a process in which funding for the sector – whether internal (from national revenues) or from donors – supports a single policy and expenditure program, under government leadership, and adopting common approaches across the sector. It is generally accompanied by efforts to strengthen government procedures for disbursement and accountability. A SWAp should ideally involve broad stakeholder consultation in the design of a coherent sector program at micro, meso and macro levels, and strong coordination among donors and between donors and government. SWAps also aim to integrate the different stakeholders, ie government, multilateral institutions and business sector, with the goal of finding solutions together.

40 The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness was signed by 102 countries on March 2, 2005. It can be found at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf>

41 It is important to note that for the United States, the largest ODA contributor with USD 15.8 billion in 2003 the most common aid modalities are those that can maintain conditionalities, namely project support and parallel funding. Parallel funding follows budget support or SWAps but allows the donor to better track resources and outputs and receive specific monitoring reports while still contributing to the sector strategy. Parallel funding exists for a variety of reasons, legal restrictions, desire for attribution of funds or lack of confidence in the government's capacity in certain areas.

According to Sunila Abeysekera, based in Sri Lanka,

“We have also seen the shifts in organizational and administrative policies within development and funding agencies, both bilateral and multilateral, that have led to the development of new systems and structures of reporting and administration that call for greater consolidation of projects and programmes at all levels – at the level of their international, regional and national offices as well as at the level of partners including even the smallest units that work on development issues at the community level. This process has increasingly created elite ‘indigenous’ gate-keepers at the level of national urban centres within civil society in most southern countries; these organizations and individuals then go on to act as intermediaries between local, community-based groups and funding and donor agencies, shaping agendas at both ends. In order to support partners in implementing these shifts in policy at the centre, many donor agencies invested in a range of capacity building exercises aimed at making partners and beneficiaries more able to provide reports in required formats.”⁴²

Recipient governments won’t prioritize women’s rights

While clearly no one can argue with the principle of ownership, one can ask questions about whose ownership. When it comes to gender equality the concept of ‘ownership’ presents government leaders with an excuse to abandon the promotion of gender equality altogether if they want to consider it a foreign-imposed agenda. As a result, as more money is going to partner countries in the form of SWAps and general budget support, including resources to NGOs, women’s organizations lose access to development assistance funding. In many cases, this is even true for the government ministries or national machineries for women.

As a result of changes in the aid architecture the amount of money available to NGOs may be expected to decrease in the years to come, especially for those NGOs that are independent and critical of their government’s positions. In practice this means that women’s organizations that are in opposition to their government and take a different position on, for example, reproductive rights, will increasingly have a hard time fundraising. The impact of this on women’s rights work could be devastating, especially in the regions where women’s organizations heavily rely on this funding segment, mostly Sub-Saharan Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean, but other regions as well. And while more money will go to so-called low-income countries, this does not mean that women’s organizations will have access to those resources.

42 Abeysekera, 2005.

The new modalities

Basket funding

Basket funding occurs when donors shift their support from projects to a common pool that is managed by one of the partners. Funds are disbursed to government from the pool on a periodic basis (usually quarterly), based on a government’s reporting of sectoral expenditures for that period. Donors agree to disburse a percentage of the total budget submitted by the government for the sector.

Budget support

Budget support is the support of existing budget lines, a form of core funding for government.

While more money will go to so-called low-income countries, this does not mean that women’s organizations will have access to those resources.

In many cases, NGOs are placed in the role of ‘subcontractor’ to their governments. This is complicated for obvious reasons—organizations that accept this funding are not commonly able to take a critical stance and become an implementation arm of their governments. Just like NGOs based in middle-income countries, but with persistent pockets of extreme poverty and high levels of injustice, women’s rights and gender equality groups with a focus on structural causes of poverty and injustice are losing external funding.

“Before, we were talking to donor governments. Now we no longer have direct access. In order to access that money we have to act as contractors of our own governments. I see this in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania (East Africa). So here is the paradox: donor governments expect us to hold governments accountable by playing an advocacy role. At the same time we can only access SWAp money if we behave as implementers of government policies. In other words, if we are not compliant with our government we cannot access these funds. Consequently more conservative women’s organizations are being resourced and have grown in size. We are all struggling with this, especially those of us who follow a feminist agenda as opposed to more conservative groups. We are now located at the fringes.”

(Women’s organization representative)

Donors are leaving regions despite women’s rights agendas

With this greater channelling of development aid to governments, particularly those with low incomes and ‘good governance’, civil society in middle income countries have less or no access to these funds. The survey results clearly indicate that women’s organizations in both Latin America/Caribbean and Central and Eastern Europe/Commonwealth of Independent States are facing major challenges in receiving funding. These middle-income countries often have gender equality indicators, such as the literacy ratio between women and men and the share of women in non-agricultural wage labour, that suggest that gender inequalities are not as large as in other parts of the world. These further make them unattractive to donors supporting gender issues. Nonetheless, other indicators, such as employment segregation, lack of reproductive rights or occurrences of violence against women, show the alarming extent of women’s human rights violations in these countries.

‘Internal accountability’ and its paradoxes

The principle of ownership in the new aid framework places the responsibility for monitoring with the aid recipient countries. This makes the promotion of a gender equality strategy more complicated. With the new

aid delivery mechanisms, the DAC-designed gender guidelines and markers have lost much of their relevance. Aid is now given in much larger amounts and for less specific programs. Eurostep's and Social Watch's report (2005)⁴³ that assesses the extent to which gender equality is being promoted in the context of international aid concludes:

"The new aid architecture has few, if any, mechanisms for accountability and even less mechanisms for implementation of national obligations to gender equality. This is creating gender apartheid in the aid architecture. Without adequate authority for ensuring institutional accountability inside donor agencies, commitment to gender equality will not be realized. Additionally, without financial resources dedicated to support an adequate gender architecture, which has political authority, the implementation gap will not be closed. High level action is required to ensure that effective gender architecture is established."

And here is another paradox. While the Eurostep/Social Watch report speaks to a political authority of accountability, civil society and national women's organizations that could play a key role in holding recipient governments to account for gender equality are losing their access to donor funds. Changes in the aid architecture require new accountability mechanisms: between governments and civil society (lateral accountability); between aid recipients and aid delivering governments (upward accountability) and within aid recipient governments themselves (internal accountability). Responsible ownership can only be achieved if these checks and balances are in place. For decades, women activists have advocated for a critical mass of women in decision-making positions in administrative and legislative functions as well as for a strong civil society that holds governments accountable. While these demands are not new, the changing aid architecture has given them a renewed significance. Ultimately the question is: who 'owns' government policies? For the new aid modalities to be effective, a strong civil society, and especially a strong women's movement, will be of crucial importance.

For the new aid modalities to be effective, a strong civil society, and especially a strong women's movement, will be of crucial importance.

Rays of hope and new opportunities

As the previous pages have indicated, the situation is bleak, if not critical in terms of maintaining, let alone increasing, resources for women's rights work from the bilateral and multilateral communities. Nonetheless, in the short term at least, and perhaps beyond, there are opportunities which could be strategically used to advance women's rights and increase budgets to women's organizations and initiatives across development agencies.

⁴³ From "Accountability Upside Down, gender equality in a partnership for poverty eradication", 2005, by Mirjam van Reisen, published by Eurostep and Social Watch, page 13-14.

Expand mechanisms for donors to support NGOs

While the future is unclear, some DAC countries do recognize that not all recipient governments are ready to support NGOs in their countries that work on women's rights. These DAC countries therefore continue to donate a considerable portion of their ODA to NGOs. The Netherlands is the number one contributor (USD 697 million) in absolute terms and Ireland allocates the largest percentage of its ODA to NGOs (20%).⁴⁴ Interviews indicated that some DAC countries are continuing their funding to individual women's organizations which aid-receiving governments otherwise would not support. For example NZAID, NORAD, DANIDA and SIDA were mentioned as donors that went out of their way to make certain provisions that would allow them to continue their support to individual women's organizations, despite their countries' overall shift to budget support and SWAps. Interestingly, these special measures are based on the recognition that the women's organizations concerned would never qualify for support from their own governments. In some ways this is a hopeful development, especially if these are not just temporary measures but contribute to the realization that a strong and independent civil society is a condition for overall aid effectiveness, and that, as such, development assistance to NGOs remains of crucial importance.

As another potential opportunity, where women's movements lose support because of loss of civil society access to government funds, potential new channels could open up through UN agencies and multilateral development banks (the latter have several very progressive feminists leading their gender departments).

Rethink gender mainstreaming and re-energize gender equality work

What this research shows is that while the traditional donor allies are cutting back, donor countries that historically did not have a strong focus on gender equality are springing up. Spain, Switzerland, Ireland, and potentially South Korea now stand out as strong supporters with new monies for women's organizing and women's rights work. In the meantime, those agency representatives that have seen their organizations lose their leadership and influence want to re-examine how best to re-energize their organizations. Said one courageous bureaucrat,

⁴⁴ The following were the top five NGO supporters in absolute numbers in 2003: The Netherlands (USD 697 million); Japan (USD 330 million); United Kingdom (USD 329 million); Sweden (USD 107 million) and Ireland (USD 104 million). The top five NGO supporters in terms of percentage of ODA (2003) are: Ireland (20%); Netherlands (17%); Luxembourg (14%); Switzerland (7.6%) and: New Zealand (7.5%). OECD statistics, kindly put together by Julia Benn (OECD) for the purpose of this research.

“In the end we need to talk about something that is threatening to power elites and is at the heart of relationships between men and women. We lost our way with all this gender mainstreaming. New ways forward are needed and I am putting it back on our agenda!”

At this moment there is a major policy re-think underway. The OECD DAC Network on Gender Equality is currently in the process of developing new and more fitting proposals to ensure gender equality agendas do not lose ground within the new aid modalities. Furthermore, at least eight of the DAC members are actually in the process of updating and/or developing new gender equality policies and instruments (including Japan, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden, Norway, and Canada). This creates new momentum and significant opportunities to shift the emphasis away from mainstreaming, raise the value of support for women’s movements within these institutions and put all the critical issues of women’s human rights into the centre of their development frameworks.

With possibilities of new strategies however, donors said that women’s groups need to again make themselves both visible and audible.

“I have the sense that there is less pressure from the outside now – groups like Women’s Eyes on the World Bank seem to have disappeared. That organization [the Bank] listens when there are protesters on the streets. We no longer hear those voices in our annual meeting. There are lots of NGOs present but none of them are talking about women.”

This external pressure that was very strong around the Fourth UN Conference on Women has dwindled. Several representatives of donor countries mentioned that there is a lot of space for shifting the agendas and resources of their institutions’ work, if only women’s organizations would take advantage of such opportunities through effective advocacy. According to one bilateral representative,

“We need strong feminists inside and pressure from the outside. Ask for a meeting with the Minister and the whole apparatus gets involved. Remember that much of what governments do is about politics. [Women’s organizations need to] use it to their advantage.”

Women’s groups need to again make themselves both visible and audible.

Strategy ideas to leverage more resources from development assistance

Bilateral and multilateral agencies are institutions that manage public monies for development assistance. Though their bureaucracies can

be intimidating, they control vast resources and tend to have significant influence relative to other funding sectors. The fact that they are allocating the tax dollars of donor-country citizens means that they are sensitive to demands that they be accountable to civil society. They can also serve as an important entry point to negotiate with national governments. All of these considerations make these agencies a worthy target for continued pressure to increase their commitment to women's rights.

Suggested goals for this sector, in terms of leveraging support for women's rights organizations, follow two tracks:

To build pressure for resources for women's organizations in both the short and long term, a watch-dog mechanism needs to be created.

– In the short term, to get greater funding going to women's rights organizations, exploring the possibility for mandating a target amount of 1% of Official Development Aid (USD 690 million).⁴⁵ To build pressure for resources for women's organizations in both the short and long term, a watch-dog mechanism needs to be created that will track and make transparent funding for women's rights and women's organizations.

– At the same time, there is a need to work towards changing the political logic of these institutions around development support and women in particular. This implies reframing the notion of 'aid effectiveness' and clarifying the role and 'value-added' of women's rights organizations in development. This also requires that women's organizations take on the 'evaluation challenge' (see also chapter 10).

In the overall landscape of development assistance, a strategy aimed at increasing the resources for women's rights is probably best focused on the actual source of resource flows, namely donor governments that allocate funding to aid recipient governments, multilateral agencies or NGOs.

A savvy strategy will initially focus on a few key countries to leverage more resources. Research suggests that Spain, Switzerland and Ireland might be relatively more open and ready to make a stronger commitment to women's rights. But the first generation champions, such as the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Sweden or Canada, should be brought on board as well. Reaching out to these governments will require working with women's rights organizations based in those countries, building a national constituency that can effectively carry weight in what is a highly political process. These countries should be encouraged not only to increase their own support for women's rights, but also to act as 'champions,' encouraging other country governments to increase their support. Many women's rights groups for example, would expect that 'friendly' European governments will work harder to influence the allocation of the substantial European Commission funds.

⁴⁵ As a result of initial discussions on this strategy the OECD is currently studying ways of tracking Official Development Aid to women's NGOs specifically.

This strategy will have to incorporate the recognition that little can be achieved without mobilising public interest in seeing greater support for women's rights. In the current context, much public opinion in donor countries is going counter to many women's rights demands. This is a trend that must be reversed if a compelling case is to be made to donor governments to increase their support.

Chapter 4

Trends in Large Independent Foundations

Characteristics and dynamics⁴⁶

Large Independent Foundations (LIF) make grants based on charitable endowments. Most are independent from the company or family they originally grew out of, though many still carry the company or founding family's name, such as Ford, Kellogg, Carnegie, Van Leer and the Rockefeller Foundations. In return for paying out a share of their assets toward charity or public interest causes (for example, US law requires that each year, independent foundations pay out at least 5% of the value of their assets in the preceding year) foundations generally receive some kind of tax benefits or privileges. For the most part, foundation funding directions and priorities are determined by Boards of Directors—made up of business, community and academic leaders—and the foundation President. In some cases, the directions and priorities are revisited every three to five years, while in other cases a major shift does not happen until a new President comes on board, which is perhaps every ten to fifteen years. LIFs are managed by a professional staff of considerable size, whose power in terms of grantmaking decisions varies depending on the culture and guidelines of the particular foundation.

Foundations have traditionally worked in silos and have invested considerable time and resources in defining and articulating their particular 'niche', philosophy and mission. For some, this means an ability to 'take credit' for advances in their particular area. As one philanthropy expert observed:

"The fact of the matter is that funders are by and large not the greatest collaborators. They have very different styles, different pressures, Boards of Trustees want different things. It's not just that they don't want to, but there are serious barriers to working together."

Yet as more foundations recognize that the problems they are trying to address are simply too big for a single funder to have impact on, many are shifting towards collaboration instead of isolation, consciously building into their methodologies partnerships with other organizations—be they other foundations, NGOs, corporations, or government entities. Collaboration is also in part the result of risk analysis, with foundations coming together on the assumption that by concentrating their resources among a select group of organizations and/or geographic area, they

⁴⁶ Data presented in this chapter is from Giving USA, COF, Foundation Center and/or Chronicle of Philanthropy. While this data gives a good indication they are not 100% accurate. For example, grants under USD 10,000 are often not included, multi-year grants may be counted in one particular year and theme categories are not always 100% comparable.

are more likely to see success. Some foundation staff say that these shifts are also due to increasing frustration that years of grantmaking are seemingly having little impact on the problems they are addressing. Thus many are motivated to focus their grantmaking more narrowly in the hopes of being able to see some impact in a more defined area. This was mentioned by several foundation representatives interviewed whose programs had been cut back to focus on a limited geographic or issue-specific area.

As foundations seek to reflect on and improve their impact and effectiveness, affinity groups play an increasingly important role⁴⁷. These groups provide a space for knowledge sharing, where foundation representatives can come together to learn from one another, deepen their understanding of the issues, and at times even advocate for certain issues or grantees. Affinity groups also aim to increase the amount of resources going to a particular field. They are generally only open to grantmakers, providing funders with a 'safe space' to share information and perspectives. But a few affinity groups are beginning to open up more, inviting civil society organizations to participate in key meetings. One representative of an affinity group explained the impetus behind this opening as the political times and a sense that...

"...addressing the social/political/economic problems we're trying to address is so complicated that we need to work together more."

At the same time, affinity groups are limited in their influence. While there are spaces in most affinity group meetings for educational sessions (for example on women's rights), the *"...problem is that it's often preaching to the choir. The people who are already interested are the ones who participate. This level doesn't reach the trustees or CEOs who are setting the policy."*

How foundation giving relates to gender equality

Large independent foundations were the third, fourth and third most frequently mentioned source of funding for women's organizations in 1995, 2000 and 2004 respectively. Many representatives of organizations working on women's rights say that the LIFs were at one time their greatest source of stability—'our bread and butter donors'. But both women's rights organizations and women's funds say that they now see that "gender is definitely on the foundation chopping block."

Beyond anecdotes of cutbacks, it is extremely difficult to get specific numbers on foundation funding for women's rights work. This is due to definitional differences and the enormous variation among different

Affinity groups are beginning to open up more, inviting civil society organizations to participate in key meetings.

⁴⁷ For example, the Funders' Network on Population, Reproductive Health & Rights, Africa Grantmakers Affinity Group, Women & Philanthropy, Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues. For more information, visit the Council on Foundations website at www.cof.org.

kinds of foundation program ‘boxes’. Many foundation representatives interviewed said that they simply could not provide a solid estimate of their giving to women’s rights. Available data⁴⁸—most of which are on US-based foundations—indicate that of the total of USD 38.5 billion representing all US foundation giving in 2003, including large independent, corporate and family foundations, 8%, or roughly 3 billion, was spent outside of the US. And while 7.3% went to ‘women and girls’ programs and initiatives that is well below the 18% of funding that went for ‘children & youth’ and 15.1% that went for ‘economically disadvantaged populations.’⁴⁹

The table below includes data for LIFs identified by respondents as most likely to support women’s rights organizations of some sort with their giving classified as ‘for women and girls’. In most cases, stark decreases are apparent between 1998 and 2003, both in the amounts of giving and number of grantees.

Foundation Giving for “Women & Girls”				
	1998		2003	
	Dollar amount	No. of grants	Dollar amount	No. of grants
The Ford Foundation	93,108,347	440	71,847,024	383
The David and Lucile Packard Foundation	61,411,343	192	34,563,510	95
W.K. Kellogg Foundation	20,858,899	54	9,435,271	23
The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation	15,770,000	38	26,519,000	66
John D and Catherine T MacArthur Foundation	14,685,672	98	10,405,000	52
C.S. Mott Foundation	10,102,219	54	4,209,708	18
Open Society Institute	8,108,149	70	6,881,399	72

Source: The Foundation Center, “Top 50 U.S. Foundations Awarding Grants for Women and Girls, circa 2003.” No distinction is made between US and international giving.

Challenges for women’s rights work related to the LIFs

Shifting leadership

“A large percentage of foundation support is suicide in the long run. With foundations you are the flavour of the month.”

Many women’s rights organizations have relied on supportive program

⁴⁸ Much of the data presented here are drawn from the Foundation Center, which relies on voluntary compliance by foundations to report on their giving.

⁴⁹ All numbers based on the Giving USA, and Women and Philanthropy data. See also Foundation Grants Designated for Special Population Groups, circa 2003. Available from The Foundation Centers’ Statistical Information Service www.fdncenter.org/fc_stats

officers to help them manoeuvre internal foundation dynamics and find the right 'fit' for program requests. While these allies and internal champions have been vitally important, they have also left groups vulnerable to funding cuts when there are staff changes. Ultimately, the power to shift foundation policy and priorities remains with the boards and highest levels of leadership.

Several representatives of smaller foundations and women's rights organizations say that traditional foundation 'leaders' on women's rights issues are playing a much more limited role than in past years. Many cited the MacArthur Foundation's recent change in leadership resulted in a near complete reversal in a foundation that had once been considered a lead supporter of women's rights. Even the Ford Foundation, still considered to be one of the most steady foundation supporters of women's rights, is not perceived to be exercising leadership on the issue as it once did. Further, some LIFs, including Ford, are decentralizing grantmaking decisions, enabling foundation field offices to determine funding priorities in their particular region. This is likely to have mixed results for women's rights groups, depending on the extent to which they are able to influence the local foundation office.

Ultimately, the power to shift foundation policy and priorities remains with the boards and highest levels of leadership.

Size matters

There is a clear tendency among foundations to want to give large grants. Foundation representatives say that providing many small grants is simply not feasible because doing so would signify a major increase in their administrative costs and overhead. Some interviewees also attributed this trend to foundation staff personalities and a desire to 'make a big splash' and claim credit for successes of large, visible programs. The problem with the push to give large grants to large organizations with 'proven capacity' is that it precludes many smaller or newer women's rights groups from accessing these sources of funds. It may also play a role in the fact that larger, mixed organizations are relatively well-funded for their gender or women's rights programs, as many interviewees attest.

Foundations are under the (US government) microscope

Numerous efforts are currently underway in the US to change the rules under which philanthropy organizations operate. The likely result will be increasingly restrictive policies.⁵⁰ The stated purpose of these efforts is

⁵⁰ The two most important US administrative and legislative measures are the "Voluntary Best Practice Guidelines for US based charities", on measures to be taken before any funds are distributed to foreign recipient organizations, for example the collection of very detailed information about not just foreign grantees but also their vendors and financial institutions: and the USA Patriot Act, which grants the executive branch greater authority to closely scrutinize where grant money is going and to apply criminal penalties without due process. If fully instituted, these measures make the work of some smaller foundations impossible.

to prevent financial support for international ‘terrorists’ and to address instances of fraudulent practices in the philanthropic sector. Most large foundations have adopted some measures (such as using automated list-checking services to check grantees against terrorist watch-lists) but have not cut back international grantmaking, although a small number have cut back. The smaller foundations (and family foundations) have little capacity to deal with the federal guidelines, and may feel confident that they know their grantees sufficiently well that the cautionary procedures recommended in the guidelines are unnecessary. However it is likely that these guidelines are contributing to the tendency to focus grantmaking on well-established institutions, rather than supporting more ‘start-up’ efforts. The new policies lead some to believe that US social change philanthropy is at risk of significantly shrinking.⁵¹ At the same time, the philanthropic sector has responded by developing alternative guidelines to be submitted to the Treasury Department with a request that they replace the existing version.

Corporate and some non-profit scandals in the US have also led to shifts in the foundation sector in an attempt to respond to increasing public demands for greater transparency and accountability. In this context, many foundations are changing policies and procedures in line with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (The American Competitiveness and Corporate Accountability Act of 2002)—even though this legislation does not technically apply to the nonprofit sector.

Corporate and some non-profit scandals in the US have also led to shifts in the foundation sector in an attempt to respond to increasing public demands for greater transparency and accountability.

Opportunities to increase funding from this sector

Between 1993 and 2003, the number of active grantmaking foundations⁵² in the US rose by close to 77%—from 37,600 to 66,400 (note that this number includes family foundations, which are discussed later in this report). Recent statistics for the European Foundation Center indicate the presence of close to 62,000 foundations, with Denmark, Sweden, Germany, the UK and Spain being the countries with the greatest numbers of foundations⁵³. And despite the cutbacks on women’s rights work, levels of foundation giving overall are increasing and many women’s rights organizations feel that especially smaller and younger foundations have the potential of becoming women’s rights supporters (see also chapter six on individual giving and family foundations). In 1995, US foundations were giving USD12.3 billion. Giving in 2004 was estimated at USD32.4 billion.⁵⁴ This reflects a recovery following drastic decreases in the asset bases of many foundations between 2000 and 2002 due to economic downturns and the impact of the September 11th attacks.

51 See also article by Urgent Action Fund, *Philanthropy at Risk*, US Administrative and legislative proposals for change, February 2005 (updated May 2005).

52 Both large independent and family foundations (see Chapter 6).

53 European Foundation Centre, *Foundation Facts & Figures Across the EU – Associating Private Wealth for Public Benefit*, April 2005.

54 “Change in Foundation Giving, 1994 to 2004” http://fdncenter.org/learn/classroom/ft_tutorial/fig01.pdf

In Europe, a survey of 26,000 foundations in nine EU countries indicated that their total spending in a single year was over 51 billion Euros (close to USD48 billion).⁵⁵ Thus, on the whole, more money is available from more foundations than before.

Despite common concerns that funding globally is riskier and harder to monitor,⁵⁶ international grantmaking⁵⁷ among US-based foundations is on the rise, particularly among larger foundations. And the number of foundations engaged in international grantmaking is growing.⁵⁸ The increase in the overall amount is largely due to a few very large foundations, such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (mainly health) and Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation (mainly environment). However, it is also a reflection of increased giving from corporate and family foundations. Within this increase, the share going to grantmaking for social change advocacy is growing as well.⁵⁹

Over two-thirds (68%) of US foundations provide general operating support. The largest grantmakers are most likely to offer this kind of support, but smaller foundations are more likely to provide at least half of their giving as operating support. But a quarter targeted between 25 and 49 percent of their giving for operating support,⁶⁰ while the rest provided at least half their funding as operating support. Although women's rights organizations do not report experiencing this trend with their grantmakers, it at least reflects a growing acknowledgement among some funders of the importance of providing organizational support.

It may also reflect a gradual recognition that the trend of funding projects over organizations has hurt social movements and women's movements among them. A recent paper, entitled War of Ideas⁶¹ compares funding practices of 'progressive' and 'conservative' foundations in the United States. The paper argues that while conservative foundations give less, a higher percentage goes to flexible core support and activities that

55 European Foundation Centre, Foundation Facts & Figures across the EU – Associating Private Wealth for Public Benefit, April 2005. Data are from different years for different countries (1999, 2001, 2003). Conversion to USD is based on the exchange rate of January 2, 2001. No data are available on funding for women and girls, or funding leaving Western Europe. Also, the vast majority of these foundations are family or corporate foundations.

56 Cited in a Grantmakers without Borders survey of five hundred US based foundations (large independent and private foundations).

57 Defined by the Council on Foundations as direct or indirect giving to organizations not based in the foundation's home country or domestic grantmaking in any country that advances international understanding and cooperation.

58 This is not counting giving as a result of the December 2004 Tsunami.

59 'Promoting Philanthropy: Global Challenges and Approaches', by the International Network for Strategic Philanthropy (INSP), December 2004.

60 The Foundation Center: "Foundation Growth and Giving Estimates: 2004 Preview". Retrieved May 19, 2005 from http://fdncenter.org/research/trends_analysis/pdf/fgge05.pdf

61 Andrew Rich, "War of Ideas: Why mainstream and liberal foundations and the think tanks they support are losing in the war of ideas in American politics", Stanford Social Innovation Review, Spring 2005.

enable grantees to achieve their core mission and communicate key messages. In other words, while progressive foundations have allocated more resources than conservatives to influence policies and promote social change, the majority support specific projects and programs, which is often not as effective. The paper argues that strong ideas need strong organizations and puts out a strong call for progressive donors to rethink their allocation of charitable dollars. So while impact and accountability will always be important to measure and insist upon, foundations also need to help foster organizations with strong cores that can more effectively pursue smart strategies and new opportunities for long-term change.

Strategy ideas to leverage more resources from large independent foundations

In-depth exploration of personal connections to access the relevant decision makers would be key.

While there is considerable frustration with the apparent disinterest of many large foundations in women's rights, there is also a sense that women's rights organizations cannot afford to simply give up on them. These foundations do hold a considerable amount of resources, which can be made available in a relatively short period of time. There are some strong women's rights allies within foundations who can help to influence the agendas of those institutions.

Suggested goals for increasing support from LIFs include:

- double the amount of large independent foundation giving for women's rights; and
- double the number of foundations giving to women's rights.

As one donor from a small foundation explained, "One really good, big foundation can make a difference in how other foundations act and prioritize certain issues." So it makes sense to focus on the few key foundations that are perceived as leaders by others—for example, Ford Foundation—to get them to be more active advocates of women's rights with other funders. There may also be opportunities for reaching out to some foundation leaders who are interested in establishing clear legacies, showing the impact their role has had on priority issues addressed by their foundation. In other words, women's rights organizations might work on convincing foundation leaders to create women's rights legacies. Some in-depth exploration of personal connections to access the relevant decision makers would be key, as would connecting with program officers inside foundations who are considered strong women's rights allies (including of course, men within foundations who can effectively make the case for women's rights with their funding 'peers')

As noted above, ultimately it is the Boards of Trustees and senior staff that have major decision-making power and set priorities in large foundations. However, in many cases, these individuals are difficult to access. As one philanthropy expert explained:

“I think the more that we can educate trustees, the better off we’ll be. The challenge is getting access to them – they are very busy people and it’s hard to get them to come to events. We have to find ways to educate them that don’t complicate their lives.”

In this sense, targeted media and public opinion campaigns could be useful strategies to bring attention to women’s rights issues and create greater openness to women’s rights agendas. Many participants in this research stressed the need to get women’s rights in the media in a much larger—and different— way, fighting the ‘double image’ described by one interviewee as the difference between women’s rights advocates projecting an image of strength, while messages to funders or the public in general presenting ‘helpless’ women in need of support.

There is also a strong sense that deepening broad dialogue among women’s rights organizations and foundation representatives on the substance of women’s rights issues and strategies is critical to building a better understanding of how the multiple dimensions of women’s rights work fit together and to ultimately building greater foundation support for holistic strategies.

Related to this, addressing the evaluation challenge is essential for leveraging greater foundation support. One study found that, “large foundations place more emphasis on the presence of measurable outcomes as a criterion in their grantmaking decisions⁶².” There are an array of urgent problems that foundations feel are worthy of funding, so it is critical that women’s rights organizations are able to make the case for their work, using evaluation tools that are not only convincing for funders but also useful for learning and building stronger strategies. At the same time, evaluation is a two-way street. One idea is to invest in evaluating the impact different foundations are having on women’s rights. A simple tool applied to foundation grantmaking could be used to applaud those making important strides in supporting women’s rights and shake up those that have left it off the agenda.

Finally, this project has made clear two other important recommendations: further research is necessary to explore possibilities with large foundations based outside of the US—particularly in Europe and Asia. And as positions open within foundations, it is critical that feminists apply for the posts in the hopes of shifting internal debates and priorities towards women’s rights.

62 Ostrower, Francie, Attitudes and Practices Concerning Effective Philanthropy; The Urban Institute, 2004.

Chapter 5

Trends in Public Foundations / International NGOs (INGOs)

Characteristics and dynamics

Public foundations are publicly supported non-profit organizations. They are funded by a combination of contributions from individuals, governments, private foundations or other public foundations. Unlike large independent and family foundations, they do not grow out of an endowment, though they may build one. They include organizations like Oxfam, Hivos, or Lutheran World Relief.

Many public foundations originated as charity, child-sponsorship, or direct service delivery organizations. They tap available funding from individuals and governments based in the Global North to provide services and run programs—especially emergency humanitarian assistance—in the Global South. Many public foundations have multiple country offices in Europe and the US where they raise funds, and offices in countries throughout the Global South where they work (although some of them fundraise in the South on the local level as well, competing in some cases with women’s rights groups for funding on the ground). Many were started in the 70s and 80s with two very distinct approaches apparent behind these varied organizations. On the one hand, some public foundations or international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) were established with a charity perspective to respond to what they saw as the tremendous needs of poor people generated as a result of armed conflicts and natural disasters. Others were grounded in a sense of solidarity, of commitment to working with people in other countries either because they felt a responsibility to influence their own governments to change the situation or to support the struggles on the ground. While these differences are blurring over time, they reflect important conceptual distinctions that do reverberate in the nature of their programs and in particular, how they understand (or ignore) women’s rights.

Mainly within the last five to ten years, many have adopted a rights-based approach while others are still struggling to embrace ‘rights’. In some cases the struggle arises because they were founded as traditional service delivery or charity groups and the shift to rights raises tensions among staff and potentially individual donors as well. But for the most part, these groups have expanded their efforts to engage with governments and multilateral institutions, are strengthening their policy and campaign work and are embracing and using the human rights system to lend legitimacy to their claims.

Public foundation/INGO support for gender equality

The online survey shows that public foundations are a very important source of support for women's organizations worldwide. In the period 1995 – 2004 they were in the top three of the most frequently mentioned sources of support, and in 2000 they were the number one source.

The Beijing Conference and its aftermath generated considerable interest and enthusiasm around gender equality and working with women. Public foundations and INGOs had long seen women as a critical part of their missions related to poverty reduction. In the 90s a lot of work was being undertaken in terms of policy development, indicators, meetings and networking among gender policy advisors/experts, and performance was compared and documented.⁶³ At that time, most had some money reserved for women's organizations specifically and all were struggling with the mainstreaming challenge.

For some, gender equality has always been on the agenda, thanks to their leadership. Hivos, a trusted and long-term partner of women's rights organizations, for example, disbursed over USD 10 million to women's organizations in 2004.⁶⁴ For others, they are just recently embracing it, the result of a long process of strategic manoeuvring by feminists who have joined their staffs over time. Many of the public foundations have adopted gender equality as a cross-cutting theme. This, however, has proven complicated, both conceptually and operationally and it seems to have made many of these funders move away from funding women's organizations specifically.

Some do set specific 'gender targets'. Of those interviewed, two mandate that 15% of funding should go to women's organizations and again another that 70% of beneficiaries should be women. Others are hard-pressed to specify their spending on women or women's rights because "things are all mainstreamed". The challenge remains to keep gender, and specifically women's rights, visible and to establish accountability and monitoring mechanisms.

The challenge remains to keep gender, and specifically women's rights, visible and to establish accountability and monitoring mechanisms.

63 See for example *Gender Planning in Development Agencies: Meeting the Challenge*, by Mandy Macdonald (ed), a Eurostep and Oxfam publication, 1994; *Gender and Diversity in Oxfam International*, by Diane Gregorio and Ellen Sprenger, in: *Gender Works: Oxfam Experience in Policy and Practice*, An Oxfam Publication, 1999).

64 Hivos 2004 annual report, www.hivos.nl

Challenges associated with the public foundations and funding for women's rights

Avoiding the mainstreaming backslide

Important successes have happened in areas of recruitment and global campaigns, for example on girls' education.

Most public foundations/INGOs have shifted into a mainstreaming approach. Gender experts within these funding organizations feel they have spent a lot of time on the development of internal systems and indicators in an attempt to positively influence the process. Still no one claimed they were succeeding in getting it right across the board. An example provided by a representative of a public foundation:

"Our business model has changed dramatically over the last few years and has made mainstreaming gender more complicated. We tend to focus on women as beneficiaries, making sure we meet their needs. In any case, gender issues are less visible in mainstreaming processes ... How to bring a gender perspective back into the mainstream? We are starting a strategic consultative review as part of the development of our next five year plan, and consultations with women's organizations are an important part of it. I believe that this is a good place to start."

Another example is an INGO that for years followed a two-track approach with regard to its grantmaking, with targets for support of women's organizations (10%) and (hard) gender-related performance criteria for so-called mixed organizations. In the last couple of years they expanded their gender equality policy to all departments of the organization and fully integrated their commitment in policies and systems. Since then important successes have happened in areas of recruitment and global campaigns, for example on girls' education. In the 90s this INGO was considered a leader but currently the leadership is no longer confident it still is. Internally gender equality issues are not very high on the agenda and externally its commitment has become less visible. The INGO feels that its mainstreaming work has been hampered by considerable staff turnover and lack of induction on gender analysis, combined with weak accountability mechanisms.

"Mainstreaming is much tougher than supporting women's organizations and movements. Inherent to mainstreaming is that you enter into a territory that shows the strength of the natural order. In order to succeed more rigor is required. I feel it is time to revamp our commitment and leadership role, starting with a mapping of the field, for example who is doing what, and where should we be present, as well as the formulation of concrete targets, both at the level of support of women's organizations and percentage of women beneficiaries."

Limited dialogue

Women's organizations are witnessing a decline in opportunities for partner consultations with INGOs on policies and strategies. In their view this may be attributed to the fact that public foundations are increasingly driven by their own financial concerns and the agendas of their own donors. The same was confirmed by an evaluation⁶⁵ of three Dutch public foundations. A tradition of consultations and critical dialogue about strategy, each others' work and shared ambitions seems to be replaced by interactions that concentrate on financial and administrative matters and directives.

Constraints of faith-based (and individual) funding

Many public foundations/INGOs originated from religious sources of funding such as Cordaid (Catholic) and Lutheran World Relief and they continue to be linked to their faith-based mission to varying degrees. Globally, the largest portion of individual giving happens through religious institutions (collections in churches, mosques, temples, etc) and religious-based international giving is on the rise. It is doubtful, or at best unclear the extent to which religious giving can be channelled to benefit women's rights, especially given the growing power of conservative religious forces of all persuasions (see box below). Many public foundations that are interested in embracing elements of a women's rights agenda face uphill internal battles with their fundraising and marketing departments who are concerned that work that is 'too political' or touches on very sensitive issues, such as women's rights, that will lead many of their individual donors to cut off their support.

Shifting tides of politics and public opinion

Because of their reliance on public funding—be it through the national government or individuals—public foundations are very influenced by the political climate and party in power. Important shifts, such as the Bush administration coming into power, or increasingly conservative governments in some European countries, have meant drastic decreases in the funding allocated for the work of these organizations. At the same time, their reliance on individual donors, which for some public foundations/INGOs make up as much as 80% of their total budget, means they must frame their messages and work to appeal to these individuals.

65 "The role of Women's Organizations in Civil Society Building (2003-2006), A joint evaluation of the programs of Cordaid, Hivos and Icco in Kenya, South Africa and Zimbabwe, in the period 1998 – 2003, by Lida Zuidberg in collaboration with Patricia McFadden and Marianne Nugteren (November 2004).

The power of giving

One women's organization received core funding (over \$200,000 total) from a Catholic fund that raised most of its income from an annual church collection in different parts of the country. At the end of 2000 this fund received a threat from conservatives in the church who discovered that the organization receiving the donation supported pro-choice work. The bishop was notified and the church threatened to stop its annual collection if the fund did not immediately announce its intention to stop supporting the organization in question. One city decided not to make its annual collection for aid work because of this controversy and the fund lost USD 1 million as a result.

Based on an anecdote shared during an interview with a representative of a women's rights organization in North America.

Working through 'local' (Northern) NGOs

Some public foundations are legally set up to only make grants through registered non-profits or charities in their home country that work with organizations based in the Global South. These dynamics are a source of considerable frustration among some of the groups interviewed, which say they see the northern-based organization taking a lion's share of the resources for 'administrative costs' with limited funds left over to actually do the work. One public foundation representative said that her organization is aware of these problems and are in the process of changing their policies so as to be able to directly support local partners in the Global South. But one representative of a women's rights organization mentioned one of the challenges to overcome:

"We should look at funding differences between the North and South. Donors give small bits of money to women's organizations in the South, while giving huge amounts of money to groups...with their headquarters in the North. It creates a kind of paternalism among NGOs. Why are northern organizations receiving funding to go and build capacities in the south?"

Identity crisis

The roles of public foundations are changing and increasingly complex. A core tension that several representatives of public foundations noted in interviews is balancing their dual identity as donors and civil society actors with their own agendas. On the one hand they provide funding to local organizations engaged in community development or advocacy work, while at the same time they want to be perceived as a peer, doing their own advocacy and campaigning. There is also often a tension in how involved they are in setting strategies and determining directions of their 'partners', especially now that many proactively seek out different types of partnerships, rather than simply waiting for funding requests. According to a Sri Lankan human rights activist who has witnessed one public foundation position itself as a player in the human rights arena, relocating offices to the southern hemisphere and becoming programme implementers at the national level:

"...using the local women's groups as their points of outreach but keeping control of the process of designing and implementing the programmes, often drawing on expertise from outside rather than work with women activists from within a country or region. In Sri Lanka, [the organization] has systematically used Indian expertise, including engaging the services of a marketing company to carry out the initial survey."⁶⁶

66 Abeysekera, 2005.

Some individuals within these institutions are challenging their colleagues to reflect on how the language of partnership masks very real power dynamics present in the funding relationship. Who controls the agenda? The following is a quote from a representative of an INGO who recognizes collaborations need to change:

“Collaboration needs to be based on two agendas coming together. My analysis would be that circumstances force us [grantors and grantees] to relate differently with each other. Northern-based NGOs are increasingly having a hard time raising money. Our response to that is to further diversify programs to also include advocacy and fundraising in different parts of the world. As we move away from (only) vertical grantmaking we grow closer in terms of our role and mission. Consequently our relationships change. We have to work together more, and find alternatives to vertical funding. We need to look for new forms and approaches and ways of working together.”

Absorbing local capacity and resources

Some of the women’s rights organizations interviewed said that INGOs are sometimes seen as a threat because they displace local NGOs by ‘poaching’ their most qualified staff (offering much higher salaries than local organizations can afford) and competing for funding at the national level. Because of the INGOs’ well-developed international infrastructure, facility for speaking donor languages and access to donors, some women’s organizations feel that they simply cannot compete.

Potential opportunities for women’s rights work in relation to the public foundations/INGOs

Ten years after Beijing, a growing number of public foundations are realizing that they have not made the progress (and difference) they had anticipated, and are looking to renew their commitment to gender equality. There is ‘new’ momentum on the part of some, while many of the more established supporters of women’s rights and gender equality are ready to place it higher on their agendas. Public foundations are almost always part of alliances, such as Interaction, Oxfam International, Eurostep or Alliance 2015. These alliances tend to have dedicated learning communities for the promotion of gender equality. The different alliances go through more or less rigorous screening and self-certification by members of their commitment to gender equality. For example, Interaction members link this screening to a process of external social auditing, whereas Oxfam International members in the mid and late 90s reported on and compared each other’s performance on gender equality executive levels, but now no longer do so.⁶⁷

⁶⁷ Oxfam International is currently in the process of evaluating its policies and practices in relation to women’s rights and gender equality

Ten years after Beijing, a growing number of public foundations are realizing that they have not made the progress (and difference) they had anticipated.

Although we have discussed the challenges of their individual donor base, public foundations that rely largely on individual donations also enjoy an enormous amount of flexibility and potential power. As a strategic partner for lobbying in their headquarters country (UK, Netherlands, US, etc), public foundations have the capacity to mobilize their donor base around specific advocacy demands.

Strategy ideas to leverage more resources from public foundations/INGOs

Some large public foundations and INGOs are increasingly important development players, receiving enormous resources through bilateral and multilateral funding mechanisms and from individuals. Many of them are moving ahead on gender programming, with or without alliances with women's rights organizations. For this reason, there is an urgent need to hold these organizations accountable on their gender equality commitments. At the same time, there is perhaps greater scope for engaging them in dialogue on women's rights issues, while supporting the feminists that have chosen to work from within these institutions.

Suggested goals for this sector follow two tracks:

- Among those that already claim to have gender equality as a key aim, encourage them to set a target of 30% of their funding to go to women's rights organizations.
- For those that have been more reluctant to embrace women's rights and gender equality, focus on promoting shifts in their policies and practices to facilitate a stronger women's rights perspective, for example, generating greater attention, support and accountability for women's human rights, emphasizing the importance of women's organizing and implementing incentive systems for staff.

As with the other funding sectors, the proposed strategy calls for an initial focus on existing or likely allies—in this case organizations like Hivos, ActionAid, and Oxfam—to encourage them to increase their giving, in particular multi-year funding, taking on women's rights as an explicit part of their agenda of civil society strengthening. These allies could then also play an instrumental role in influencing other organizations in this sector.

The fact that many public foundations are torn by their dual identities as funders and campaigners can open an opportunity for dialogue with them to raise concerns about their financial support for women's rights work. One cautionary note is that these relationships require a significant investment of time. They demand a proactive approach, reaching

out to individuals within these organizations to connect, collaborate and educate. It is easy to become absorbed into their agenda, in particular an agenda of capacity-building for staff and other partners. This may be a strategic choice that makes sense, but it is important to be aware of how all-consuming such work can be.

To help clarify the nature and scope of the relationship, it is critical to develop very clear terms of engagement when working with these institutions. These terms of engagement would resolve some of the following questions: How is decision-making power distributed? How will political differences be negotiated? Who has ultimate authority over program design and choices? Who has 'ownership' over materials that are produced? What are the channels for complaint should a problem arise in the relationship?

Chapter 6

Trends in Individual Giving and Family Foundations (Private Philanthropy)

Characteristics and dynamics

Individuals may choose to donate to one or more causes—this is called individual giving. An increasing number of wealthy individuals are also deciding to establish their own family foundation based on a charitable endowment. These foundations are usually run by an individual or family with a small board of trustees. Examples are Shaler Adams from the USA and the Sigrid Rausing Trust from the UK.

The US has the strongest history of philanthropy, much stronger than Western European countries or Canada where historically governments have taken more social responsibility (citizens have the sense that “I pay taxes for a purpose”), both inside their countries and in relation to the global South (development cooperation). However this is changing and Western Europeans and Canadians are increasingly responding to donation requests, though still at lower levels than people in the US.

Natural disasters and tragedies have stimulated giving in many cases. The December 2004 tsunami mobilized donations from individuals, estimated to have exceeded a billion dollars in private giving from around the world.⁶⁸ Earthquakes in Japan (in 1995) and Mexico (in 1985) were also known to stimulate giving in those countries. The hurricane crisis in the southern USA is another example. In some cases these emergency responses shift to longer-term philanthropy.

Natural disasters and tragedies have stimulated giving.

Emerging economies are seeing growing levels of philanthropy as well. Examples are Mexico, Brazil, India, the Ukraine and Russia. The wealthy classes in these countries are increasingly motivated to give, whether out of goodwill, interest in taking advantage of a favourable tax environment, or in response to organizations who, through promotion and marketing of their work, actively seek donations. Growth of philanthropy to a large extent depends on the existence of a favourable legal and regulatory environment and the existence of broad-based public awareness that substantially expands the proportion of the population active in philanthropy. Once a favourable culture is established, the next step is to attract and cultivate donors, and expand the number, reach and share of donations.

⁶⁸ Based on a compilation of giving statistics per country, available on-line at http://www.nationmaster.com/graph-T/dis_tsu_int_aid_pac

Experts in the field note a few key shifts in the private philanthropy landscape. One is the intergenerational transfer of wealth in the US, which has been estimated to be between USD 30 trillion to USD 60 trillion in the next few decades, of which around 15% will go to 'charity'.⁶⁹ New wealthy donors in the USA are characterized as being interested in the 'bottom line', impatient to see results and show a tendency to move on to new issues or organizations if they do not see change in a few years. Another trend is an increase in international giving, which experts in the field attribute in part to the generational shift in wealth, with younger people having more experience working and travelling in other countries and therefore greater interest in international grantmaking. This growing interest in international issues likely also has to do with 9/11 and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Still, the availability of resources for women's (and girls) programs and organizations appears quite limited.⁷⁰

Signs of Growth in Family Foundations in the U.S.		
	1999	2003
No. of foundations	20,498	30,517
Total giving	\$8,966,588	\$11,920,290
Total assets	\$177,769,855	\$195,091,150

Source: Key Facts on Family Foundations, The Foundation Center, January 2005.

Philanthropic advisors have become key players in private philanthropy. They may be based with banks, or operate independently. They are increasingly influential, not only in terms of financial management but also in terms of acting as intermediaries to introduce new philanthropists to the world of philanthropy. It is therefore important to educate these advisors and bring them into the larger community of funders and fundraisers for women's rights and gender equality.

Remittance giving (or diaspora giving) is a significant philanthropic resource in many countries. Diaspora communities in wealthy countries donate to their home countries/communities with which they have maintained strong ties. Official statistics recorded USD80 billion in migrant remittances to developing countries in 2002. Taking into account informal flows and underreporting of official data, estimates put the value much higher, at between USD100 and 200 billion. At this level, it constitutes the fastest growing and most stable capital flow from the global north to developing countries.⁷¹ To put things in perspective, ODA constitutes

69 Boston College, Social Welfare Research Institute. Why the USD 41 trillion wealth transfer estimate is still valid: A review of challenges and questions, by John J. Havens and Paul G. Schervish, January 06, 2003

70 The 7.3% of foundation giving to "women and girls" cited in Chapter 4 includes both LIFs and family foundations

71 Migrant Remittances to Developing Countries: a scoping study. Overview and Introduction to issues for pro-poor financial services, Excerpt - Executive Summary, prepared for the UK Department of International Development (DFID), by Cerstin Sander, Bannock Consulting, June 2003

between 35% - 70% of these estimations. Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe and South Asia receive the largest share of diaspora funding.

Another important dimension of diaspora giving is internal diaspora, or populations supporting community projects in their new home country. While donations are mostly for consumption (food and clothing), donors have begun to recognize the role of remittances and have become interested in how to facilitate an increase of the flow and use of remittances for developmental benefits.

Challenges of private philanthropy

Many women's organizations feel "*unless you can figure out how to get individual funding, you don't have a long life.*" But they also recognize the need to take into account the considerable investment costs, including significant time and resources to cultivate and maintain the necessary personal connections and relationships to access these donors.

There are important distinctions between philanthropy that reflects 'traditional charity' (ie helping disadvantaged groups in society) and a more 'social justice' perspective (the transformation of society and as such the promotion of justice and human rights). In most countries where a culture of giving exists, it is primarily charity-based and a considerable investment is required to create, strengthen or reshape private giving generally, and specifically towards giving with a social justice perspective. In some countries the creation of social change philanthropy is simply not yet a realistic alternative. In others, some women's rights organizations are trying to reshape the notion of philanthropy and educate donors to become more aware of the underlying and structural causes that mean that certain groups of people are disadvantaged. In some ways this can be seen as a new 'membership model', a model where individuals donate money and in return become educated, get connected and mobilized and as such are part of a movement.

Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe and South Asia receive the largest share of diaspora funding.

Another challenge is that individual and family giving is driven by what may seem very eccentric or rapidly shifting individual interests. Some interviewees from Eastern Europe say they were surprised with how quickly their individual donors cut off their support as their interests shifted elsewhere.

If women's organizations want to grow their funding share from individuals, they have some serious catching up to do. As Amnesty International and other big NGOs incorporate gender equality goals into their work, they are at a fundraising advantage given that they

already have large numbers of donors (most of whom are women) and have in place the systems (such as direct mailing) and resources to maintain and cultivate existing and new donors. As a result, they compete with women's rights organizations wanting to grow their own share of revenue from members and individual donors.

As organizations increasingly turn to individuals for financial support either through 'gifts' or membership, we must also consider the issue of privilege. A number of women's organizations based in the Global North, and especially in the United States, are succeeding in raising money from individuals, while in other countries there are much more limited opportunities. Semillas in Mexico City and the Ukrainian Women's Fund in Kiev are two examples of the more successful attempts so far.⁷² However there are some questionable ethics if groups in the Global North have the most favourable environment to access funding from individuals.

Opportunities

Some small family foundations are also stepping into areas that larger foundations are leaving, such as sexual and reproductive rights.

"New and emerging private foundations are more willing to give to women's rights, including reproductive rights and sexual rights, than most of the larger independent foundations. They are more progressive. Also, the amounts are impressive. For example, in 2003 a foundation gave USD 100,000 and so did Ms Smith. The number of anonymous gifts is growing too," (representative of a women's fund).

Redirecting diaspora giving for women's rights and social justice might be easier when donors are second (and even third) generation immigrants, and no longer have deep personal ties with a specific community. Several women's funds have researched diaspora communities and are developing plans in this area. So far the Ukrainian Women's Fund has been the only fund that has been successful in raising a substantial amount (around USD 90,000 from the United States and Canada), linking their work to a campaign against breast cancer.

Others are looking into the role of women in decision-making on donating, especially since research shows that women are more inclined to give to women than men are. We do know that in the next two decades a large number of women will inherit considerable wealth and more women than ever before will be in a position to make major gifts. This presents an important opportunity for women's organizations

⁷² Semillas, see <http://www.semillas.com.mx/> and the Ukrainian Women's Fund, see <http://www.uwf.kiev.ua/eng/index.htm>

seeking to grow their individual donor base. According to one representative of a women's fund, "If we educate them we can create an interest in women and women's empowerment. It is hard work but it can be done."

Contributing to a bold women's rights agenda could be presented as a compelling option.

Some foundations, especially the large independent foundations, are interested in supporting the development of philanthropy. More recently this includes an emphasis on strategic philanthropy, and social justice philanthropy. Foundations that see the importance of long-term asset building also give endowment grants. The creation of local level resources is intended to reduce dependency on limited external resources and also enable NGOs to grow a support base for their work, and as such, expand the legitimacy of civil society.

Experts in the field believe that the time may be ripe for cultivating new individuals as donors. Young women and women from middle to upper income levels are considered prime potential donors. At the same time, there is a sense that people are generally interested in finding ways to feel that they can make a positive difference in the face of strong conservative, right-wing movements in many countries. Contributing to a bold women's rights agenda could be presented as a compelling option.

Strategy ideas to leverage more resources from private giving/family foundations

Although approaching this sector can appear particularly daunting, participants in this research make the point that it cannot always be left for the long-term. There is an enormous amount of resources available from individuals and families—if women's rights organizations do not make an effort to tap those funds, other organizations will. At the same time, individual donors also play a potential role as a base of support, expanding the numbers of people that are willing to speak out to advance women's rights agendas.

Many high net-worth individuals tend to be very low profile thereby creating a challenge for women's organizations, particularly outside the Global North, to become known to them. Identifying small, little-known family foundations also requires more detailed research to better inform strategies. The initial phase is therefore very much about building personal connections as well as visibility in philanthropic circles. Though some individuals and foundations are open to supporting 'radical' agendas, these relationships require meeting donors 'where they are' in their understanding of women's rights and a willingness to stay in conversation with them to help expand that understanding. A compelling case for support will also require an ability to discuss impact and the difference that the financial support will make in people's lives. For organizations

that want to get a foot into the door anstart meeting individual donors and family foundations, asking existing grantees to make introductions and how to proceed is often a good place to start. Philanthropic advisors are often the next critical actors to reach and influence.

Some individual donors who are supporters of women's rights tend to be very vocal and active. Working with these individuals to leverage support from others can be another strategy. Individuals that are able to make significant contributions are often influential people in society who can play an important role in shifting public opinion, or influencing other wealthy individuals in the context of affinity groups, conferences and other platforms.

Because tapping into this sector requires a major investment of time and resources, some respondents propose a 'division of labour' where women's funds, especially those in middle and higher income countries, taking the lead. The fact that most women's funds have an understanding of both sides of the grantor/grantee relationship seems to position them well to connect with individual donors and harness their resources for disbursement to women's organizations globally. In regions with an emerging culture of philanthropy, it could be strategic for women's funds and large women's rights organizations to come together in a joint fundraising campaign to generate visibility and mobilize greater individual resources for women's rights.

Chapter 7

Trends in Women's Funds⁷³

Characteristics and dynamics

A relatively new development in women's movements globally is the growing number of women's funds and their ability to raise and multiply resources. Women's funds are publicly supported institutions, relying on donations from donor agencies, corporations and the general public. Women's funds are committed to mobilizing financial, human and technical resources to support the rights of women and girls in marginalized communities. They are also committed to long-term asset-building, ie investments in endowments, real estate and other assets that grow in value over the years. Their overall goal is to build a substantial resource base to ensure the sustainability of women's initiatives and solutions in many parts of the world.

The first known women's fund to support organizations working outside of the Global North was established in The Netherlands in 1983, soon followed by others in the US, Mexico, Brazil, Nicaragua, Chile, Nepal, India, Mongolia, Hong Kong, Ghana, South Africa, Ukraine, Slovak Republic, Czech Republic, Serbia, Bulgaria and Australia. In 2004, women's funds held roughly USD 24 million in net assets⁷⁴, earned USD 28 million in revenue and disbursed approximately 15 million in grants⁷⁵. It is estimated that around 25% of their combined annual revenue is raised from individuals.⁷⁶ Women's funds have created their own learning communities where they exchange experiences, discuss developments in women's rights and social change philanthropy, and provide and receive technical assistance.⁷⁷

Respondents to AWID's online survey most frequently mentioned women's funds as a funding source in 2004. While this is partly the result of other sources of funding decreasing (for example in Eastern

73 This chapter is partly based on an article by Bisi Adelye Fayemi and Ellen Sprenger for Alliance Magazine, Volume 9, number 3, September 2004.

74 Of total net assets (USD 24 million) the GFW holds around 86% (USD 20.7 million). Also, the GFW represents half of the total grantmaking budget (USD 7.4 million) and a little over 60% of revenue (USD 17.4 million).

75 Data are based on the Women's Funding Network database, communications with staff from the Global Fund for Women and annual reports. Of this amount around USD 7.5 million is disbursed by the Global Fund for Women, USD 3 million is disbursed Mama Cash and the remaining USD 4.5 million by women's funds based in the Global South and the Central and Eastern Europe region (based on data from 2004).

76 For the GFW this percentage is 35%, for Mama Cash almost 30% and for Semillas around 25%.

77 Examples are the International Network of Women's Funds, a network of women's funds working in regions and countries other than the Global North (see <http://www.inwf.org/>) and the Women's Funding Network (www.wfnet.org) a membership organization that specializes in tool development and technical assistance on fundraising, measuring social impact and organizational development.

Europe as the Open Society Institute slowly pulls out), it also shows that despite their total grantmaking being small, women's funds are reaching a large number of women's organizations globally. The women's funds themselves indicated that the numbers of funding requests are growing and they increasingly feel the pressure to raise larger amounts of money.

Women's funds usually donate small amounts and mostly to groups with budgets under USD 100,000. Grant size varies from USD 15,000 on average (for the Global Fund for Women) to between USD 1,000 and USD 8,000 for most other women's funds. Some occasionally also support organizations with bigger grants. Women's funds generally reject a project-cycle, piecemeal approach and are especially interested in core institutional support. Some are increasingly also providing multi-year support.

Program officers at most women's funds work with advisers to make decisions about focus areas for different regions where the funds work. Through their networks of volunteer advisers the funds make funding decisions, while keeping costs as low as possible. These on-the-ground expert advisers identify grantees and provide mentoring and monitoring. In addition, they give their feedback on developments and priorities in the different regions and countries and are actively involved in strategy development of the women's funds.⁷⁸ While women's funds, just like other funders, insist on funding proposals, checks and balances, contracts and monitoring reports, many interviewees confirmed that the fact the donor-grantee relationship is grounded in a shared passion for women's rights makes the relationship different. Women's funds do seek to make fundraising less of a bureaucratic experience than with most other funders. Some women's funds have been essential in providing resources to organizations from highly marginalized sectors of women's movements with limited access funding such as lesbians, rural women, peasant and indigenous women and young women. In some cases, resources coming from women's funds are the only ones available to support these groups.

Potential challenges associated with women's funds

While the steady growth of women's funds, both in number and amount of money raised, is an important achievement, it is by no means enough to fill the gap in funding that women's organizations are experiencing

78 For example, in April 2005, the GFW organized a meeting with members of its advisory council for Latin America and the Caribbean. Advisors provided feedback, contextual perspectives and strategic guidance on the issues and groups the GFW supports. These recommendations have been key in the development of a GFW strategic plan for the region, which were discussed and ratified by the GFW Board of Directors.

The Global Fund for Women's fundraising success story

At the end of its recent fiscal year (2004-2005) the GFW's net assets amounted to USD 20.7 million—an increase of 37% over the previous year. Actual expenses were USD 11.8 million (an increase of 29%) of which USD 7.5 million went out in grants. Importantly, of its total USD 17.4 million revenue for the year, around 35%, or USD 6 million, was raised from individuals. In fact, over an 18 month period, the Fund was able to double its individual donor base from 8,000 to 15,000. They attribute their success to a combination of factors including their investment in external marketing and PR expertise. Ironically, in the US, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have created a new awareness of the lives and challenges of women 'overseas'. Finally, their success has also been thanks to the leadership of the Global Fund for Women, which had the vision and was able to make the necessary investments. The Fund is currently experimenting with web-based fundraising with the use of self-run, peer-to-peer software that will enable them to grow even further.

(Based on interviews with GFW staff)

all over the world. While one might argue that this was never the intention to begin with, the fact that women's funds are the most frequently mentioned source of funding in 2004 in the AWID survey does raise this issue.

The donor-grantee relationship is grounded in a shared passion for women's rights.

Just like all other grant seeking organizations women's funds struggle with the fact that their own donors tend to prefer project and restricted funding as opposed to core support. There is also a great concern about an overall decrease in funds from foundations and donor institutions. At the same time, our research uncovered some concerns about competition. Women's funds and women's rights organizations are often applying to the same limited group of donors. While women's funds have developed fundraising as an area of expertise and core competence, other women's organizations do not have the same levels of resources available. Some respondents argued that it is not helpful to think in terms of competition since we are all working towards the same overall goals. Others shared their frustration with cases where women's funds would receive the larger grants over women's rights organizations because they were sub-granting to small groups – a fact that made them more attractive to large donors.

Connected to this is the issue of grant size. The fact that the vast majority of women's funds money goes out in very small grants and mostly to groups with small budgets raises a number of strategic questions regarding their long-term ability to strengthen feminist movements as a whole. In other words, some may question how strategic a grantmaking strategy is based on the notion of 'letting a thousand flowers bloom'. Such a strategy seems to diminish the potential for bigger and longer term work that costs more than USD 10,000, a typical grant size.

Opportunities

Women's funds are increasingly successful in bringing in large numbers of individuals, as members and as donors, and are building long-term assets⁷⁹ that in due time will give them considerable independence. These funds clearly represent a key opportunity for further mobilization of resources for women's rights and it is important to strategize together on how this can best be done. The biggest opportunity is thus to engage in this conversation and start exploring how the assets of women's funds can become vital investments to much more powerful global women's rights and feminist movements.

⁷⁹ Long term assets include an endowment (see definition in Annex 1: glossary), financial mechanisms such as a working capital reserve or capital depletion fund, which make flexible funding available over a longer period of time, for purposes such as cash shortfalls and core operations as well as investments in real estate or land.

Strategy ideas to leverage more resources from women's funds

Some would say this group is the de facto 'fundraising wing' of women's rights movements. Most staff are feminists as well as fundraising experts, located all over the world and making the case for women's rights work in philanthropic and development aid communities. Yet deeper negotiations with women's funds around questions of grant size and issue focus are needed. The overarching question that needs to be raised regards their long-term vision for women's movements globally. In other words, how do women's funds see their role in this changing funding landscape? And how do other women's movements see the role of women's funds? Clarifying what is perceived as the most strategic investment for their USD 15 million is critical (for example, one idea is to apply a large share of that to an ambitious global fundraising campaign).

The unprecedented success of the Global Fund for Women's fundraising campaign begs the question: what could this model, experience, technology, connections and marketing strategies generate if it was scaled up to, say, all the G8 countries? It is important to determine how women's funds can develop new models and ways of working that enable them to further accelerate growth, with a focus on areas where other women's organizations are comparatively weaker in their fundraising ability (ie individual giving).

While most women's funds have been frequently recognized as the 'easiest' or 'most supportive' donors of women's rights groups, there have also been challenges in these funding relationships. Women's funds are not always inherently better than other funders in their grant-making practices and relationships to women's rights organizations and some of them do not have a clear women's rights approach. Ongoing dialogue with women's rights organizations would be helpful for providing women's funds with feedback, holding them accountable to their missions, and engaging in shared agenda-setting and broader movement building issues.

How do women's funds see their role in this changing funding landscape?

And how do other women's movements see the role of women's funds?

Chapter 8

Trends in Corporate Giving / Philanthropy⁸⁰

Characteristics and dynamics

Corporate philanthropy involves a corporation donating a part of its profit or resources to other organizations. It may reflect a commitment to social responsibility, which is the integration of positive social values in the business model as a whole. At the same time, there may be other cases where philanthropy is used to garner a favourable public image to offset critiques of other, less-responsible corporate practices.

In the US, corporate philanthropy began during the Industrial Revolution as a handful of individuals acquired an enormous amount of wealth. They created charitable trusts intended to serve public needs, mostly in communities directly surrounding their factories. Many of the large independent foundations that are so well-known today, such as Carnegie, Rockefeller, Kellogg, and Ford grew from endowments established by this generation of corporate philanthropists in the early 1900s. In Europe, corporate philanthropy developed much later, mostly due to existing government support for social programs. And in Japan, corporate philanthropy started during the 1960s and 1970s as Japanese corporations came under attack for the negative effects, eg environmental pollution and a steep rise in land prices, of the rapid economic development they were propelling. In Russia, corporate philanthropy is rapidly developing, but mostly motivated by government expectations that corporations take joint responsibility with them for social programs. Corporate philanthropy or corporate social responsibility agendas have also developed in numerous other countries.

Today, corporate giving programs have become institutionalized and professionalized in most major companies. There are basically three corporate giving strategies, classified as:

1. Charity: promotion of the public good (high social interest, low commercial interest).
2. Strategic: To support the long-term success of the business and to promote the public good (high social interest and high commercial interest).
3. Commercial: To promote the product/company (low social interest, high commercial interest).

⁸⁰ Based on data from the Conference Board (a not-for-profit organization that promotes corporate giving and produces research on trends in corporate giving, <http://www.conference-board.org/>); Chronicle of Philanthropy (see among others: Big Business Doing More for Charity: Corporations plan increases after giving dropped in 2003, by Ian Wilhelm, 2003); Council of Foundations Corporate Affinity Group, Community to Encourage Corporate Philanthropy (CECP) and their Corporate Giving Standards.

The largest corporate giving programs are driven by either strategic or commercial interests. Their motivations generally include some combination of wanting to acquire greater market share, improve public image (especially for those industries that have an image problem), and to encourage staff motivation and competition in the labour market. Corporations often base their giving on previous years' earnings. Thus with a strong economy, corporations, especially those with long traditions of giving large sums, are increasing donations significantly. Overall corporate giving programs are facing a large rise in the number of requests they receive.

Where corporate giving in the earlier years focused primarily on community based giving (in locations directly related to the corporation's operations), over the years the brand and public image of a corporation has increasingly become the focal point. Learning from experience that child labour, bad working conditions in sweatshops, health hazards or environmental pollution negatively impacts their bottom line, some corporations have come to believe that consumers not only want a product they can afford, but one they can feel good about using.

In today's global economy there are a growing number of instances where corporations are expanding their giving agendas across borders and issue-areas. Most international corporate giving consists of non-cash contributions such as goods or services (56% among US corporations). A handful of companies offer unrestricted grants for general operating support, while most prefer restricted grants with concrete outcomes and deliverables. There is also a trend toward increasing donations of staff time through volunteer programs. In terms of sectors supported, 'Health and Human Services' is the top priority among corporations, making up 41% of corporate giving. 'Cause marketing' is growing (ie branding of giving by connecting the industry or product with one charitable cause, for example breast cancer in the case of the Avon Foundation).

A more recent development is where corporate philanthropy is tied to the revenue stream of a product. This is called consumer philanthropy, ie where consumers are made aware that a percentage of the sales price of a particular product goes to a designated cause or organization.

An active community of corporations with giving programs exists, especially in the US. For example as part of the Council of Foundations, the Corporate Affinity Group and the Corporate Contributions Council (that includes heads of philanthropy departments and foundations of the Fortune 500 in the US) have meetings twice a year.

A look at the Nike Foundation

Nike allocates 3% of its (previous year) pre-tax income to its corporate giving program. In 2004 this was around USD 37 million of which around half went out in products and in-kind services and the other half in the form of cash donations. In 2005 it re-launched its foundation with a focus on young women and girls. In the search for a strategic focus for its giving program, the issue of poverty alleviation combined with the fact that 80% of factory workers are women, and indisputable data showing the need for, and importance of, investing in women, led the corporation to conclude that a focus on young women and girls has the highest point of leverage.

Many corporations are quite conservative in their giving because their focus is on making money and their giving program cannot distract from that. But there are often push and pull factors. For example, some feel that corporations have been ahead of many governments in their commitment to diversity. While there is still a lot of progress to be made, corporations tend to understand the business case for diversity. Or as one interviewee noted,

“Corporations look at things in terms of self-interest. Once they are sold on it, they are often quite solid. It is about finding that self interest.”

Some feel that corporations have been ahead of many governments in their commitment to diversity.

Based on the survey and interview results corporate sector support is in the bottom three in terms of most frequently mentioned sources of funding for women’s rights, though it moved up slightly between 2000 and 2004. Research conducted in Brazil shows that only 10% of corporate giving promotes women’s rights⁸¹. Yet some women’s rights groups have sought collaboration with the private sector with positive results. In Latin America, there are interesting experiences such as one group that was able to convince a utility company to include an anti-violence against women slogan on all the bills it sent out as part of the 16 Days of Activism Against Violence Against Women Campaign. Others say they have reached agreements with local companies that allow them to use meeting space or supplies for meetings and conferences.

Challenges associated with funding from the corporate foundations

While there are some interesting new developments, most corporate giving programs are still an add-on, do not include gender equality objectives, and are not linked to overall social responsibility and accountability of the corporation. Also, the vast majority of funds still go out in the form of products or basic health care services, rather than in terms of financial support. Generally speaking corporate cash donations are small and can take a lot of time and negotiations, especially when the corporation sees the donation as part of its marketing efforts. In this sense, there is a risk involved if the corporate donors are only providing support to make themselves look good and drive up their sales. At the least there needs to be recognition of the importance of mutual benefit. Thus some caution is important in accepting funds or other support from this sector.

Women’s rights are highly contested in many cases and as such, they can be intimidating to corporations who are concerned about their public image. As one representative of a corporate foundation explained,

81 Interview with Amalia Fisher of the Angela Borba Fund, Brazil.

“Corporations clearly see the consumer power of women. And there is tons of research and evidence pointing to the fact that focusing on women makes complete sense to a corporation. But when you add in the rights work: - that will make many corporations very wary. Make it a comfortable experience.”

Many women’s rights groups are also cautious of what are promoted as national level “public private partnerships”. They see that they often take the shape of collaborations with the private sector that aim to compensate for systematic disinvestments in the state’s capacity to provide essential services to citizens. So the challenge is to find opportunities to work with corporations, while still also holding the state accountable to its commitments and responsibilities.

Opportunities

Corporations can be motivated to do things if they are rooted in corporate history and culture and if it makes ‘business sense’. For example, in the case of the Levi Strauss Foundation, an annual budget of USD 10 million goes to women and youth because of the history of the founders, who implanted social justice values in the corporation. After it was established, research related to the company’s anti-poverty focus made clear that women are the most affected by poverty and that, through women, you reach whole families. It was then decided to focus their philanthropy squarely on women and youth. Youth represent the company’s market and women are the majority of employees, who sell the products and work in the factories. And because Levi Strauss sees itself as an ‘edgy’ company, they are not afraid to take on issues such as rights, sexuality or collaborations with NGOs. More importantly the Levi Strauss corporation has a strong commitment to social responsibility. For example, in 1991, and in response to external criticisms, they became the first worldwide company to establish a comprehensive ethical code of conduct for manufacturing and finishing contractors working with the company. This includes prioritizing the strengthening of workers’ rights and improving working and living conditions in communities where third-party contractors make their products.

Corporate responsibility and accountability discussions help corporations ask important questions about their role. This is a good wave to ride and grantees can push corporations in healthy and efficient ways. However, along with corporate resources comes the responsibility to actively monitor the other dimensions of their work so that a giving program and its grantees are not manipulated to cover up for other less-responsible corporate practices, or labour rights violations that directly affect in many cases thousands of women employees in their factories.

Strategy ideas to leverage more resources from corporate philanthropy

Because of the potential challenges and conflicts that many respondents identify as likely to accompany financial support from corporate sources, this sector ranks as a relatively low priority. However, there is also a sense that it is important to keep in view as a potential long-term source of support. As one respondent explained “it’s not a question of always or never, but when to take corporate money.” In this sense, the strategy might be two-fold. On the one hand, identify ‘champions’ within the corporate community. Members from the corporate giving community tend to influence each other, so the focus should be on current (for example the Levi Strauss Foundation) or potential ‘champions’ to find ways to work with or support them to influence other corporate foundations or philanthropists.

It’s not a question of always or never, but when to take corporate money.


On the other hand, explore the possibilities by looking for a fit and keeping in mind the self-interest of a corporation. Some women’s rights organizations have had positive experiences with corporate philanthropy by keeping very clear of the potential pitfalls and challenges. Corporations are essentially interested in the bottom line and corporate giving programs are also expected to make business sense. Nonetheless, consumer philanthropy, as described above, seems an area that, after an initial investment, could generate a lot of revenue for the long term. Similarly, corporations may show interest in contributing to fundraising events, especially galas, dinners and luncheons with influential people attending, which raise their profile while benefiting the organization. Thirdly, women’s organizations could be working with the private sector to establish services and products, for example financial services, that are more favourable to women’s organizations.

Chapter 9

Women's Rights Organizations: feeling the funding shifts

How are the trends and shifts among different kinds of funders being felt by women's rights organizations in practice? This chapter looks at how these groups say they are experiencing funding trends. The information is organized by region and draws from the interviews with representatives of women's organizations, a survey AWID conducted with the assistance of Redfern Research in the spring of 2005 among four hundred women's organizations globally⁸², and a detailed analysis of financial information provided by grantees of the Global Fund for Women. Table 1 reflects the regional distribution of respondents to the AWID survey.


Table 1



In terms of annual revenue of their organization for 2004 respondents were organized in three groups: under USD 100K (68%), of which almost half (37% of total) had revenue under USD 20,000) between USD 100-500K (24%) and USD 500K and more (8%). Overall revenue ranges per region are as follows:


82 More detailed results from the survey are in Annex 4.

Table 2




While many women's rights organizations are seeking to further diversify their funding base, and are focusing on new fundraising strategies and potential sources, only a handful of groups seem to feel hopeful about their fundraising prospects. Most are convinced that overall funding levels for women's rights work are static or declining. As indicated in Table 3, approximately one half say their own organization is receiving less funding now than five years ago. This is evident in all regions but most commonly reported in Latin America and the Caribbean (as per table 4). Around 25% say they receive more funding now than five years ago and for approximately 25% funding levels have remained the same.

Table 3



While many women's rights organizations are seeking to further diversify their funding base, and are focusing on new fundraising strategies and potential sources, only a handful of groups seem to feel hopeful about their fundraising prospects.


Table 4



Bigger organizations show the largest growth levels while most of the smaller organizations with budgets less than 100K experienced static or decreasing budgets. According to the survey, 20% of the organizations with revenue under 100K and 21% of organizations with revenue between USD100-500K have experienced a decrease in revenue between 1995 and 2004. For the group with revenue over 500K only 6% experienced a decrease. This finding was echoed in many interviews, where representatives of women's rights organizations noted that funders seem to prefer supporting larger, well-established organizations and are much less willing to support smaller or relatively new groups. Representatives of many of the large regional or international women's rights organizations that grew considerably in the mid/late nineties say they have been able to maintain the same donors for several years and in some cases even ten years, though they too are concerned about potential future decreases and are working hard to further diversify their funding base.


When comparing growth data, we find some interesting and potentially contradictory results. On one hand groups reported overwhelmingly that they felt it was harder to raise funds, yet as Table 5 and 6 illustrate a significant percentage were able to increase their budgets. The research found an interesting correlation that those with larger budgets were able to apply their resources to fundraising. Nonetheless, the middle and higher budget categories experience less growth in the period 2000-2004 than in 1995-2000. Most organizations reported that it took more to raise the same amounts over the years.

Table 5



The results also show a large percentage of organizations with static revenue over the study period.

Table 6




The results also show a large percentage of organizations with static revenue over the study period. When analysing this data it is important to keep in mind the effects of inflation and purchasing power – the latter having potentially decreased dollar values by 20 percent⁸³. In other words, while total revenue may have risen or stayed the same, the real value of these funds has not increased as much. Furthermore, budget declines may have eliminated some organizations entirely, making their inclusion in the survey impossible.

83 Between 1995 and 2004, the purchasing power of the US dollar declined domestically by approximately 20%. Between 2000 and 2004 alone, the US dollar fell 9% domestically. While this percentage will vary in different parts of the world, these facts should be borne in mind when considering the trend data presented in this report. This also explains the difference between Table 3 (based on a general impression) and Table 5 and 6 (based on actual budget analysis).

Those who have improved their funding situation tend to credit favourable changes to their own leadership and fundraising capacities alongside favourable donor agendas. Those who have lost funding tend to attribute this to changes in donor focus, a decline in funding overall, and the current political and economic climate. Those with less funding do not generally blame their own approach or efforts.

Where is the money coming from? On average over the last ten years, the most common revenue sources for women’s rights work for the period 1995-2004 have been development assistance and public foundations (almost the same), followed by women’s funds and large independent foundations⁸⁴.

Table 7



It is worth noting that women’s funds have shown a significant increase in importance over the last ten years. In 2004 women’s funds are the most often quoted source of funding (see Table 7). We also see that the relative importance of funding from individuals has decreased between 1995 and 2004, as has revenue from membership dues and religious sources. Family foundations are showing a slight increase as do local government sources and income generation. The number of times corporate sector giving was mentioned as a source of funding remained largely the same.

Funding trends on issues and kinds of activities: With the exception of North America and Western Europe, all regions indicate that it is more difficult to raise funds for non-HIV/AIDS related health issues, reproductive rights, sexual and LGBT rights, and civic/political rights.

84 An analysis of almost 1,400 Global Fund for Women grantees over the period of 1999 – 2005, shows a similar pattern.

Those surveyed felt that it is significantly easier to raise funds for issues such as HIV/AIDS-related health issues and work on gender-based violence.

In terms of the kinds of activities supported, respondents from all regions indicate that it is hardest to find funding for staff salaries, administration and capacity building. They perceive it to be significantly easier to raise funds for media, technology and communications work, leadership development, and linking and networking.

Table 8





Table 9



Trends in fundraising: More than a half of organizations surveyed say that it is generally harder to raise funds now than it was ten years ago. Only 24% say it is easier. The majority of respondents also say that they are spending more time fundraising now than they did ten years ago. Organizations with budgets over 500k all spend either the same or more time fundraising. There are no significant regional differences.

Table 10



It is hardest to find funding for staff salaries, administration and capacity building.

The fundraising tasks at women’s rights organizations are carried most heavily by the executive directors, especially in organizations with budgets between 100-500K. In these organizations, the directors on average take on 45% of the fundraising work. For the most part, organizations invest in professional fundraising staff only after they reach the 500K threshold. Board involvement in fundraising tends to decrease as budgets grow and very few organizations (regardless of budget size) hire outside expertise to help with fundraising and marketing. While organizations have tried to respond to increased funding challenges by expending more time on fundraising, it is unclear to what extent these efforts are paying off overall. One interviewee expressed her frustration that,

“The ones who best work the system get the money, and not necessarily the ones who understand the issue and have been working on it for some time”.

Many representatives of women’s rights organizations interviewed explained that they have become experts at refining their discourse to adjust to shifting donor interests, while still remaining true to their core work and principles. On the other hand, some of these same groups

and several funders expressed concerns that in their effort to fit so many donor 'boxes', groups end up over-extending their workloads and promising more than they are really capable of taking on. Some say it is increasingly difficult to develop holistic strategies because projects are isolated (funded by different sources) and it is difficult to fit them into a coherent overarching agenda because of donor funding boxes. One director of a women's rights group noted her frustration that fundraising and donor demands have led her to hire increasingly 'technical' staff, with little political or feminist experience, but strong skills in completing logframes, and developing and reporting on impact indicators.

At the same time, there are some women's rights advocates who like fundraising—engaging donors in a dialogue, educating, persuading and finding creative ways to connect donor interests with strategic women's rights agendas. One interviewee noted that fundraising is ostensibly advocacy as "funders are increasingly policymakers in the field". Through talking to donors, they are making the case for what the solutions are to women's rights (and other) problems.

Regional trends

Sub-Saharan Africa

There is a perception among many women's rights groups that while funding cutbacks are common in many regions, Africa is one of the few continents where donors continue to pour in substantial amounts of money. And it is true that many African countries continue to qualify for sizable development assistance based on the same human development indicators that have risen and 'disqualified' other countries for aid (despite growing levels of inequality). Yet many African activists note that while large sums of aid are going to Africa, women and women's rights issues are receiving little benefit. As one leader of an African women's organization stated:


*"Do others think Africa is getting increasing levels of resources?
Women's organizations are getting less in fact.
The bilaterals increasingly focus on governments and the big
Global Fund for HIV/AIDS does not address the needs of women.
Maybe the money comes to Africa, but to whom in Africa?"*

Of the survey respondents from this region 28% experienced static funding levels in the last five years, 49% experienced a decline, 18% an increase and 5% were unable to answer the question. This is very much in line with the experiences of the different regions combined.

Yet many African activists note that while large sums of aid are going to Africa, women and women's rights issues are receiving little benefit.

Table 11 shows the top funding sources for African NGOs on average over the last ten years. Development assistance and public foundations are the top two sources of funding for women's organizations in the region. When comparing data for 2000 and 2004 however, it turns out that both these sources show a significant decrease. The number of times local governments and large independent foundations were mentioned as sources of support remained fairly stable in the last ten years. Women's funds on the other hand show a steady increase and in 2004 they form the third most frequently mentioned source of support, after public foundations and development assistance. Support from individuals, corporate sector and family foundations is growing as well, though quite minimally. The number of times religious sources were mentioned decreased considerably since 2000.

Table 11



New aid modalities are having a huge impact on the funding for and politics of women's movements. As discussed in Chapter 3, the bulk of development assistance to the region has shifted in recent years to 'government to government', meaning that less of this funding is available for NGOs generally. In this context, NGOs are expected to access funds through their national government, while at the same time, they are encouraged by donors to play an advocacy or monitoring role to hold their governments accountable to their commitments.

Similar to most regions of the world, informants report that it is easiest to raise money for HIV/AIDS as well as gender-based violence related initiatives. Sexual and LGBT rights and reproductive rights work are most difficult for which to fundraise.

Table 12 i





Table 12 ii




North Africa and Middle East

Of the survey respondents from this region, 25% experienced static funding levels in the last five years, 61% experienced a decline and 14% an increase. Compared to the global picture, the Middle East / North Africa is experiencing a harder time than average. This is ironic considering the recent use of women's rights as part of the justification for attacks in Afghanistan and Iraq. While there are huge flows of money into the region, very little of these funds benefit women. Many activists say that corruption is a challenge and that groups with the right connections are the ones to receive benefit from external funding flows. At the same time, some countries in the region, like Egypt, are losing donor interest because of growing per capita income levels.

Many activists say that corruption is a challenge and that groups with the right connections are the ones to receive benefit.

Table 13



Public foundations are the number one financial supporters mentioned by groups in the region, though they are less frequently mentioned in 2000 and 2004 than they were in 1995 (Table 13). Development assistance is the second ranked source of support, followed by large independent foundations, whose support has decreased since 2000. The number of times women’s funds are mentioned has decreased since 1995, which makes this region the only region that shows a reduction. Support through religious sources was highest in 1995 and has gone down since. Corporate sector support as well as local government support gradually increased, and family foundations and individual support show a slight increase as well. Organizations interviewed credit this in part to support they have received from international women’s rights organizations who have helped them make connections with individuals and small foundations.

Yet several interviewees spoke to their frustrations from past experience with public foundations/INGOs and development assistance agencies. A majority of funding for work on women’s rights is said to go directly to the governmental ‘women’s machineries’, which were, after all, a core demand of NGOs that was realized following Beijing. However, as one interviewee explained:

“post Beijing resources go to [government] machineries, which so far have had a very disappointing portfolio ... they represent what states look like in terms of lack of democratic practice, lack of accountability... none of them talk about serious women’s issues.”

While these government agencies could potentially have greater reach than NGOs, the challenge is that similar to many other regions, they are often headed by the first lady, another female relative of an influential

politician or someone else who does not necessarily have the experience or background needed for running the program.

Many interviewees also expressed a strong criticism of large INGOs present in the region, based on the perception that they dedicate much of their funding to their own administration, housing and cars for personnel, and security expenses, with only a small share reaching local programming efforts. There is also some frustration that these organizations draw off the most skilled staff from local groups, paying them very large salaries for the context. Another interviewee said her organization was devastated when their primary funder, an INGO, cut their funding with little warning. This experience forced the organization to downsize and scramble to find more diverse, if smaller, sources of funding. Now she says, “we feel that what is more important than funding is the [donor] organization you work with and the fact that your partner should be a like-minded, feminist organization”.

Between the governmental offices on women’s issues and INGOs, several women’s rights activists in the region say they are hard-pressed to secure funding.

“All of these are branches of the current dominant institutions. For organizations like us [small, local NGO]... you go to UNDP and they say ‘work with the national machinery’. You go to smaller donors and find yourself competing with these big organizations [INGOs].”

For many, the external funding groups receive is subject to very complex, slow and expensive processes to enter the country. Funding is often held up by national governments and it can take up to six months for funds to be released. Women’s rights organizations are also feeling the impact of the USA Patriot Act and Voluntary Guidelines, as their granters ask a growing number of questions about their political positions and connections, which make fundraising processes more elaborate and time consuming.

Negative experiences with some INGOs in certain countries have led governments to crack down on all NGOs and there is growing public opinion that casts NGOs as ‘traitors’ to their country – because of assumptions about the agendas that come with foreign funding. This has constrained the ability of some women’s rights groups to even accept funding from certain external sources (particularly from the US). This is a huge ongoing debate in the region that is exacerbated in some cases by the donors. For example, there was a recent instance where a US government official announced to the press that funding would be going directly to NGOs in order to ‘pressure the government on democracy’, creating a major public uproar.

There is growing public opinion that casts NGOs as ‘traitors’ to their country – because of assumptions about the agendas that come with foreign funding.

Finally, several interviewees also mentioned frustration that donors do not ‘do their homework’ and that much funding goes to ‘shell’ NGOs headed by prominent women but with minimal programming actually being implemented.

Issues that are relatively easy to fundraise for include programs addressing gender-based violence and HIV/AIDS-related issues. Hardest are civic/political rights and participation, sexual rights/LGBT rights, reproductive rights and health issues not related to HIV/AIDS. One interviewee expressed her frustration at donors’ preferences saying:

“Look at FGM [female genital mutilation]. We can get funding for awareness raising that has nothing to do with women’s empowerment. But we can’t find support for something beyond counting the number of clitorises that have been cut.”

Table 14 i






Table 14 ii



Latin America and the Caribbean

Of the survey respondents from this region 11% experienced largely static funding levels in the last five years, 74% experienced a decline and 14% an increase. Compared to other regions, Latin America and the Caribbean have experienced the greatest reduction in funding levels.

Table 15



When looking at the funding sources mentioned by survey respondents between 1995 and 2004, development assistance is the source most frequently mentioned. Second are public foundations, with a slight decrease between 2000 and 2004. Women's funds have increased in importance and so have large independent foundations, although to a lesser extent. Support from individuals, membership dues, family foundations and local governments show a slight increase. Religious sources are less frequently mentioned in 2004 than they were in 2000.

Through the mid 90s, gender was a big issue on the public, political agenda in Latin America and the Caribbean. Leading up to and shortly after the Beijing conference, funding was going to grassroots organizations, groups of rural women, and women in trade unions. There was extensive support for women's organizations generally, which led to a blossoming of many new groups. But in the years after Beijing, there was a growing tendency to form 'issue silos'—for funders to target specific issue, such as reproductive health or education. So organizations that did not have a clear issue profile started to lose their funding. During this time, many of the regional and sub-regional networks suffered drastic funding cuts because of their focus on areas such as leadership development and movement building. Some lost all funding and continue to the extent possible on a volunteer basis, using resources from the offices of their various volunteers.

'Gender is now passé'. Activists in the region note a significant decrease in the number of women's organizations and in the resources available for gender equality work. They see that even gender offices (state ministries or women's departments), which many fought to build over the last decade, tend to be highly under-resourced and have limited legitimacy in the eyes of other government actors. The exception to this bleak scene appears to be a handful of large, well-established organizations that have been active for several decades, and who have continued to attract donor support.

In general, despite widening income inequality in the region, indicators showing reductions in overall poverty levels have meant that many donors are pulling out of the region entirely. One interviewee emphasized that Caribbean countries have been particularly hard-hit by funding cutbacks. Those donors that remain in the region tend to focus primarily on Central America, the Andean region, and Brazil. They are also operating with new aid modalities and greater conditionalities than in the past. For example, as in Africa, development assistance in the region is increasingly channelled through the state, reducing direct funding available for NGOs and social movements. Some raise concerns about the influence of donor governments (in particular the US) on national policy, for example on issues relating to sexual and reproductive rights. Others say that while they have been able to take advantage of funding from their national governments, it is usually focused on areas such as health and education, and the bureaucracy to access these funds presents a major challenge. Grant sizes tend to be relatively small but applying for them is extremely time and labour intensive.

"The movement face of NGOs is challenged by the increased premium placed on policy-relevant activities and by their contractual relationships to states and donors who expect visible, short-term "results" on gender projects. Such exigencies may undermine NGOs' ability to pursue more process-oriented forms of feminist cultural-political intervention—such as consciousness-raising, popular education or other strategies aimed [at] transforming those gender power relations..."⁸⁵

They face donor demands to develop strategic plans and thorough program evaluations, without funding being allocated for these activities.

Longstanding feminist allies within various donor agencies and foundations have fewer resources to invest in the region and are themselves forced to impose greater conditionalities than in past years. Some attribute this to the increasing pressure they are under to make more efficient use of resources and to justify their spending within their own institutions. Groups working on women's rights in the region say that it is extremely difficult to secure funding for administrative expenses or salaries. In addition, they face donor demands to develop strategic plans and thorough program evaluations, without funding being allocated for these activities.

⁸⁵ Alvarez, Sonia E. (1998). *Advocating Feminism: The Latin American Feminist NGO "Boom"*. Retrieved May 19, 2005 from <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/latam/schomburgmoreno/alvarez.html>

Table 16 i





Table 16 ii



Some groups also note a funder shift toward service delivery approaches, which they see fitting with the economic policies being pushed in many countries by multilateral development institutions. One representative of a women's rights organization describes the challenge this poses for her organization. She described how the World Bank gives funding to the national government for leadership training with women heads of household. The government seeks out an NGO to subcontract to perform the training. So in a context where any kind of funding for women's rights work is difficult to obtain, the organization must decide whether they take the funding to do work that is peripherally related to their agenda and that the state is controlling; or do they go without the funding and try to survive while maintaining a focus on their core agenda. This is a dilemma increasingly faced by groups doing women's rights work in the region.


HIV/AIDS is one issue that is relatively easy to fundraise for in the region, though some interviewees said that it is difficult to track how the large government funding allocations are actually spent and whether they are reaching women. Linking and networking as well as leadership development are also mentioned as issues for which it is relatively easy to fundraise.

South and South East Asia and Pacific

Of the survey respondents from this region, 21% experienced largely static funding levels in the last five years, 52% experienced a decline and 27% an increase. Comparing this region to others, the picture follows the general pattern.

As Table 17 shows, women’s funds are the most frequently mentioned source of support for groups working in the region, showing significant growth over the last decade. They are followed by development assistance sources and public foundations, both of which have decreased in relative importance since 2000. Membership dues show a strong decrease while support from local government sources and individuals has remained relatively constant. After a significant increase in importance between 1995 and 2000, support from large independent foundations appears static.

Table 17



The December 2004 tsunami generated a surge of funding into the affected countries. However women’s rights organizations say that again they are receiving little benefit from, or access to, these resources. One interviewee from Indonesia explained that even before the tsunami, many INGOs had become active as “executing agencies” on the local level, so that rather than working through existing organizations, they

were building up staff (draining qualified staff from national organizations) and implementing their own programs. According to some respondents, this trend was exacerbated by the tsunami. These frustrations echo similar concerns voiced by women's rights activists in the Middle East—that the INGOs have infrastructures and resources that facilitate their access to donors and enhance their ability to produce quick and efficient proposals with the 'right' language.

There is a sense among women's rights activists in the region that women-specific funding is shrinking and becoming woven into general governance and decentralization agendas. The MDGs are also having a strong influence on donor priorities, which poses a challenge for women's rights activists who want to work beyond the issue of girls' education.

Table 18 i





Table 18 ii



Many NGOs do not want to get money from the World Bank because it leaves them open to strong criticism from other civil society groups.

Multi-donor trust funds are a growing trend, particularly in Indonesia. These are funds pooled by development assistance agencies (donor governments, regional development banks, etc.) and often coordinated by a single donor, such as the World Bank, with well-established and efficient financial management systems. The trust funds are governed by a committee that includes representatives from each of the participating donor agencies. One women's rights activist says that the problem is that many NGOs do not want to get money from the World Bank because it leaves them open to strong criticism from other civil society groups.

"For small grants, we could go directly to the British Embassy, but for more long term funding it's all through the multi-donor office ... If you want to develop long term programs you need a huge investment that you can't get from small donors or just by implementing an INGO program."

In terms of the relative ease of fundraising for different issues and activities, groups in the region say that it is easiest to raise funds for work on HIV/AIDS and gender-based violence though there is significant disagreement on the latter point). The hardest issues appear to be health work that is not HIV/AIDS related, and economic rights. As in other regions, it is hardest to raise funds for salary and administrative expenses, as well as for organizational capacity building and research/documentation.

Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CEE/CIS)


Of the survey respondents from this region, 50% experienced a decline in funding levels over the last five years, 20% have experienced largely static funding and 30% an increase. When comparing this region to other regions the picture follows similar patterns. However, more recent data from 2005 show a devastating decline in funding for women's organizations in the region.

As per Table 19, public foundations and large independent foundations are the most often mentioned sources of funding and are more or less equal. Women's funds show a growing importance and development assistance has increased as well, mostly from the United Nations and European Union. Funding from individuals has decreased over the years and other sources, such as corporate sector funding, religious sources, income generation and membership dues have remained low in the last ten years.

While standard indicators for gender equality, such as the literacy ratio between women and men and the share of women in non-agricultural wage labour, would suggest that gender issues are not a matter of great

concern in CEE/CIS, consideration of other indicators, such as employment segregation, lack of reproductive rights or levels of violence against women, show the alarming extent of gender inequality, exclusion and poverty in the region.

Table 19



After experiencing a significant 'boom' in funding following the fall of the Berlin wall and the flood of donor support that entered the region for 'democratization' agendas, the CEE/CIS region is currently witnessing a sharp decline in available funding for NGOs. With the sense that democratization is 'underway,' and a strong anti-poverty focus in Official Development Assistance, many donors have pulled out of the region entirely. Even the Open Society Institute, historically the most important funder of women's rights work in this region, is slowly pulling out its funding. This vacuum in funding is hurting women's organizations, many of whom are relatively young having started after the 1995 Beijing conference. This shift has affected women's organizations considerably. While alternative sources are being developed and tapped, interviews with activists illustrate that there is a considerable gap in funding in 2005 and that the same may be expected for 2006 as well. (This information is not reflected in Table 19).

We need to start demanding resources and lobby the EC. How come they allocate less than 0.,05% of their budget to women's rights and gender equality initiatives?

"Our office used to be on the third floor and now we are in the basement, where rent is cheap. And we had to let go of most of the staff. We are back in the trenches and I am terrified when I think about the future. Okay, maybe we should have better anticipated the departure of funders. But who thought it would go this fast? We need to start demanding resources and lobby the EC. How come they allocate less than 0.,05% of their budget to women's rights and gender equality initiatives?" (Representative of women's organization).

Because funding is so unstable, and pieced together for small projects, activists say that many women's rights organizations in the region are ill-equipped and rely on volunteer staff. They say that because of the financial insecurity, it is difficult to retain staff and many must do other part-time jobs to bring in regular income. They are also at a stage of organizational development that is very precarious, and some leaders complain of insufficient opportunities to build staff capacity, particularly on things such as proposal-writing and fundraising, necessary to resource the organization.

Many representatives from women's rights organizations that were interviewed say they are looking to European Union funding as a potential alternative source of funding. However, the application procedures are incredibly complicated and lengthy, and they have had little success to date in accessing these EU funds. In addition, requirements that groups put in at least 20% of their 'own' funding for a program or in some cases, requirements that they partner with an organization in Western Europe, serve as tremendous obstacles. In any case, as the Eurostep study revealed, the total EU budget available for women is very small. It is also subject to fierce competition, in some cases pitting NGOs against UNDP or UNIFEM, as one interviewee from the region noted.

The Institute for Social and Gender Policy (ISGP) conducted research on funding trends in Russia. Most foreign donors entered Russia in the early nineties in a response to political changes. Local philanthropy only started around 2000, through a small group of wealthy Russian individuals and families. The research found that in the last few years the amount of money donated by foreign donors is decreasing and that while the share of Russian donations is growing (16% in 2002-2004), the focus is on charity, mostly disabled people and orphans. In fact, it was found that for this group the least popular themes are human rights and especially women's rights and gender equality.

Of the amount of funds disbursed by both Russian and foreign donors, less than 0.5% was spent on women's rights and gender equality concerns. For foreign donors this was 0.48% and for Russian donors as little as 0.05%.

The research concludes that while the growth of local philanthropy is promising, the challenge is to create a culture of social justice philanthropy. Also, foreign donors are leaving the country at a much higher rate than alternative funding sources are becoming available, especially for women's rights organizations.

(Source: The donor community in Russia: Innovations and Gender Resources (based on an assessment of 98 donors, November 2004-April 2005), by: ISGP, Moscow)

Women's organizations are trying to tap into alternative sources from private and corporate philanthropy, but without a favourable tax environment or a tradition of social justice philanthropy, and often hampered by difficult, bureaucratic giving mechanisms, progress is very slow. Little support is available from national governments and what opportunities do arise are often manipulated or subject to corruption. One activist described a case where after her organization submitted a proposal, a member of the selection committee approached her asking for a bribe in order to support her proposal.

Another critical alternative, women's funds, have emerged in the Ukraine, Slovak Republic, Czech Republic, Poland, Ukraine, Serbia and Bulgaria. While an important start, these funds are building their own organizational infrastructures and it will take many more years to develop a culture of giving that goes beyond a charity orientation for women's funds to be a potential substantial source of funding for women's rights work.


Trafficking in women is perhaps the most internationally widely-known issue affecting women in the CEE/CIS region. For many donor organizations this is the only work they support in the region. While anti-trafficking funding is extremely important, unfortunately much of this money focuses on issues of migration and security, often resulting in the criminalisation of victims. Streams of funding that focus on assisting victims are often badly coordinated. For example in countries of the Western Balkans, shelters

for trafficking victims are well equipped but almost empty while shelters for victims of domestic violence are overcrowded, operate on a shoe-string budget or are closing down due to a lack of funding. These shelters could be used for victims of trafficking and function as an early warning mechanism if victims of trafficking start to request assistance. This way existing initiatives and women’s movements could be strengthened and root causes of trafficking, namely gender-based violence, could be addressed. According to Barbara Limanowska,

*“Anti-trafficking programs should be seen as components of sustainable development, anti-discrimination and anti-violence programs implemented in the region. They should support development of long-term, comprehensive programs and seek long-term solutions. Prevention of trafficking (should be) understood as addressing its root causes in the countries of origin and the demand for cheap, unprotected labour and services of victims of trafficking in the countries of destination (...).”*⁸⁶


In terms of the issues and activities most likely to get funded in the region, the survey indicated issues such as civic/political rights and participation, gender-based violence, and economic rights. Advocacy and public policy work, and medial/technology/ communications activities were considered relatively easy as well. Health not related to HIV/AIDS, sexual and LGTB rights were found to be hardest for which to secure funding.

Table 20 i



⁸⁶ Quote taken from: “Trafficking in Human Beings in South Eastern Europe, 2004 - Focus on Prevention in: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Moldova, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, and the UN Administered Province of Kosovo”, by Barbara Limanowska, United Nations Children’s Fund, United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe/Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2005, pp. 54-55.

Table 20 ii



North America and Western Europe

Of the survey respondents from this region 26% experienced largely static funding levels in the last five years, 38% experienced a decline, 33% an increase and 4% were unable to answer this question. Comparing this region to other regions this picture is better than average. It is also in this region that we find the largest percentage of organizations with budgets over 500K. Since very few Western European women's organizations participated in the survey, the picture is primarily based on the experience of US- and Canada-based organizations.


Local governments are most often mentioned as the highest source of revenue.

Historically there are about six US funders and one European funder supporting women's organizations in the US working internationally. The picture started to change in 1998 with less money becoming available for these groups due to a confluence of factors. Women's rights organizations in the US believe they are feeling funding cuts in part because more and more donors prefer to fund organizations based in the Global South, and also because many funders say the time has come to shift resources away from the UN arena and the US-based organizations that have facilitated much of the activism and advocacy around the UN. Some have experienced dramatic losses in funding, while others have been successful in diversifying, and growing new funding sources.

Large independent foundations and individuals are the most frequently mentioned revenue sources, though both show a slight decrease over time. Local governments are most often mentioned as the highest source of revenue. Family foundations are growing in importance and so are

religious sources of funding. Corporate sector support, local government support and development assistance support stayed roughly at the same level while women’s fund support, public foundation support and income generation increased gradually. Compared to other regions, here we see the highest level of diversification in funding sources, with funding spread out over the different sectors. This indicates a certain level of sustainability, since groups do not overly depend on changes in one or two funding sectors.

Table 21



For women’s rights organizations in Western Europe, their funding is primarily from development assistance sources or public foundations. There is very limited experience with fundraising from individuals other than among the women’s funds in the region.

The organizations interviewed for this study that operate as networks had very different experiences with fundraising from non-network organizations. Some felt that as an international network, they had a relatively easier time raising funds. Others said they were practically ‘non-funded’ and that concerns about competing for funding with their members based in other countries prevented them from undertaking a major fundraising drive. One explained her sense that,

“It’s a liability being an international organization – many funders are decentralizing, downsizing at headquarters, so much of the money is going out to the missions. There is little funding available for international networks.”⁸⁷

Ultimately there is a belief that the core role of international networks—what one interviewee described as bringing a diverse group of people

87 Based on communications with Marsha Freeman.

together to learn from one another and build critical analysis and strategy —is something that few funders are willing to support.

“Funders like to fund organizations working in specific countries.

As a result we are losing the breadth of vision, encompassing what’s going on in the world.”

Clarifying the role and value of these Northern-based organizations with an international focus was considered important by several people interviewed from this region. One described the role as keeping an “ear to the ground” on what’s happening with relevant UN and US government policies and activities. “As the UN continues to be a central part of global women’s agenda, it’s important to fund some institutions in New York that can anchor that work”. Yet another interviewee expressed concern with the sense of growing disenchantment with the UN and the potential political fallout following the frustrating experience of the Millennium Summit.

One challenge mentioned by some funders and women’s rights groups interviewed is the limited national connections of many of the US-based organizations active in women’s rights internationally. This disconnect is a challenge to building a stronger movement and compelling case in the eyes of some funders who see the international groups paying little attention to marginalized women in their own countries. Some interviewees also noted what they see as growing donor interest to fund US-focused work, which has led some US-based organizations that have traditionally worked internationally to include a domestic focus.

There is also a disconnect between groups working in their own countries and region and those working in ‘development’.

In Western Europe, few women’s organizations have a mandate to (also) work outside of Western Europe. Most that do can be found in the UK, some in Brussels and a few more scattered in different Western European countries. There is also a disconnect between groups working in their own countries and region and those working in ‘development’, or globally. Regional World Social Forum meetings seem to have created a new momentum for making linkages. More recently, women’s migrant organizations and ‘development’ organizations are making connections. There are also increasing numbers of partnerships with women’s organizations in the CEE/CIS region, some driven by EU grant requirements.

In terms of issues, there does not appear to be a particular issue that is overwhelmingly easier or more difficult to raise support for, though civic and political rights and gender-based violence rank among the easiest, along with media/technology/communications and leadership development.

Table 22 i





Table 22 ii



Chapter 10

What Women's Rights Organizations Need to be Thinking About and Doing Differently

Fundraising... the skills and the attitude

It is vital to recognize that funders are seeking 'fundable' projects and programs and to approach them from a position of confidence with the goal to look for partnerships.

There is huge need and demand for fundraising support and skills-building in proposal writing. Furthermore, many women's rights advocates feel they do not have the necessary information or connections to raise money effectively. When asked about the most common error made by grantseekers, 30% of respondents from the online survey confessed they need better and more informed fundraising strategies, better proposal-writing skills and more time dedicated to studying donors, investing in better connections and being more proactive in anticipating funding changes. They also recognized that they should dare to ask for bigger amounts of money when they do currently.

At the same time, many of the women who participated in this research said they struggle with their personal relationship to fundraising. While some see it as a core part of their work, and an opportunity for engaging in 'donor advocacy', others are uncomfortable with what they feel is "begging for money". Thus, beyond capacity-building or teaching specific skills for fundraising, women's rights organizations must also invest in developing different ways of thinking about money so that they are increasingly more competent and comfortable in making requests for financial support for their work.

It was also noted that in many countries of the Global North, people are constantly bombarded by appeals for money from organizations and 'causes', which means feminists there are more familiar with different ways and styles of fundraising. Activists in the Global South, Central and Eastern Europe and former Soviet Union say they feel at a disadvantage because asking for money is not so openly done or accepted in their contexts. At the same time, many feel a different approach and way of thinking about money and its role in women's rights work is essential. Fundraising is a critical part of strategies to realize women's rights and it is vital to recognize that funders are seeking 'fundable' projects and programs and to approach them from a position of confidence with the goal to look for partnerships that work for all parties. It is important to talk about the paradigm shift that is needed, and at the same time develop ways of making fundraising support and skill building accessible to those groups that need it most.

Re-politicize fundraising and the donor relationship

As fundraising became increasingly technical and individualized, and also a source of competition among groups, there seems to have been a de-politization of the relationship with donors. Beyond the need to ensure that women's rights organizations have the funding they require to sustain their work, the relationship with donors needs to be an explicit political issue on the women's rights agenda. Women's organizations' capacity to engage in dialogue with donors, to be part of the decision-making process of how donors define their funding priorities and strategies, increases not only the access that women's organizations could have to resources, but also their position as political actors in different processes and relationships.

Identify and expand new sources

Increasing the pool of potential funders for women's organizations is easier said than done, but it is an absolute necessity in a landscape where there is shrinking support available from development assistance agencies, and at best static support from large independent foundations and INGOs/public foundations. There are lessons to be learned from new or alternative sources that some groups are already tapping. For example, if shifting aid conditionalities are pushing more organizations to accept funding from their national or local governments, it would be useful to explore those experiences in more detail. Under what circumstances do they work?

One interviewee mentioned social banking or social economy models as one potential alternative. There are examples of partnerships between financial organizations and voluntary sector organizations – for example a bank that offers financial products at slightly sub-market interest rates, with the difference going to support a cause. Could women's rights organizations use some of these models? Additional research and exploration would be needed to clarify the opportunities and potential risks.

There is widespread agreement that tapping into private philanthropy—family foundations and individuals—is critical, and yet few women's rights organizations have the infrastructure or necessary resources to invest in developing these kinds of fundraising strategies. In this regard, many see a particular role for women's funds and larger women's rights groups that do have some room to invest in identifying and nurturing new funding sources, and which could potentially open doors for more organizations to access these kinds of donors.

Hold on to existing resources: invest in (potential) alliances

While exploring new sources, it is also important for women's rights organizations to influence existing donor allies to expand their support. A common theme in many interviews was the enormous desire to have greater spaces for political dialogue with 'ally' funders to build shared analysis and explore common agendas and priorities. This kind of strategy requires building relationships with funders that are about more than just money, that go to reflecting on long-term programmatic lines of action and political priorities. It also means being open to understanding the pressures donors face, and where there are shared challenges and interests. Building greater understanding among a wider range of donors is also an important way to begin to influence their policy development while at the same time building the profile of women's movements.

Past experiences with collective fundraising have had mixed results. In some instances, they have actually created 'gatekeepers' to the money.

In this respect there is a need to prioritize, to identify donors with strategic opportunities and space for real change. The focus should be on forming strategic alliances with key players that are influential in the broader funding community and can play a role in shifting the sector as a whole. It is also important to hold donors accountable, to ensure that these interactions are not merely 'talk shops', and to guarantee that whatever focused programming they do on women's rights and gender equality is well resourced, done in collaboration with existing women's rights organizations and does not attempt to reinvent the wheel.

Where is the fundraising wing of our movement(s)?

The suggestion that there should be a specialized 'wing' of the women's movement/s to raise money came up in a majority of interviews with representatives of women's rights organizations, almost always followed by an assertion that 'it would never work given the dynamics amongst our organizations.' Nevertheless, although women's rights organizations are very diverse and there may be much they do not agree on, it is critical that together with a vision for their movement(s), they articulate how they are going to mobilize the necessary financial resources to get there.

On one hand, fundraising is clearly not happening on a level playing field. North-South and class divisions prevail, with some individuals and groups having more opportunities than others to travel and meet donors either in their offices or at conferences. Those that can speak the donor languages or use the latest jargon for successful proposals are at an advantage. Past experiences with collective fundraising have had mixed results. In some instances, they have actually created 'gatekeepers' to the money.

Yet, strength in numbers is an important consideration when it comes to influencing donor priorities. How can women's rights organizations build more collaboration to mobilize collectively to identify, nurture and share the benefit from new (and existing) funding sources? Many of the strategy ideas for leveraging greater funding necessarily imply initially a small group of women's rights activists that would be acting to benefit a larger group of organizations.

How does one identify and work with, particularly at a regional level, those that do have access to donors, as well as interest and skill for fundraising, to benefit a broad range of organizations? Some of the organizations interviewed said that because they have strong international connections, they avoid seeking funding from donors focused more on a national or local level to avoid competition with local groups. Some believe that if the future is in small donors and individuals, women's organizations need to help each other with the connections—leverage funds for other organizations, open doors for people, or even come up with a new global campaign, building on the experiences and learning of, for example, the Global Fund for Women. Similarly, it seems that women's funds should focus to the extent possible on raising funds from individuals, family foundations, and other sources to which most women's rights groups have less access. This leaves open more opportunities for women's organizations to access larger independent foundations and other mainstream funding sources.

One interviewee emphasized that for a collaborative fundraising effort to work, it would require a carefully structured process, otherwise it gets down to 'the power of who gets in certain places, of who we're spokespeople for... It's empire building.' More generally, a core concern is the 'ethical' dimension of how access to funding opportunities is used. Stronger alliances and 'political pacts' among women's rights organizations are needed to articulate shared responsibilities and commitments to ensure that those with access to donors are representing an agenda that is broader than their organization alone. Collaborative fundraising would also require agreements around the process for developing and content of a clear agenda—what is funding being sought for? As one respondent asked, "What agenda are we taking to donors? Beijing plus 50!?"

Revisit strategies

*"We need to get ourselves back on track before we can get [donors] on track. Serious internal dialogue and housekeeping needs to happen."
(Representative from women's rights organization)*

Many of the people interviewed from women's rights organizations as well as funding agencies raised critical questions about the strategies groups are using in their program, communications, advocacy, research or capacity building work and how this shapes their access to funding. Below are the key areas that people mentioned as needing some further development:

Influence public debate and shape public opinion: Several interviewees mentioned that women's organizations need to position themselves differently in the public eye and build more credibility.

"We need to build credibility for the whole movement. Position ourselves as a vision for everybody, not just women ... Not just the victim dimension or a target group/issue approach. We need conceptual shifts. The Vienna conference [on Human Rights] was such a success because we managed to do so. The money will not follow if we do not get our act together. We need new solutions and new issues, linking local to global and the other way around. We need to think it through, do all the detailed work, identifying strategic opportunities, and openings. For example create a full-time team to develop feminist proposals, real suggestions, and back it up with research... The right wing has it down, they are offering answers. It is a big intellectual challenge ... We need to better envision the next stage."

We need to build credibility for the whole movement. Position ourselves as a vision for everybody, not just women.

Constituency-building and articulating connections among different levels: As many women's rights organizations have grown and professionalized, there is a perceived disconnect between the 'intermediary' kind of NGOs and grassroots women's organizations and concerns. In part, some interviewees attribute this to strong donor support for advocacy, which in many cases was focused on policy change without corresponding attention to building a broad constituency behind women's rights demands. This has left many strong policy advocates disconnected from local issues and organizing.

"Some argue that donor privileging of NGO preparations for the UN Summits...led many professionalized feminist groups to neglect their work with the base ... Even when many of the UN-focused activities sponsored by NGOs involved multiple forms of outreach to grassroots women's groups and other actors ... many women I talked with maintained that technical efforts to influence texts sometimes overrode efforts to use the UN process as a consciousness-raising/educational pretext." 88

88 Alvarez, Sonia E. (1998); *Advocating Feminism: The Latin American Feminist NGO 'Boom'*. Retrieved May 19, 2005 from <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/latam/schomburgmoreno/alvarez.html>

At the same time, the idea is not to value one kind of action over another—which often gets oversimplified into an apparent dichotomy between the ‘base’ and ‘elite’—but rather to articulate more coherent linkages among organizations working at different levels so that strategies reflect more holistic approaches to change, and there are clear mechanisms in place to ensure accountability and transparency among women’s groups themselves.

Strengthen leadership and organizations: Several interviewees mentioned what they felt as a strong need for more open dialogue among women’s rights groups on leadership and organizational strengthening issues. Established leaders say they want more spaces for critical reflection and evaluation of their leadership styles and the extent to which they are appropriate for the context, life stage and objectives of their organizations. Young leaders, many of whom say they are trying to develop alternative organizational models, say they struggle to gain recognition for their efforts. Many activists also spoke of an enormous need for capacity building at different levels. Some interviewees wondered if women’s rights movements are in a position to meet the high expectations they have raised. There was also interest in seeing stronger organizational leadership, in the sense of a capacity to convene other organizations around a shared political agenda.

Rethinking our movement structure: Several respondents focused on ‘revisiting the whole NGO model and exploring other ways of structuring women’s rights organizations’ in order they can push against the trends toward bureaucratization and technification. Suggestions varied from the closing down of organizations whose time has passed, organizational mergers, changes of leadership and the starting of new initiatives. Many people wanted space to reflect on what other kinds of structures would enable feminist movements to grow a more independent funding base, without the overwhelming demands of sustaining full organizational infrastructures. While some respondents felt that a movement needs to be made up of diffuse, grassroots, self organizing groups, others said they wanted to see ‘anchors’, ‘magnet organizations’ and ‘household names’, similar to what Amnesty International is for (mainstream) human rights and Greenpeace is for the environment. Both women’s rights organizations and funders noted the potential strengths (and pitfalls) of creating ‘giants’ of women’s movement(s), that could potentially give more credibility to the movement as a whole and as such advance women’s rights agendas much further.

Take on the evaluation challenge

Funders and women's rights organizations agree that evaluation is critical—to learn from work being done, improve strategies and generate deeper and clearer theories of change. However there is enormous frustration on both sides with the limitations of many conventional approaches to evaluation that do little to provide insights into process of transformation in which many women's rights activists are engaged.

"I'd love to see some really interesting, efficient and sharp evaluation mechanisms that aren't just for...appeasing funders, but really critical ways of thinking about whether or not we're doing everything we could be doing well."

Reality is that our work is complex and about power relations.

There is widespread criticism from women's rights organizations that donor-imposed evaluation frameworks demand quantifiable indicators of success, over short periods of time, with little recognition of the immeasurable nature and interconnectedness of many change processes.

"Of course, this is bringing values from the corporate and business world...it's hard to claim credit for accomplishments – we contribute to processes. If you want to be honest about how you look at these things, results-based [evaluation] doesn't work unless I have a totally pompous attitude, and say this is 'my work'...we know this is ridiculous...and give me a break when they want to see women's empowerment in a year". (Women's organization representative)

Yet some donors also say they miss seeing a more nuanced discussion of evaluation from the women's rights organizations with which they work. One said that many of the grantees she works with are "using tired, dry indicators, just reporting numbers, not really questioning or deepening evaluation."

Both sides agree that investment in developing alternative approaches to evaluation that more accurately reflect the complex dynamics shaping the realization of women's rights and move beyond rigid logical frameworks is much needed. One donor recognized the inherent challenge with evaluating the work of women's organizations:

"I am not sure if and to what extent women's organizations are effective. What I do know is that they do political work, which does not fit with the technocratic approach of short-term quantifiable results. It is hard to assess the impact of their work because it is political, and complex. If we measure them with a technocratic mindset, we cannot do them justice. People need to reduce things to tangible results and are tired of talking about complex power relations. Yet reality is that our work is complex and about power relations."

Engage in and re-shaping the mainstreaming debate

Although mainstreaming was a hard-fought policy win for women's rights advocates in many organizations, its implementation has often had dismal results. Consequently, many feminists are rejecting the mainstreaming agenda outright because it has been seen to be so detrimental in practice. Others are still trying to create reform from within and say that there are important opportunities for doing so.

Many funders, especially those that were once leaders on women's rights and gender equality, are questioning their approach to mainstreaming. One interviewee suggested, "Join them in their explorations, be their experts, and offer ideas and alternatives". Yet while there is considerable space to engage in those debates, it is important to be selective, focusing energy on key funders that are in a position to influence others.

As Joanne Sandler from UNIFEM has suggested, mainstreaming pitfalls could be avoided by⁸⁹:

- Shifting away from training, tool and policy development and putting systems of accountability in place. We need to 'end impunity for distorted gender mainstreaming'.
- Generating greater attention, support, accountability and capacity for women's human rights, using CEDAW and regional conventions, with the goal to end discrimination against women; and,
- Emphasizing the importance of more resources for women's organizations, and building strong and sustainable organizations and networks advocating for women's rights.

Over the longer term, donor representatives and women's rights organizations believe that gender mainstreaming has to be replaced by a concept that does not obscure but instead holds up a transformative social justice and women's rights agenda.

89 Joanne Sandler, quoted in *Gender Mainstreaming, can it Work for Women's Rights?*, published by AWID, 2004, page 10.

Chapter 11

Conclusion

This report has attempted to illustrate and analyze trends in funding for women's organizations around the world since the 1995 World Conference on Women, in order to identify ways to increase access to and amounts of funding for critical women's rights work. The findings have been based on over eighty face-to-face interviews with donor organizations and women's groups, three international consultations, an extensive online survey with women's groups worldwide and a comprehensive review of secondary literature.

The research has clearly indicated that while public awareness of women's rights violations internationally may have increased, funding for women's organizations to guarantee those rights has not. Many groups are in a state of survival and resistance and trying to adjust to the new funding landscape, particularly as a result of shifts in development assistance and cutbacks by the large independent foundations. Our survey also highlighted other key dynamics:

- The majority of women's groups reported to have annual budgets in 2004 well under USD100,000, which demonstrates that women's organizations are doing an incredible amount with very few resources;
- Groups with smaller budgets were not able to increase their funding or shrink their budgets, whereas the small number of organizations with budgets over half a million USD were more likely to be able to increase their budgets in the past ten years;
- Women's rights organizations are having to invest far more time and resources into fundraising than in the past and therefore those that can afford to are more likely to get funding;
- Funding is more readily available for work around HIV/AIDS and violence against women than it has been, while finding funding for work related to reproductive and sexual rights and non-HIV/AIDS related health issues is harder;
- Similarly, core funding for salaries and administration has become more elusive; and,
- While women's rights organizations in all regions are facing serious funding challenges, those groups in Central and Eastern Europe as well as Latin America have the fewest number of funding opportunities.

This report has also looked deeper into why funding has decreased or remained static for women's rights, by exploring six funding sectors and the contexts that influence their support. The report has analyzed some of the following trends:

- Development assistance and funding by bilateral and multilateral agencies has become increasingly harder to access for women's rights organizations as a result of gender mainstreaming and new aid modalities;
- Many large independent foundations have acknowledged that gender is out of fashion, and when many got hit by the stock market crash women's rights funding slumped too;
- Many of the more influential international NGOs that supported women's groups through the Beijing process have waned on their commitment and have acknowledged that they have lost much of their explicit attention to gender equality;
- Meanwhile, women's funds that are increasingly emerging on the funding landscape internationally have become a very important source of funds for women's groups despite their very small grant size;
- Corporate foundations and private sector funding has also become more prevalent in the past ten years and will likely to grow in importance;
- Private family funding and individual donors are indeed very significant sources of funding to consider, but for the majority of women's organizations, almost impossible to tap.

What this research has concluded is that the situation for so many women's organizations doing critical work to guarantee and protect the rights of women on the ground is so incredibly challenging that their very survival is at stake. What we also conclude, however, is that there are significant shifts occurring that signal signs of hope. Many governments are reconsidering their gender equality policies and how best to ensure that gender mainstreaming remains a two-track strategy: one of integration of gender equality priorities across all policies and programs, but also a strategy to support women's rights specific strategies. Many INGOs are bringing gender 'back on the table' and are willing to talk about what it means to support women's movements on the ground. In the same way, new sources of funds are being tapped and many women's rights advocates are seeking ways of ensuring that women's groups worldwide have access to new pots of money.

This research has enabled us to develop a series of recommendations through consultation with leaders, policy makers and activists worldwide on how best to support and affirm the legitimacy of women's rights organizations and movements worldwide. In fact, this project doesn't end with this report. Instead, throughout 2006 and beyond we will:

- Disseminate the findings of this report as wide and far as possible, and put them in the hands of women's organizations so that they can use them to leverage more financial resources for their work, as well to strategically influence the donor community to increase their funding;

- Work on a new AWID initiative known as Fundher - Money Watch for Women's Rights that will track and analyze funding trends on an on-going basis; and finally,

- Work with women's organizations internationally to tackle the fundamental challenges within our movement on how we deal with the dynamics of money and power relationships amongst us. This means finding new and better ways of making the case for women's organizations, seeking new strategies to share resources across our movement, as well as expanding knowledge on how best to fundraise. Women's movements will need to move from a culture of competition within scarcity to new forms of movement building around money. This will mean that we can harness resources effectively, responsibly, and sustainably in order to increase our collective voice and strengthen our positive impact on the lives of women internationally.

For new information about this initiative please refer to AWID's website at www.awid.org.

Annex 1

Glossary

Accountability. Forms and structures of relationships⁹⁰ and responsibilities between people who work together in organizations/movements and between the organizational/movement as a whole and others; 'liable to be called to account' in legal, moral, human terms⁹¹; to hold ourselves responsible to the women we work for and with, in our pursuit of equality and inclusion⁹².

Civil society. The sphere of association and conversation which falls outside the direct control of the state and other authorities. Civil society encompasses the dialogues and interactions through which political views are formed and through which groups come to understand their interest vis-à-vis those other groups and the state. Civil society includes voluntary associations, friendship networks, religious groups, independent newspapers, and the like⁹³.

Endowment. Funds intended to be kept permanently and invested to provide income for continued support of an organization. They seek to create, expand or otherwise support a permanent financial asset of an organization.

Feminism. Feminism is a political discourse based in justice. Feminism is also a political theory and practice articulated by women who, after analyzing their reality, became aware of the discrimination they face and decided to get organized to eradicate them, to change society. Feminism is articulated as a political philosophy, and at the same time, as a social movement⁹⁴.

Feminist movements. Social and political movements based on the awareness that women (as a human collective) are oppressed, exploited and dominated through patriarchy, in its different historical stages. In this way, feminist movements do not only struggle for 'women's rights' but also question from a new perspective, all power structures including gender as a power structure (but not reduced only to this one)⁹⁵. Feminist movements are formed by diverse currents, both in terms of organizational spaces, as well as thematic and political interests⁹⁶.

90 David Kelleher and Kate McLaren: *Grabbing the Tiger by the Tail*. Ottawa: Canadian Council for International Cooperation. 1996. page 4

91 Oxford English Dictionary

92 Disabled Women Network of Ontario (DAWN), *Feminist principle of accountability*, in *Feminist Principles*, in <http://dawn.thot.net/feminism1.html>

93 Jeff Goodwin and James M Jasper. Eds. *The Social Movement Reader*. Maine: Blackwell Publishing. 2003. p. 221.

94 Nuria Varela; *Feminismo para Principiantes*, Ediciones B. Barcelona España, in <http://www.modemmujer.org/docs/11.242.htm>

95 Facio, Alda, *Cuando el género suena, cambios trae*, Programa Mujer, Justicia y Género-ILANUD, San José, 1999, p. 31.

96 Celiberti, Lilian and Gina Vargas, *Feministas en el Foro*, *Estudios Feministas*, Florianópolis, 11(2): 586-598, July-December/2003, p. 596.

Feminist organization. A group of people who work together to achieve a common goal, and who explicitly identify themselves as feminist and embrace broader feminist agendas and links itself with some expression of the feminist movement.

Philanthropy. The origin of the word philanthropy is Greek and means 'love for humankind'. Philanthropy stands for the promotion of human welfare by donating time, money or other resources for the wellbeing of others beyond one's family and kinship networks. Diverse traditions of voluntary and charitable giving, as well as expressions of solidarity with the less fortunate, are present all over the world. While philanthropy was initially used to talk about wealthy people giving to people with fewer resources, in the last decades the term has gained a much broader meaning, and includes the giving activities of the wealthy with those of citizens in general.

Social movement. A collective, organized, sustained and non-institutional challenge to authorities, power-holders or cultural beliefs and practices⁹⁷. Some argue they are a set of opinions and beliefs in a population which represents preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and/or reward distribution of a society⁹⁸.

Women's organizations. A group of people who work together to achieve a common goal: improving the status or the situation of women. They might share common goals with feminist organizations, but do not necessarily identify as feminist. Women's organizations are diverse in terms of structure, populations they work with and issues they focus on, as well as in terms of their political and ideological positions.

Women's movements. This term refers to 'all the spectrum of people who act in an individual way, and to organizations or groups who are working to ameliorate diverse aspects of the gender subordination on the basis of sex (...) Some of the parts [of women's movements] might be in disagreement with each other, others could set different sets of priorities, and some of its currents, groups or individual elements might be lethargic during certain periods. Some persons self-identify themselves as feminist; others will probably never use such a word, but they all promote in their activities causes in favour of women⁹⁹.

97 Jeff Goodwin and James M Jasper; Eds: The Social Movement Reader. Maine: Blackwell Publishing. 2003. Page 3.

98 MacCarthy and Mayer N Zald: Social Movement Organizations, in Jeff Goodwin and James M Jasper. Eds: The Social Movement Reader. Maine: Blackwell Publishing. 2003. page, p. 172.

99 Lycklama a Nijeholt, Virginia Vargas and Saskia Wieringa (comp), Triángulo de Poder, TM Editores, Bogotá, pp. 6-7.

Annex 2: Individuals Interviewed for the Study

Resource people:

1. Rob Buchanon, Council on Foundations, USA
2. Maria Chartok, CAF, Russia
3. Stephanie Clohesy, Clohesy Consulting, USA
4. Marsha Freeman, International Women's Rights Action Watch (University of Minnesota), USA
5. Chris Grumm, Women's Funding Network, USA
6. John Harvey, Grantmakers without Borders, USA
7. Suzanne Kindevatter, Interaction, USA
8. Patti O'Neill and Julia Benn, DAC/OECD
9. Kim Otis, Women and Philanthropy, USA
10. Ruth Pearson, University of Leeds, UK
11. Mirjam van Reisen, EEPa, Belgium
12. Denise Shannon, Funders Network on Population, Reproductive Health and Rights, USA

Women's Funds:

13. Katherine Acey, Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice, USA
14. Bisi Adeleye Fayemi, African Women's Development Fund, Ghana
15. Amalia Fisher, Angela Borba, Brazil
16. Mira Hadjimitova, Bulgarian Women's Fund, Bulgaria
17. Vivien Labaton, Third Wave Foundation, USA
18. Emilienne de Leon, Semillas, Mexico
19. Diana van Maasdijk, Mama Cash, Netherlands
20. Nicky McIntyre, Global Fund for Women, USA
21. Suzette Mitchell, International Women's Development Agency, Australia
22. Bev Wybrow, Canadian Women's Fund, Canada

Funders:

23. Sylvia Borren, Novib - Oxfam Netherlands
24. Julie Delahantie, CIDA, Canada
25. Ireen Dubel, Hivos, Netherlands
26. Maria Eitel, Nike Foundation, USA
27. Ana Falu, UNIFEM Latin America, Ecuador
28. Theresa Fay Bustillos, Levi Strauss Foundation, USA
29. Patricia Jiménez, Heinrich Böll Foundation, EU Regional Office, Belgium

30. Ana Luisa Liguori, MacArthur Foundation, Mexico
31. Pontso Mafethe, Comic Relief, UK
32. Ray Offenheiser, Oxfam America, USA
33. Ann Petersen, (former) Kellogg Foundation, USA
34. Lilian Ploumen, Cordaid, Netherlands
35. Manuela Monteiro, Hivos Netherlands
36. Joanne Sandler, UNIFEM, USA
37. Shira Saperstein, Moriah Fund, USA
38. Bradford Smith, Ford Foundation, USA
39. Kathy Sreedhar, UU Holdeen India Fund, USA
40. Koy Thomson, ActionAid, UK
41. To Tjoelker, Dutch MFA, Netherlands
42. Gabriela Vega, Inter-American Development Bank, USA
43. Katrin Wilde, Channel Foundation, USA

Women's Organizations:

44. Lina Abou-Habib, CRTD, Lebanon
45. Peggy Antrobus, DAWN, Barbados
46. Betsy Apple, WEDO, USA
47. Meagan Baldwin, WIDE, Belgium
48. Carol Barton, WICEJ, USA
49. Teresa Blandon, Corriente, Nicaragua
50. Codou Bop, (former) AAWORD, Senegal
51. Charlotte Bunch, CWGL, USA
52. Susana Chiarotti, CLADEM, Argentina
53. Malikka Dutt, Breakthrough, USA/India
54. Yassine Fall, Millennium Project, Senegal based in NYC
55. Susana Fried, IGLHRC, USA
56. Lucy Garrido, Articulación Feminista Marcosur, Uruguay
57. Adrienne Germain, IWHC, USA
58. Amal Hadi, New Woman Foundation, Egypt
59. Joanna Kerr, AWID, Canada
60. Kinga Lohman, KARAT Coalition, Poland
61. Marusia Lopez Cruz, Elige, Mexico
62. Ximena Machicao, REPEM
63. Pramada Manon, CREA, India
64. Jivka Marinova, GERT, Bulgaria
65. Diane Matte, World March of Women, Quebec, Canada
66. Sarah Mukasa, AMwa/AWLI, Uganda
67. Wanda Nowicka, Astra, Poland
68. Ruth Ojiambo, ISIS WICCE, Uganda
69. Cecilia Olea, Flora Tristan, Peru
70. Lina Quorah, SIGI, Jordan
71. Mary Jane Real, (former) APWLD, Thailand
72. Maria Eugenia Romero Contreras, Equidad de Genero, México
73. Karin Ronge, Women for Women's Rights, Turkey

74. Mina Saadadi, Netherlands/Iran
75. Sanya Sarnavka, BaBe, Croatia
76. Schuma Schumacher, REDEH, Brazil
77. Vicki Semler, IWTC, USA
78. Alexandra Spielloch, IGTN, USA
79. Vivian Stromberg, MADRE, USA
80. Muthoni Wanyeki, FEMNET, Kenya
81. Sakena Yacobi, Afghan Institute of Learning, Afghanistan
82. Nani Zulminarni, PEKKA, Indonesia

Participants in “Strategies to mobilize funding for women’s rights work: a stakeholder meeting”, held September 18-20, 2005 in Mexico City:

1. Sunila Abeysekera, INFORM Human Rights Documentation Center, Sri Lanka
2. Bisi Adeleye-Fayemi, African Women’s Development Fund, Ghana
3. Lydia Alpízar, Association for Women’s Rights in Development (AWID), Mexico
4. Susana Chiarotti, CLADEM, Argentina
5. Cindy Clark, Just Associates, USA
6. Ana Criquillion, Central American Women’s Fund, Nicaragua
7. Emilienne de Léon, Semillas AC, Mexico
8. Ireen Dubel, Gender, Women & Development, HIVOS, Netherlands
9. Josefa (Gigi) Francisco, Women & Gender Institute, Miriam College / DAWN, Philippines
10. Lucero González, Semillas A.C., Mexico
11. Chris Grumm / Women’s Funding Network, USA
12. Hanneke Kamphuis, Mama Cash, Netherlands
13. Natalia Karbowska, Ukrainian Women’s Fund, Ukraine
14. Joanna Kerr, Association for Women’s Rights in Development (AWID), Canada
15. Sonja Licht, Network Women Program, Open Society Institute, Serbia
16. Ximena Machicao Barbery, Network of Popular Education among Women (REPEM), Bolivia
17. Nicky McIntyre, Global Fund for Women, USA
18. Geetanjali Misra, Creating Resources for Empowerment in Action (CREA), India
19. Sarah Mukasa, Akina Mama wa Afrika, Uganda
20. Patti O’Neill, Network on Gender Equality DAC/OECD
21. Joanne Sandler, UNIFEM, USA
22. Ellen Sprenger, Just Associates, The Netherlands
23. Rieky Stuart, Independent Consultant, Canada
24. To Tjoelker, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Hague, Netherlands

25. Gabriela Vega, Gender Equality in Development Unit,
Inter American Development Bank, Peru
26. Lisa Veneklasen, Just Associates, USA

**Participants in session on “Where is the money?
Funding for women’s rights a decade after
Beijing,” held March 4, 2005 in New York:**

1. Suzette Mitchell, IWDA, Australia
2. Terry McGovern, WHEI, USA
3. Geeta Misra, CREA, India
4. Kathy Sreedhar, UU Holdeen, India
5. Karin Ronge, WWHR- New Ways, Turkey
6. Maeve Taylor, Banulatch, Ireland
7. Kaori Miyamoto, DAC/OECD
8. Julia Benn, DAC/OECD
9. Karina Batthyam, Social Watch, Uruguay
10. Muthoni Wanyeki, FEMNET, Kenya
11. Elaine Zuckerman, Gender Action, USA
12. Vicki Semler, International Women’s Tribune Center, USA
13. Karen Plafker, Wellspring, USA
14. Brigitta Jaksas, Habeas CorpUS Working Group, Hungary
15. Holly Barthing, General Service Foundation, USA
16. Vicki Larson, Madre, USA
17. Carol Barton, WICEJ, USA
18. Nadia Johnson, WEDO, USA
19. Sarah Mukasa, AMWA, Uganda
20. Andrea Jonson, Carnegie Corporation, USA
21. Barbara Adams, UNIFEM, USA
22. Tricia Moser, IWHC, USA
23. Sarah Murison, Capacity Development Group, USA
24. Laurah Frade, Milenio Feminista, Mexico
25. Tarcila Rivera, CHIRAPAQ, Peru
26. Katherine Acey, Astraea, USA
27. Alen Desla, VON, Netherlands
28. Patti O’Neil, DAC/OECD
29. Jewel Dany, CWGL, USA
30. Katrin Wilde, Channel Foundation, USA
31. Zonibel Woods, IWHC, USA
32. Jivka Marinova, GERT/Karat Coalition, Bulgaria
33. Gladys Nhekairo Mutukwa, WILDAF, Zimbabwe
34. Mirjam Van Reisen, EEPA, Belgium
35. Karen Judd, UNIFEM, USA
36. Myrna Cunningham, Madre/ IIPP, Nicaragua
37. Elizabeth Plácido, Elige/ REDLAC, Mexico
38. Teresa Valdés, FLACSO, Chile
39. Everjoice Win, ActionAid International, Zimbabwe

40. Charlotte Bunch, CWGL, USA
41. To Tjoelker, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands
42. Mariana Cabrera, Social Watch, Uruguay
43. Hilda Tatria , AWDF, Ghana
44. Zeedah Meierhofer, AMWA, UK
45. Vivian Stromberg, Madre International, USA
46. Ana Cristina Gonzalez, AWID Board, Colombia
47. Barbara Klugman, Ford Foundation, USA
48. Wanda Nowicka, Astra, Poland
49. Barbara Phillips, Ford Foundation, USA
50. Susana Chiarotti, CLADEM, Argentina
51. Bisi Adeleye-Fayemi, AWDF, Ghana
52. Alejandra Sardá, IGLHRC-LAC, Argentina

List of participants in “Where is the Money for Women’s Rights” sessions during the January 2005 World Social Forum (only partial list as not all participants signed in):

1. Manuela Monteiro, Executive Director Hivos, the Netherlands
2. Nicky McIntyre, Vice President, Global Fund for Women, USA
3. Katerina Anfossi, Acting Director FIRE, Costa Rica
4. Joanna Kerr, Executive Director AWID, Canada
5. Roberto Bissio, Social Watch, Uruguay
6. Charlotte Bunch, CWGL, USA
7. Emilienne de León, Semillas, México
8. Alejandra Scampini, REPEM, Uruguay
9. Nancy Kachingwe, Zimbabwe
10. Liliana Ipinice Zevallos CESIP, Perú
11. Nadia Underhill, Princeton University, USA
12. Maria Nyberg, Trade Union SKTF, Sweden
13. Cristina Carvallo, Word Vision, Chile
14. Myriam Gloz , CECONDEL, Chile
15. Claudia Morales, Candela Mujeres de Huaraches, Chile
16. Cecilia, Casa de la Florian, Chile
17. Patricia Cáceres, CEMES, Chile
18. Patricia Willis, Women International WILPF, USA

Annex 3: Our 'Money and Fundraising' dreams

Let it not be said that women's rights organizations do not dream big enough when it comes to money and fundraising. Below are the dreams of participants in the Mexico City stakeholders' meeting that was part of this research.

My dream is that in the future the centrality of women's autonomy and choice to development will be recognized not just at the level of rhetoric but where it really counts, where money, lands etc are a top priority!!

I dream that the world's leaders, men in suits at the bilaterals, multilaterals, the heads of large foundations, etc. send a delegation to the 2007-8 AWID conference to beg forgiveness and say "We finally get it". Now they give one billion minimum each year.

I dream that women's organizations are placed (more) centre stage in the effectiveness of aid debate (and let the money flow....).

I dream that in three years all funders –from governments to individuals– will completely understand why we need to financially support feminist organizing.

I dream about a continuous stream of funding for women and girls' work that allows work to move forward and be successful.

I dream that women's rights organizations around the world will be able to count on public (individual) donations to cover at least 50% of their budgets –unrestricted support! I dream to be able to guarantee sustained work with massive impact around issues on the feminist agenda.

My dream is to raise more than one billion USD with a new campaign focusing on individuals (globally).

I dream about strong sustainable women's and feminist movements and organizations, with a big resource-base, public support and excellent capacity and position to influence all donor sectors.

I dream that all aid budgets allocate 25% to women's human rights organizations as a stand alone focus. In the remaining 75%: again 25% to women's programs and initiatives in relation to different sectors.

My dream is that women offer such a compelling vision of an alternative to fear-laden fundamentalisms and anti-human "security" that we rally billions to our cause.

I dream that in the next five years we will have annual global, regional and national level consultations, info sharing and strategizing on available resources for women's rights work.

I dream that women's movement(s) become the backbone of a movement for social change and the most vigorous partners and allies of large progressive funding organizations. We need a viable alternative, and it needs money.

My dream is that the gap in terms of resources for women's organizations in the Global North and South would not be so wide and that it will be possible to develop a shared understanding of the complexities of local realities that we live and experience.

I dream that the power of our ideas and aspirations secure women's rights everywhere, so that the money becomes irrelevant. But until then the women's rights movements have dedicated funds of at least five billion annually to support their work, struggle, achievements that are context-specific and locally controlled.

I dream that decision makers and gatekeepers will stop saying that women are essential to development and start acting and funding women and women's activities as if they did matter. I dream that women and women's organizations will be at the center of development activities, and that we can stop begging and that money will flow so that world communities and households will be safe.

I dream that women's rights will remain to be seen as human rights. I dream that people realize how important it is that women's rights are fully realized and make money and moral support available so that within 15 years we are only discussing how we retain our equal rights.

My dream is to have a huge global campaign to raise yearly thirty billion USD from individuals. This would require every woman in the Global North to donate USD 100. This money will be used to fund women's movements, including putting pressure on governments.

I dream that women rights and human rights are fully understood by all actors in society...that governments, citizens and the corporate world are willing to contribute with rhetoric, action and resources to the fulfillment of rights. That organizations working towards women's rights are recognized valued and funded.

Annex 4: Funding for Women's Rights Online Survey Results

**Prepared for AWID by
Martin Redfern / Redfern Research
October, 2005**

Background

In April 2005 AWID sponsored research into the funding situations and experiences of organizations working on behalf of women worldwide.

- The fundamental objectives were to measure changes and trends in the amount of funds available to these organizations, the amount and types of resources devoted to fundraising, and the ease or difficulty of raising funds for specific types of work.
- The results contained in this report are based on 406 online surveys which were completed in May 2005. Each respondent represents a unique organization working on behalf of women worldwide.
- Responses to open-ended questions are included in this report, but a deeper analysis is included in a separate report, but a deeper analysis is included in a separate report.
- A full explanation of the methodology can be found at the end of this document.

Findings

- Most respondents are convinced that overall funding levels at the regional and country level are static or declining. This perception is strongest in Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Approximately one-half say their own organization receives less funding now than it did five years ago. This is also most commonly reported in Latin America, but evident in all regions.
- In contrast, a more detailed analysis of reported budgets since 1995 suggest that funding levels are largely static and that increases are more common than decreases overall. This positive impression may be offset by the effects of inflation on purchasing power. Furthermore, budget

declines may have eliminated some organizations entirely, making their inclusion in the survey impossible.

- Those who improved their funding situation tend to credit favourable changes in donor focus, as well as improvements within their specific organization. Those who have lost funding also tend to blame changes in donor focus, a decline in funding overall, and the current political and economic climate. Those with less funding do not generally blame their own approach or efforts.

- Concurrently, there is evidence of disproportionate aggregation and growth among larger organizations – the number with at least \$1.5 million to spend appears to have more than doubled since 1995.

- Women's Funds, INGOs/Public Foundations, and Multilateral/Bilateral Aid Agencies are the most often cited sources of funding. Membership dues and individual donors are relatively important as well. Local governments, income generation, the private sector, family foundations and religious sources are relatively small contributors.

- Women's funds have shown a significant increase in importance over the last five years. In contrast, membership dues, individual donations and religious sources appear to have declined slightly in recent years.

- More than one-half of organizations say that it is harder to raise funds in general now than it was five years ago. Only 24% say it is easier.

- More specifically, it is more difficult to raise funds for subjects like reproductive rights, civil and political rights, sexual rights/LGBT rights and health issues other than HIV/Aids. Respondents also say that it is harder to find funding for activities such as staff salaries; administration; organizational capacity building and research and documentation.

- Conversely, it is significantly easier to raise funds for subjects such as HIV-related health, gender based violence and activities such as media and communications; leadership, and networking.

- These trends in the ease of fundraising are general trends, insofar as there is evidently a diversity of experience among different organizations.

- The fundraising tasks at organizations working on behalf of women are carried most heavily by the executive directors, especially in organizations with budgets between 100-500K, where EDs take on 45% of the fundraising work. Organizations invest in professional fundraising staff

only after they reach the 500K threshold. Interestingly, board involvement in fundraising tends to decrease as budgets grow and very few organizations (regardless of budget size) hire outside expertise to help with fundraising and marketing.

- Reflecting their statement that funds are more scarce than five years ago, the majority of respondents also say that they are spending more time fundraising now than they did ten years ago.

- From the above, it would appear that funding is becoming more difficult to obtain and that donors in general place priority on some subjects and activities over others. Money to run an organization, for example, is evidently harder to come by. It seems that organizations have responded by spending more time on fundraising. These increased efforts appear to be paying off overall.

- Despite the evident feeling that funding is more scarce and more available for some subjects, activities and regions than for others, there is no strong evidence that most organizations have suffered declines in funding since 1995. That said, more than two thirds of small organizations (under \$100,000 USD) report static or declining revenues since 1995. Latin American and Caribbean respondents, as well as those in the Middle East and North Africa, are especially likely to report stagnant or declining levels of funding. In contrast, North American and Western European respondents are least likely to report stagnant or declining levels of funding.


- The primary criticism leveled at donors is that they are short-sighted and unrealistic in terms of both funding windows and expectations. Donors are also criticized by many respondents for imposing inappropriate agendas, funding the wrong types of activities, and for requiring excessive reporting and paperwork.

- Women's organizations say that the most common mistakes their sector makes in seeking funding are poorly informed fundraising, and a lack of networking. They also mention a need for better advocacy, better management, and better writing and targeting of proposals. Finally, many also say that organizations should not distort their goals simply to obtain funding.

Organizational Profiles

Regional Distribution


In what country is your organization based? (Recoded from country)



Base: 401 Respondents

Age of Organizations


In what year was your organization founded?



Base: 406 Respondents

Scope of Work by Region


What is the geographic scope of your organization's work?



Base: 396 Respondents

Overall Revenue Ranges


Thinking back over the last few years, which of the following categories best describes the average total budget your organization spends each year on gender equality and women's rights?



Sample: 391 Respondents

Overall Revenue Ranges by Region

Thinking back over the last few years, which of the following categories best describes the average total budget your organization spends each year on gender equality and women's rights?




Sample: 391 Respondents

Trends in Funding *Overall and Specific*

Five-year Trend in Organization Funding

- Among only those who existed five years ago -


Compared to five years ago (2000), what is the funding situation for YOUR organization's work?




Base: 315 Respondents

Five-year Trend In Organization Funding
 - Among only those who existed five years ago -

Compared to five years ago (2000), what is the funding situation for your organization's work?



Reported Revenue Change
 - 2004 revenue compared to 1995-




Calculable only for those organizations which existed in 1995 and 2004 and who provided specific revenue information for those years. (N=145)

Reported Revenue Change
- 2004 revenue compared to 1995-

US Dollars

■ Revenue increased ■ Revenue was static ■ Revenue dropped




Calculable only those organizations which existed in 1995 and 2004 and who provided specific revenue information for those years.

Reported Revenue Change
- 2004 revenue compared to 2000 -


US Dollars

■ Revenue increased ■ Revenue was static ■ Revenue dropped




Calculable only those organizations which existed in 2000 and 2004 and who provided specific revenue information for those years.

General Reasons for Increased Funding
 Among those 24% reporting higher funding now -



Base: 62 Respondents


General Reasons for Decreased Funding
 - Among those 53% reporting decreased funding now -



Base: 154 Respondents


Sources of Revenue

Top Three Revenue Sources - Trends 1995-2004



Top Three Revenue Sources - 2004


Please rank the financial value of each of the following types of donors to your organization



Base: 392 Respondents

Top Three Revenue Sources - 2000


Please rank the financial value of each of the following types of donors to your organization



Base: 301 Respondents

Top Three Revenue Sources - 1995

Please rank the financial value of each of the following types of donors to your organization




Base: 193 Respondents

Fundraising

Ease of Fundraising Overall

- Compared to five years ago -

Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds [In general] for issues/activities related to women's rights and gender equality?




Base: 315 Respondents

Ease of Fundraising for Subject Areas

- 5-Year Trend -

Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following issues related to women's rights and gender equality?




See Appendix for Regional Results

Base: 233 to 283 Respondents

Ease of Fundraising for Activities

- 5-Year Trend -

Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following activities related to women's rights and gender equality?




See Appendix for Regional Results

Base: 235 to 283 Respondents

Overall Mix of Fundraising Resources

- In Different Revenue Groups -

How much of your organization's fundraising efforts are done by each of the following groups? Your answers should total to 100%




Percentage total, on average, to 107%

Base: 403 Respondents

Trends In Time Spent Fundraising

- By Revenue -

In the last ten years, has the proportion of your staff and resources spent on fundraising increased, decreased, or stayed the same? (If your organization is less than ten years old, please describe the trend in the years since its creation).




Common Mistakes of Donors and Grantees

Question Wording

The following section report on the full-test typed responses to the following two questions:

1. In your experience, what are the most common mistakes donors make when it comes to their support for women's organizations? What should they do differently?
2. In your experience, what are the most common mistakes that organizations working on women's rights and gender equality make when it comes to seeking support and funding? What strategies would work better?

Common Donor Errors
 - General Coding of Open-end Responses -



Base: 372 Respondents

Common Grantee Errors
 - General Coding of Open-end Responses -



Base: 360 Respondents

Detailed Methodology

- Between April 27 and May 13, 2005, AWID disseminated an invitation to its partner organizations through its e-lists. Additionally AWID received the support of GFW and UNIFEM Trust Fund on Violence against Women, who shared with us their list of grantees, who were also directly invited to fill out the on-line survey. The survey contained 27 questions requiring approximately 104 responses in total. To ease completion most questions relating to money used ranges. The survey included five open-ended questions, but most others were multiple choice category questions.
- Approximately 850 individuals completed the survey. (A survey was considered 'completed' once the name or email questions were completed.) Duplicate responses from the same organization were eliminated, yielding a final sample of 783 respondents. Among these were 408 women's organizations, which form the basis of this analysis.
- The data was cleaned in Microsoft Excel and ported to SPSS for analysis.
- Between 1995 and 2004, the purchasing power of the US dollar declined domestically by approximately 20%. Between 2000 and 2004 alone, the US dollar fell 9% domestically. These facts should be borne in mind when considering the trend data presented in this report.
- The survey design and analysis was managed by Martin Redfern. Questions about the methodology may be posed to him at martin@martinredfern.com or 613-830-7278.

Appendix


Additional Regional Results

- Ease of Fundraising for Subjects by Region
- Ease of Fundraising for Activities by Region
- Top Revenue Sources by Region
- Global Fund for Women data

Ease of Fundraising for Subject Areas

- Respondents in Africa (South of Sahara) -

Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following issues related to women's rights and gender equality?




Base: Approximately 50 Respondents

Ease of Fundraising for Subject Areas

- Respondents in Asia -

Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following issues related to women's rights and gender equality?




Base: Approximately 58 Respondents

Ease of Fundraising for Subject Areas

- Respondents in CEE/CIS -

Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following issues related to women's rights and gender equality?




Base: Approximately 17 Respondents

Ease of Fundraising for Subject Areas

- Respondents in Latin America and Caribbean-

Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following issues related to women's rights and gender equality?




Base: Approximately 28 Respondents

Ease of Fundraising for Subject Areas

- Respondents in Middle East and North Africa -

Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following issues related to women's rights and gender equality?




Base: Approximately 28 Respondents

Ease of Fundraising for Subject Areas

- Respondents in North America and Western Europe -


Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following issues related to women's rights and gender equality?



Base: Approximately 65 Respondents

Ease of Fundraising for Activities - Respondents in Africa (South of Sahara) -


Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following activities related to women's rights and gender equality?



Base: Approximately 56 Respondents

Ease of Fundraising for Activities - Respondents in Asia -

Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following activities related to women's rights and gender equality?




Base: Approximately 60 Respondents

Ease of Fundraising for Activities

- Respondents in CEE/CIS -

Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following activities related to women's rights and gender equality?




Base: Approximately 19 Respondents

Ease of Fundraising for Activities

- Respondents in Latin America and Caribbean -

Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following activities related to women's rights and gender equality?




Base: Approximately 31 Respondents

Ease of Fundraising for Activities

- Respondents in Middle East / North Africa -

Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following activities related to women's rights and gender equality?




Base: Approximately 28 Respondents

Ease of Fundraising for Activities


- Respondents in North America / Western Europe -

Compared to five years ago, is it easier or more difficult to raise funds for each of the following activities related to women's rights and gender equality?




Base: Approximately 63 Respondents

Top 3 Revenue Sources: 1995-2004
- Respondents in Africa (South of Sahara) -




Approximate Base: 2004:93; 2002: 63; 1995:37

Top 3 Revenue Sources: 1995-2004
- Respondents in Asia -




Approximate Base: 2004: 88; 2002: 66; 1995: 43


Top 3 Revenue Sources: 1995-2004
- Respondents in CEE/CIS -



Top 3 Revenue Sources: 1995-2004
- Respondents in Latin America and Caribbean -




Top 3 Revenue Sources: 1995-2004
- Respondents in Middle East and North Africa -



Approximate Base: 2004: 45; 2002: 36; 1995: 22

Top 3 Revenue Sources: 1995-2004
- Respondents in North America and Western Europe -




Approximate Base: 2004: 91; 2002: 77; 1995: 50

Source of Income

- Among GFW Grantees 1999 to 2005 -


Grantees mentioned up to five sources of funding, which have been sorted into 15 general categories.



Source of Income by Year

- Among GFW Grantees 1999 to 2005 -


Grantees mentioned up to five sources of funding, which have been sorted into 15 general categories.



Source of Income by Year

- Among GFW Grantees 1999 to 2005 -

Grantees mentioned up to five sources of funding, which have been sorted into 15 general categories.



AWID

The Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID) is an international membership organization, headquartered in Toronto, Canada, with offices in South Africa and Mexico, with over 6,000 members in over 100 countries, primarily in the Global South. Set up in 1982, AWID has been working to bring about policy, institutional and individual change that will improve the lives of women and girls everywhere. AWID does this by sharing strategic information and creating critical spaces for organizing and strategizing. AWID is one of the few organizations to play the role of facilitator and provocateur amongst gender equality advocates at the global level.

Just Associates

Just Associates (JASS) is a global advocacy learning network dedicated to building movements for human rights, equality and justice by strengthening the leaders, strategies, and organizations that share our vision. The JASS network is comprised of activists, popular educators and researchers in fourteen countries. JASS works with international and local non-governmental organizations (NGOs), trade unions, advocacy coalitions and grassroots groups involved in a range of rights and justice issues such as education, gender and racial equality, jobs, corruption and land. While sharing justice and human rights agendas with its partners, it also seeks to sharpen political thinking and better connect short-term tactics and actions with long-term visions and base-building strategies. In addition to the 18 network associates and advisors, Just Associates has a small staff of 6 based in Washington, DC where we also work closely with grassroots and democracy activists, in addition to its work in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe.

AWID would like to thank **Bisi Adeleye-Fayemi**, AWID's out-going Board President, for her commitment and support to this initiative.

This project has been generously supported with the financial contributions of the following organizations:



THE SIGRID RAUSING TRUST

