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https://www.bridgespan.org/insights/library/philanthropy/philanthropic-collaborations

This research provides crucial information on the growth and function of collaborative philanthropy, as well as pathways to increased collaborative giving. It builds on recent research on funder collaboration that found that collaboratives have the potential to produce significant impact. Using data from surveys with 97 collaborative initiatives, as well as interview and group discussions with about 100 donors and fund leaders, this report goes further, to examine the momentum and scale of “a trend toward more collaborative giving platforms.” In this research, collaboratives are defined broadly as “entities that either pool or channel resources from multiple donors or nonprofits.”

According to the survey, there has been significant growth in the number of collaboratives since 2010, with more than half of the respondents launching their collaboratives after 2015, and 16 of them being formed in 2020. Research attributes this surge to wealth accumulation over the past decade, as well as increasing interest in new ways of giving. Since their founding, the collaboratives in this survey have facilitated roughly $10–12 billion in investments. Ninety-seven respondents estimated their total grantmaking in 2020 fell between $2 billion and $3 billion, making
an average of 44 grants a year, with most grants totalling less than $500,000 each. The respondents noted that they have the potential to disburse substantially more resources—amounting to $15 billion a year, “with minimal growth in current staffing.”

One primary survey finding was that collaborative funding strategies differ from traditional philanthropy—“they tilt toward equity and justice, field and movement building, leaders of color, and, for some, power sharing.” Generally, the research found that collaboratives have more diverse leadership than institutional philanthropy. Almost half of the funds were led by people of colour, compared to only 10% of US foundations.

This diverse leadership held significant sway on the issues given attention: for example, 15 collaboratives identified racial justice as their primary focus, while all of the funds “referenced racial inequities, centered Black, Indigenous, and people-of-color (BIPOC) populations, and/or challenged engrained power hierarchies when describing their change objectives.” Economic mobility and climate change were also popular areas of focus stated by respondents. It was also found that collaboratives pursue impact in a way that differs from institutional philanthropy, especially in terms of supporting systems change and comfort with power sharing. The most favoured approach to systemic change among the respondents was through “building fields and movements,” while 10 respondents said they approach impact by “transferring decision-making power to nonprofit leaders and community groups.”

The study also identified three interlinked factors influencing the recent trend toward collaborative giving—efficiency, effectiveness and engagement—which give funders “the opportunity to tackle more
problems at a greater scale than they could do alone.” Efficiency and effectiveness came from outsourcing to the collaboratives’ staff who have specialised knowledge, skills and relationships, and are able to engage with funders’ peers, allowing funders to “fill knowledge gaps and broaden their giving horizons”—all while disbursing funds.


https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57cd7cd9d482e9784e4ccc34/t/61c487052cdc8459485f6a83/1640269574434/Funding_(in)equality_cffp_V3.pdf

This brief provides a concise overview of the funding landscape of actors mobilising for and against human rights in the EU, with specific focus on existing threats to feminist and LGBTQI+ freedoms. Building on research done by the Centre for Feminist Foreign Policy, the European Parliamentary Forum on Sexual and Reproductive Rights (EPF), Open Democracy, AWID, and Prospera, as well as a roundtable discussion organised by CFFP and Open Democracy for EU policymakers and civil society in June 2021, the brief highlights data gaps regarding anti-gender funding in the EU.
According to the briefing, EPF found that “European anti-gender actors have received USD 707.2 million between 2009 and 2018, with a fourfold increase in terms of annual financing (from USD 22.2 million in 2009 to USD 96 million in 2018).” Three main geographic regions were detected as sources of these actors’ financing, including the US (11.5% of total funding), the Russian Federation (26.6%), and the EU (66.9%). Funding from US Christian Right was largest from the US, and two conservative oligarchs, Vladimir Yakunin and Konstantin Malofeev, contributed the largest share of funding from the Russian Federation. Funding from the EU came from about 20 foundations whose largest donors are Catholic foundations from France, Italy, Germany, Spain, and Poland. However, the report notes that the lack of financial transparency and disclosure requirements in the EU means that data on funding to anti-rights actors from within the EU is scarce, and what is available very likely underestimates the actual sums flowing into European anti-gender movements.

The brief identifies four complex funding mechanisms through which anti-gender actors in the EU can acquire large sums of money. While these mechanisms mirror fundraising tactics that have typically been used by feminist civil society, the anti-gender movement has raised much more money through these mechanisms, suggesting that greater networking and fundraising is required among feminist civil society actors to counter these activities. One mechanism mentioned fundraises through grassroots initiatives with petition-based mobilisation, contributing to the mobilisation of large groups of individuals to donate small amounts of money, as well billionaires and millionaires from social and economic elites who donate larger sums.

Anti-gender activities are also funded through state support, “for
example, by setting up pseudo crisis pregnancy counselling centres or indoctrinating youth through school curricula, anti-gender actors gain access to official government funding, which can be abused to spread anti-equality political messages.” Anti-gender actors also have access to the usage of religious networks, ”predominantly Catholic and other faith-based networks through which donations and contributions can be mobilised.” The brief also mentions the role of language in the anti-gender movement and its ability to amass funds, pointing to how “anti-gender language and the rejection of feminism and gender, which does not, on the surface, appear to be extreme positions, makes more ‘traditionally’ exclusionary stances socially acceptable.”

Also included in this brief is information on the availability of funding for progressive civil society and a section on “the risks inherent for rights, freedoms, and democracy in the context of rising authoritarianism and shrinking civil society space in the EU.” It concludes with recommendations to policymakers and civil society in the EU to better address these issues, including to invest in internal capacity and knowledge development to better understand the strategies of anti-gender actors, and to increase the funding for feminist civil society by EU institutions and EU member states so as to effectively challenge the anti-gender movement.


This report seeks to identify barriers preventing foundations and program officers (POs) from providing more multiyear general operating support (GOS) to NGOs. It uses data from a survey of 168 foundation CEOs and 105 POs of private and community foundations giving at least $5 million annually, as well as 212 nonprofit CEOs/executive directors. It also draws from a series of in-depth interviews, which were conducted with foundation leaders working at foundations that provide multiyear GOS. The findings were compared with data from 300+ funders who used CEP’s Grantee Perception Report (GPR) published about 10 years before the COVID-19 pandemic. That report revealed that while 57% of grants distributed during this time were multiyear, and 21% were GOS, only 12.4% were both multiyear and GOS. It is important to note that the methodology for this report did not test for statistical differences between responses from POC-led organizations and non-POC-led organizations.

The report presents three findings from the data collected. The first being that non-profit leaders understand the many benefits of multiyear GOS to
to the health of their organizations, despite barriers that exist to receiving these grants. Some (29%) believed that foundations provide few multiyear GOS grants due to “a lack of trust in nonprofits and a desire to maintain control.” This issue of a lack of multiyear GOS precedes the COVID-19 pandemic. The report notes that only 41% of grantees interviewed reported receiving multiyear GOS during the year before the pandemic, contributing to a “pre-pandemic financial strain.” This strain has been exacerbated during the pandemic, forcing nonprofits to further “reduce staff, reduce services, and spend more time fundraising.”

The second finding reveals a disconnect between the attitudes and practices of foundation leaders. The study shows that there is a growing understanding among foundation leaders that GOS and multiyear grants are an effective means for supporting grantees’ work, ultimately enabling greater foundation and grantee impact. However, while the majority of foundation leaders are more in favour of providing multiyear GOS to their grantees, many of their foundations do not, and “those that do only provide it to a small percentage of the nonprofits that they support.” Many (63%) of foundation CEOs surveyed reported being in favour of increasing the percentage of grantees receiving multiyear GOS, however most did not report plans to change current practices. The report notes that it is possible that these plans have now changed as a result of the pandemic, based on the pledge hundreds of foundations signed to “make new grants as unrestricted as possible, so nonprofit partners have maximum flexibility to respond to this crisis.”

The third finding suggests that the study could not identify significant shared barriers foundations leaders experience in providing multiyear GOS. The most common explanation was that multiyear GOS does not fit with many foundations’ approaches to grantmaking. Some (10) CEOs of
Community foundations noted that providing multiyear GOS “is not possible with their limited levels of discretionary funding.” Those foundations that do provide multiyear GOS “have made it an intentional choice borne of their belief that it can build trust, strengthen relationships, and increase impact.”

The report offers the following closing questions: “Will the benefits experienced by the foundations providing more multiyear GOS lead others to provide or increase their provision of multiyear GOS? Will the COVID-19 pandemic, the related economic crisis, and the increased attention to longstanding inequities have an impact on the provision of multiyear GOS? Or will foundations continue to operate as they have been, in spite of the calls for change?”

Also published by CEP alongside this report are, “Making the Case: Foundation Leaders on the Importance of Multiyear General Operating Support” and “Making it Happen: Multiyear GOS Discussion Guide,” which includes profiles of five foundations that participated in interviews for this study.


This report, which provides data on the activities and funding gaps of LGBTI organizations in Europe and Central Asia, was produced by ILGA-Europe in 2021 as a resource for LGBTI organizations and donors. It is informed by survey responses from nearly 300 LGBTI organizations and interviews with 20+ LGBTI activists from all subregions of Europe and Central Asia gathered in 2020. Findings from this survey are also compared to the 2017 ILGA-Europe needs assessment survey to illustrate what changes may have occurred during this period.

The data shows that there are a growing number of LGBTI organizations in Europe and Central Asia since 2017, as well as a higher percentage of LGBTI organizations receiving external funding. While there was greater representation of LGBTI organizations with external funding, paid staff and savings in 2020, one third of all of these organizations had budgets under 20,000 euros, and about a quarter of LGBTI organizations in Europe and Central Asia had no external funding in 2020. Central and West Asian organizations, as well as Southern European organizations
and those that focus on subsections of LGBTI rights organizing, such as the rights of transgender, gender non-conforming and intersex people—were more likely to lack external funding and have budgets less than 20,000 euros. For example, a larger percentage of TGNC organizations had no paid staff compared to those that focus on LGBTI groups more broadly.

According to the report, foundation and intermediary funding were the most common funding sources for LGBTI organizations in Europe and Central Asia in 2020. Most LGBTI organizations in the survey did not have flexible, long term funding to support the activities they prioritize, such as community organizing and social and health services. It was also noted that some funders require organizations to spend money in ways that make it difficult to save or develop reserves. This contributed to significant financial strain during the pandemic (between March 2020 and March 2021), when the most common social service activities provided by these organizations were psychological support to LGBTI people and facilitating and/or providing space for peer support groups. Most organizations relied on core funding to support this work, or did the work without funding.

Several organizations expressed the desire to do more cross-population work in the LGBTI community to reach the groups most in need, but lack the funding and skills necessary to do this work. Some noted pandemic-specific challenges to accessing funding, such as an increase in negative experiences contributing to stress and burnout among staff, as a result of COVID-19 and anti-LGBTI rhetoric, threats and attacks. This was especially prevalent in Eastern Europe, where organizations have also faced difficulty accessing funds due to changes in national laws. These issues highlight a primary challenge mentioned in the report—that “funding
is not keeping pace with the changing realities experienced by LGBTI organizations.” The lack of alignment between funders’ priorities and the immediate and long term needs of LGBTI organizations in the pandemic hinders their ability to support their communities and forces them to compromise on the most urgent areas of action in order to ensure their survival.

**Financing Women, Peace and Security in fragile contexts. OECD. 2021**


This notice by the OECD calls on donors to provide more aid in support of gender equality, particularly in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, which has exacerbated gender inequalities and increased the risk of conflict and violence towards women and girls around the world. In light of the 20th anniversary of United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325 on Women, Peace and Security (WPS) in 2020, the notice encourages us to consider the progress that has been made over the past 10+ years, as well as areas for improvement. For example, while aid to support gender equality in the economic and productive sectors represented 47% of DAC members’ total bilateral aid in these sectors in 2021, this funding only accounted for 2% of aid to these sectors targeting gender equality as a principal objective.

Given the impact of the ongoing pandemic on women’s livelihoods and their engagement as economic actors, the brief calls on donors to “consider the crucial role of women in crisis response and recovery.”
and to ensure that “development co-operation programmes and financial stimulus packages fully take into account a gender equality perspective.” Noting that DAC members are reprogramming their agendas and their support of developing countries in response to the pandemic, the notice also makes mention that ODA is the second most important source of external finance after remittances in fragile contexts. Building on the progress that has been made in aid toward gender equality in fragile contexts, the notice emphasizes the importance of donors providing more aid toward gender equality in this political moment, with specific attention to the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda.

**Isabella Cordua and Sabrina Mahtani. Forgotten by Funders: An exploratory report on the challenges of resourcing work with and for incarcerated women and girls worldwide. Women Beyond Walls. December 2021.**

[https://www.womenbeyondwalls.org/forgottenbyfunders](https://www.womenbeyondwalls.org/forgottenbyfunders)

This report by Women Beyond Walls sheds light on funding challenges faced by organizations that work with and for incarcerated women and girls around the world. In August 2021, Women Beyond Walls, “a new movement-building platform, amplifying voices to end the over-incarceration and over-criminalisation of women worldwide,” reached out to 34 organizations spanning 24 countries across five continents, involved in this work to better understand the funding challenges they
face, in terms of the quantity and quality of funding.

The report compiles key findings from the survey results which point to a general lack of support for organizations that work with and for incarcerated women and girls. While these established organizations are using diverse strategies to do important work, they are struggling to survive in a context where addressing women’s incarceration is not a priority for most donors. One key finding revealed that 71% of respondents do not receive funding from foundations that identify as women’s rights or feminist foundations—pointing to a larger issue within feminist movements, where “work with and for incarcerated women and girls is often left out of mainstream women’s rights and human rights dialogues, convenings and movements.” The report noted the harmful impact of such exclusion, referencing the Generation Equality Forum in July 2021 as an example. The Forum, which aimed to “foster an intersectional, intergenerational, and intersectoral approach to gender equality,” garnered $40 billion in pledges to support gender equality. However, due to the lack of attention to issues affecting incarcerated women, they were not prioritized in the resulting funding commitments.

Women Beyond Walls’ report also revealed that government and multilateral funding to organizations working with and for incarcerated women and girls was low—only 44% of respondents said they received government funding (29% from national government sources and 15% from local government sources), and only 21% had received funding from multilateral organizations between 2020 and 2021. Some participants in the survey felt that this lack of prioritization was “a reflection of the negative public perception around incarceration, which impacts donor agendas and also makes it challenging to access corporate or individual support.” Political and social environments
have also created challenges for organizations working with and for incarcerated women, such as lack of access to prisons and a restricted civic space. These challenges have been exacerbated during the COVID-19 pandemic.

In general, these organizations spoke of a lack of access to flexible, core funding, difficulties with the funding process and funding key staff positions, and a need for non-financial support for sustainability. Organizations also noted receiving insufficient funding to fully implement all their strategies, particularly their work with women and girls post-incarceration, including “work with and for women on release from detention, legal services and strategic litigation, research and policy work, national, regional and international advocacy, ability to test new strategies/innovative ideas, and scaling up work to different areas/countries.” The report concludes with a number of recommendations, including to make funding more accessible to organizations working with and for women and girls impacted by the criminal justice system, as well as to explore funding gaps and how to better support investments in these areas.
This report showcases the important, intersectional work of LBQ-led groups around the world and makes the case to increase funding to these groups. Presenting findings from surveys conducted in 2018 with 378 LBQ groups from all regions of the world, the report also builds on data from 67 donors, including public and private foundations, and provides four case studies of LBQ groups based on follow-up interviews. Respondents in the survey belonged to groups that are “self-governing or autonomous,” and “work specifically on LBQ issues or with LBQ communities, with LBQ people comprising the majority (50% or more) of the group’s leadership.”

According to the report, LBQ groups and LBQ activism have grown significantly in the last two decades in every region of the world. Most groups (89%) have been founded in the last twenty years, with more than half (61%) being established since 2010. Most (90%) of the groups use diverse strategies in their activism, including movement building, advocacy, and capacity-building, as well as cultural change strategies, such as creating media and art, preserving LBQ history, and engaging in research and knowledge production. Several groups (63%) offered direct
health and social services, as well as mental health and wellness support to LBQ communities, with more than half (56%) using safety-related strategies in their work.

The survey also revealed that nearly three-quarters (72%) of LBQ groups operated on annual budgets of less than $50,000 USD per year, while the median budget for LBQ groups in 2017 was $11,713 USD. Almost half (40%) of the groups reported an annual budget of less than $5,000 USD, and one-third (34%) of groups received no external funding. Nearly half (48%) of the groups’ external funding was $5,000 USD or under, indicating that LBQ groups have small budgets and limited access to external funding. Additionally, the majority of the groups had very few, if any, paid staff, and had to rely on volunteers. Most (70%) LBQ groups did not have savings and some (27%) had no assets.

While funding to LBQ groups was scarce in every region, there were significant regional differences. For example, “the median external funding for LBQ groups in North America was $244,000, and in every other region the median external funding received was less than $10,000.” Groups in Europe and Central Asia and in Asia and the Pacific had the lowest median external funding. The report highlights how this lack of funding to LBQ groups reduces their ability to implement their strategies and address priority areas of action. More than half (56%) of LBQ groups have never received multi-year funding and less than a quarter (22%) received unrestricted funding, hindering their ability to do long-term work. A third (34%) of LBQ groups are generating community funding to resource their work.

The report highlights some of the barriers LBQ groups face in accessing long-term funding are "a lack of requests for proposals reflecting their
priorities and strategies, requirements to present a successful fundraising track record, a lack of donor response to their queries, and delays in payments once funding is awarded.” It also makes recommendations to donors, who have been presented with an important opportunity to adjust funding strategies to ensure that they meet the needs and priorities of the growing LBQ movement. These recommendations include: “1) increase funding for LBQ communities and direct it to LBG groups, 2) make funding more accessible to LBG groups, 3) improve the quality of funding for LBQ groups, 4) direct funding to regions where LBQ groups’ access is especially limited, 5) invest in research and knowledge production and service provision, two priorities of LBG groups that are particularly underfunded, 6) increase non-financial support to LBG groups and ensure it meets their needs, 7) for donors without LBQ-specific portfolios, ensure that funding intended to be LBQ-inclusive actually reaches LBQ communities and 8) seek to “de-silo” funding for LBQ groups’ intersectional work.”


https://racialequity.org/mismatched/

This report presents an analysis of funding trends over time to show that while funding to support racial equity and racial justice work has
increased over the past decade, it is still a small proportion of overall foundation funding and does not meet the demands of racial justice movements. Following an increase in mass organizing against police brutality and racial injustice in 2020, corporations and foundations pledged large amounts of funding for racial equity. As a result of “incomplete data, double counting, and inclusion of commitments for broad multi-year pledges and internal corporate spending,” there have been misperceptions about the scale of financial support that has been distributed to grassroots organizations and movements mobilizing for racial equity and justice.

This report was produced in this context and relies on the Philanthropic Initiative for Racial Equity (PRE)’s yearlong analysis of the comprehensive funding data collected by Candid, as well as new research criteria developed to identify grants specifically for racial equity and racial justice. It differs from other reports of its kind by highlighting the confirmed grants that were awarded, and by examining trends, contradictions and divergences in funding for racial equity and racial justice efforts over the past decade, with particular focus on the years 2015–2018 and 2020.

According to the report, there has been steady growth in the scale of funding and the number of funders engaged in racial equity and racial justice over the last five years, with funding for racial equity reaching nearly $5.8 billion and funding for racial justice reaching $925 million in 2018. Grassroots organizing for equity and justice has also grown significantly between 2015 and 2018, contributing to several legislative victories. Despite this progress, “only 6 cents of every philanthropic dollar is devoted to racial equity, and only 1 cent toward racial justice,” indicating that there are clear “mismatches” between the needs of grassroots movement organizers and the responses and priorities of philanthropists.
The report found that the top 20 funders of racial justice work accounted for 60% of all racial justice funding in 2015–2018, pointing to an overreliance on a small group of funders that puts vulnerable grassroots organizations at risk. Misinformation about the scale of funding going to racial equity and justice has also negatively impacted these organizations, suggesting that if funders believe that these movements are well-funded, or even over-funded, they are less likely to invest.

The report also points to the co-optation of movement language by corporations and white-led organizations to raise money for their own diversity and inclusion efforts, or to market “mortgages and other products to Black and Brown communities, rather than to external community grants.” For example, it mentions that more than one third of the top 20 racial equity recipients were founded by white billionaires and large corporations advancing their own ideas of social change, often with minimal or no input from grassroots organizations led by and for communities of colour.

As a result, funding for racial justice, grassroots organizing and long-term movement-oriented work has suffered, while most funding has focused on meeting short-term needs. Funding for grassroots organizing made up 1.3% ($276.2 million) of the total racial equity funding for 2015–2018, and 9.1% ($252.3 million) of the total racial justice funding for the same period. Annual funding for specific communities of colour was particularly low, and within some Black, Latinx, Asian Pacific American (APA), and Native American communities, the funding for grassroots organizing totaled approximately 1% of the total funding for that community between 2015 and 2018.

To combat these issues—summarized as the tendency of corporations
and foundations “to answer the movement’s call for deep, structural change with support for shallow individual-level change”—the report makes a number of recommendations, including “to 1) devote more resources to racial equity and racial justice, 2) sustain funding for racial equity and racial justice, 3) engage communities of colour and movements in strategy and funding decisions, 4) fund transformational change beyond an equity framework, and 5) improve data about racial equity and racial justice grant making.”


This brief is based on a comparative analysis of data from two reports—The State of Intersex Organizing (2017, 2nd Edition), which used data from a global survey of 54 intersex organizations in 2016 about their organizational structure, budget, funding needs and priorities, and the 2015/2016 Global Resources Report: Government and Philanthropic Support for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Intersex Communities (2018), which analyzed data on 12,964 grants awarded by 511 foundations, intermediaries, and corporations and by 15 government and multilateral agencies during 2015 and 2016.
In comparing this data, the report identified a number of primary funding challenges, noting that in 2015–2016, intersex funding represented a tiny fraction of total global LGBTI grantmaking (0.59% of all global funding on LGBTI issues), with only 0.29% of this funding going directly to intersex organizations. These numbers suggest that a substantial amount of the scarce funding flowing into intersex movements is going to LGBTI organizations rather than to intersex-led organizations. When funding is not directed to intersex-led groups, there is a risk that intersex issues and organizations will be overlooked. This is demonstrated by another funding challenge identified in the report, which reveals that less than 10% of funders of global LGBTI issues supported intersex organizations in 2015–2016.

Another primary funding challenge listed is the lack of funding to intersex-led organizations in the Global South and East. While funding is limited to intersex groups around the world, those in the Global South and East experience the greatest challenge in accessing resources. Between 2015–2016, no grants were awarded to intersex organizations in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, and only $40,000 was given to intersex organizations across the Caribbean, Central America, and South America.

Other challenges noted are the lack of external support from donors, which leaves intersex organizations to work with little financial resources and few paid staff, and a lack of general flexible support that would give intersex organizations the resources to work at multiple levels. Additionally, the report pointed to the need for more resources for community organizing and movement building, and more support from children and youth rights funders, very few of whom are funding intersex organizations.
This brief is based on a comparative analysis of data from two reports—The State of Trans Organizing (2017), which used data from a 2016 survey of 455 trans organizations and groups working in 99 countries, representing every region of the world, about their organizational structure, budget, funding needs and priorities, and the 2015–2016 Global Resources Report: Government and Philanthropic Support for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Intersex Communities (2018), which analyzed data on 12,964 grants awarded by 511 foundations, intermediaries, and corporations, and by 15 government and multilateral agencies during 2015 and 2016.

In comparing this data, the brief outlines a number of funding challenges faced by trans-led organizations with the goal of driving greater attention and funding to trans issues within individual funding institutions and philanthropic fields. In particular, the data demonstrated that the growing international trans movement is significantly under-resourced and continues to receive only a small amount of total global funding on LGBTI issues.

Between 2015 and 2016, funding to trans organizations accounted for only 3.5% of the total amount of global LGBTI funding over those two
years, and only 2.7% of all global LGBTI funding outside of the U.S during the same period, pointing to another funding challenge—that the limited funding reaching trans organizations is not evenly distributed across the globe. Data from both reports suggests that while trans organizations in every region lack access to external funding, it is particularly difficult for trans groups in the Caribbean, Central America, South America, the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), Asia and the Pacific, Australia, and New Zealand. Between 2015 and 2016, there was only one recorded grant to a trans organization in MENA, while there were no recorded grants to trans organizations in the Pacific, Australia, and New Zealand.

Between 2015 and 2016, trans organizations generally received smaller grants than other organizations funded to do LGBTI work, with the average grant size to trans organizations ($23,000) making up almost half of the global average grant size for LGBTI work ($44,700). This points to another challenge identified from the data, which shows that only a fraction of funding on trans issues actually reaches trans-led organizations, whose expertise is informed by lived experience and makes them well-placed to find the best solutions to the challenges faced by trans communities. According to the Global Resources report, between 2015 and 2016, $26,134,000 was awarded for work with trans communities outside of the US and only $7,032,700 (26.9%) was awarded to trans organizations directly. These organizations are also at the front lines of the HIV response within their communities but they receive a very small amount of global HIV funding.

Other challenges identified in the brief are the concentration of trans funding among a small number of foundations, the lack of financial support to trans organizations from government and multilateral funders, and the lack of funding to trans organizations working at local and international level outside of the US.