



Peace and Security Funding Index: An Analysis of Global Foundation Grantmaking

Executive Summary

On June 7, 2016, Carnegie Corporation of New York hosted a group over 40 funders, policymakers, and practitioners for a discussion on the Peace and Security Funders Group's (PSFG) recently-released [*Peace and Security Funding Index: An Analysis of Global Foundation Grantmaking*](#), and what the results mean for the peacebuilding sector. PSFG presented the report's key findings, highlighting that total foundation funding in the peace and security field was \$283 million, which is less than one percent of total foundation giving. Despite this, the Index showcases where peace and security funders are having an outsized impact on global peace and stability. Following the presentation, participants discussed the challenges and opportunities facing the field of peace and security. Peacebuilding experts discussed the current state of peacebuilding as a pillar of the peace and security field, opportunities for private foundations to fill gaps in the field, and next steps.

Lessons Learned

In order to spark conversation, two peacebuilding experts were asked to share their perspectives on the effectiveness and future trends in the peacebuilding field. Experts agreed that some of the failures in the field of peacebuilding can be attributed to the fragmentary nature of intervention on the part of international agencies, and the lack of coordination and long-term planning. There was general consensus that closer collaboration between private funders, practitioners, and multilateral donor agencies is needed. Various intervening agencies (e.g., World Bank, International Monetary Fund, NATO) have not successfully built capacity on the ground. One expert maintained that international entities involved in peacebuilding operate with their own agendas and do not coordinate with one another. Some participants argued that there continues to be no long-term political strategy to build upon and stresses the need for political resolutions to be at the center of any peacebuilding strategy.

Participants also stressed the need for inclusivity in the peacebuilding process. Current practices in the field of peacebuilding limit engagement with elites and government entities in conflict settings; instead, we should invest in grassroots groups generally and women and youth specifically. Finally, panelists discussed the centrality of politics to peacebuilding and the need to understand the field of peacebuilding through the lens of politics and conflict resolution/prevention, rather than solely through the lens of development. Participants called for a paradigm shift that moves peacebuilding into "something that is much wider" and investing more at a conflict prevention stage.

Challenges and Opportunities

Participants discussed the future of the field of peacebuilding, expressing concern over resources. One participant mentioned that in 2013, \$35 billion went to conflicted affected countries and, of that, only 16% was actually targeted to peacebuilding, with half of going to Afghanistan and Iraq. This year, \$9 billion is allocated towards peacekeeping operations, with more funds being allocated for humanitarian response and peacekeeping operations versus conflict prevention. This trend in funding, participants noted, is politically short-sighted. Participants also expressed concern about the

trend towards “stabilization” as a strategy of peacebuilding. “I think where the field is going is very worrisome,” said a participant, “the trend is towards what we call “stabilization” and it requires having the military on the ground, the trend is ever greater militarization.”

Identified funding opportunities included an economic analysis of peacebuilding, an in-depth analysis of existing conflicts and what will it take to resolve them (from the country’s perspective), how to fund in risky situations (e.g., PSFG’s [white paper](#) on the role of funders in conflict), and how to better measure outcomes of an investment. This latter gap includes funding impact assessments for grantees via a budget line-item in their grant budget.

Panelists suggested that the Index could be very useful moving forward in pushing the field towards identifying best practices. With regards to opportunities, one participant suggested that private funders have an advantage as long as funds can be used towards careful assessment and a genuine study of outcomes. Often, United Nations agencies cannot maintain long-term investment in conflict affected countries, but they can chart a path for private funders. There is an opportunity to bridge the gap between research and practice, and foundations have an agenda-setting capacity in this regard.

The Peace and Security Funding Index: Key Findings and Next Steps

The Index can help build and expand the field of peace and security, and serve diverse audiences. It can also assist-funders in identifying gaps in terms of strategy, issue area, and geographic focus, and helps those who don’t see themselves as “peace and security” funders situate their grantmaking portfolio vis-à-vis other “traditional” funders in this broad “field in the making.” Policymakers may want to engage with the Index to find and connect with foundation partners, while researchers and the academic community have a role in improving upon the data and its interpretation. One participant from the United Nations Development Program expressed that their Working Group on Youth, Peace, and Security wants to collaborate with PSFG on finding opportunities to expand the field and have structured dialogue with funders around different types of modalities.

The Index report can be downloaded here: <http://peaceandsecurityindex.org/wp-content/themes/peaceandsecurity/images/PSFG-report.pdf>. The website itself is a rich source of information on who are peace and security funders, what are they funding, how are they funding, and where are they funding. The Index will be updated annually. Future editions will seek to refine the methodology to address concerns raised about coding and other definitional issues. The dearth of detail about grant objectives in some of the data provided by funders may have detracted from the robustness of some of the findings.