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Funding situation of women’s organizations worldwide...

Our 2006 survey results
In what country is your organization based? (Recoded from country)

- Africa - South of Sahara: 31% (N = 299)
- Latin America and Caribbean: 25% (N = 244)
- Asia: 15% (N = 139)
- CEE/CIS: 13% (N = 128)
- Western Europe and North America: 9% (N = 84)
- Middle East /N.Africa: 4% (N = 38)

Base: 958 Respondents
Budget Size

What was your organization’s total income in 2005?

- Under $10k: 34%
- $10k to $50k: 32%
- $50k to $100k: 12%
- $100k to $500k: 19%
- $500k+: 4%

Sample = 845 respondents
Overall Revenue Ranges by Region: 2005

Sample = 845 respondents
Big challenges…

• Women’s organizations are in a state of “survival and resistance”

• When asked in August 2006, most say they would need to double their budget to do everything they hope to do this year

• Women’s rights work is made much more difficult given dominant conservative agendas, neoliberalism, growing violence, and destruction of the social fabric

• Compared to other social movements and sectors, women’s organizations have very small budgets

• Capacity, leadership, and vision to mobilize large resources is also a challenge
But opportunities exist…

• The situation clearly seems to be changing, opportunities are opening up and the pool of available resources may become larger than ever before. The question is how can they be harnessed?

• Women’s organizations around the world are strategizing about expanding the resource base for women’s organizations and movements
Where has the money come from?
Income 1995 - 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bi/Multilateral Development Assistance</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Private Foundations</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Foundations/INGOs</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Giving</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Private Foundations</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Funds</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Giving/Philanthropy</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/local governments</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization's resources</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO with grantmaking function</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of all revenue in 1995, 2000 and 2005 which came from each source. (Totals to 100%)

Sample = 454/504/729 respondents
How well resourced are we together?
Total Revenue 1995 – 2005

- All Organizations, All Sources

2005 (729 Organizations)
$77,561,683
Average: $106,394 per organization

2000 (504 Organizations)
$43,549,514
Average: $86,407 per organization

1995 (454 Organizations)
$39,145,077
Average: $86,222 per organization

Total Revenue to All Participant Organizations.
## Top 20 Donors: 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual Donor(s)</td>
<td>$7,726,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dutch Government</td>
<td>$4,482,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
<td>$4,031,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Local foundations</td>
<td>$3,198,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oxfam International Members</td>
<td>$3,195,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Global Fund for Women</td>
<td>$2,674,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HIVOS</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Swedish Government</td>
<td>$1,980,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>European Commission/EU</td>
<td>$1,673,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Norwegian Government</td>
<td>$1,482,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>DANIDA</td>
<td>$1,235,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>United Nations Fund for Women (UNIFEM)</td>
<td>$1,186,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Packard Foundation</td>
<td>$1,079,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td>$916,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CORDAID</td>
<td>$885,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>$852,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Local groups</td>
<td>$749,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mama Cash</td>
<td>$730,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>$725,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Open Society Institute</td>
<td>$657,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Donations to All Participant Organizations**

Combined revenue is USD 77.5 million

**Base: 729 respondents**
What factors influence these trends, positively and negatively?
Factors that influence funding trends (1)

- **Fashions**: gender equality and even women’s rights was “flavor of the month” for many donors. As one respondent said, “there’s a disturbing certainty among governments that enough has been done for women.” Women’s rights, many say, is out of fashion with donors.

- **Gender Mainstreaming**: as a concept and an approach, has been misconstrued and wrongly applied. It was always meant to mean a two-track strategy: integrating gender equality across all policies and programs, as well as focus on women’s empowerment specifically – the latter got deprioritized and mainstreaming got depoliticized.

- **Global frameworks**: policy agendas of global institutions have increasingly demanded the attention and resources of international and regional NGOs of all types with mixed results. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness are among the most recent of these agendas.
Factors that influence funding trends (2)

- **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.

- **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 entered the funding community with both good and bad results. A negative result has been a shift away from core funding to project funding, with a predominance of short-term funding.
Factors that influence funding trends (3)

- **Not so equal partners:** The power dynamics inherent in funding relationships generate considerable frustration. 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.

- **Political forces and deeper dilemmas of our time:** 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:
  - *Neoliberalism*
  - *Religious fundamentalisms*
  - *Militarization*
  - *Patriarchy*
The funding landscape

**Government sources:**
1. Bilateral and Multilateral Development Agencies

**Private foundations and philanthropy:**
2. Large Private Foundations
3. Individual Giving, Small Private Foundations
4. Corporate Philanthropy

**Public Foundations:**
5. Public Foundations / INGOs
6. Women’s Funds
A few recommendations…

– **Ownership**: this is one of the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Let’s rethink or even better, expand our understanding of what ownership means, and let’s say that ownership also mean to let CSOs, particularly women’ organizations decide how best to invest the resources through their strategic plans, by providing them with core support and multi-year grants. Somehow, is giving organizations their own form of budget support.

– **Contribute to accountability**: ensure that direct funding goes to support women’s organizations in different regions, which does not go through national government channels, to advance the autonomy and independence of women’s organizations and contributes to strengthen civil society at all levels.

– **Improve all donors’ systems for tracking the money** invested in women’s rights and gender equality, so that better systems of accountability can be put in place.

– **Create large women’s specific budget lines and programs** within bilateral agencies (such as the one launched by Norway last March or by the Dutch Government last June 2007), as well as in other donor agencies such as INGOs, foundations, etc.
A few recommendations…

– **Channel resources through women’s funds** at different levels and intermediary granting-making institutions truly committed to advance women’s rights and gender equality, to reach out and support smaller-sized and middle-sized women’s organizations working at the grassroots and other levels. Resources for all women’s organizations of diverse sizes, sectors and working on different issues need to be allocated.

– Ensure that a **set percentage of funds available for CSOs** are available in the Embassies or in offices at the national level (in the case of Large Independent Foundations or INGOs for example), and are allocated to women’s organizations.

– At the national level, **support the inclusion and full engagement of women’s organizations and movements in the definition of national development plans** which will guide the aid effectiveness agenda and the prioritization of gender equality and women’s rights and empowerment as part of the national development plans.
A few recommendations…

- Create spaces for meaningful dialogue and new ways of engagement between donors and women’s organizations, beyond pushing donor to rethink their approach and prioritization of women's rights, women’s groups should work collectively (giving themselves more clout) to discourage funders from imposing agendas, aggressively pursuing and headhunting women NGO leaders with often negative effects on the organizations they leave behind, stealing or taking credit for ideas coming from the movement, or representing women as victims or passive recipients of aid.

- Renew the commitments of donors to strengthening movements, by investing more in alliance building, networking, linking and learning as well as supporting endowments for national women’s organizations to build a strong institutional base for the movement. Movement building funding should be a major priority of support provided to women’s organizations and movements in all regions.
Thank you!!!
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