

## CART File

# HRFN WEBINAR OCTOBER 19, 2021 Power in Numbers: Evidence-based Advocacy to Move Money to Social Justice Movements

\*\*\*\*\*

This file is being provided in a lightly scanned format to address punctuation and formatting. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) captioning is provided in order to facilitate communication access and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings; this file is intended for use as notes for the recipient. Due to the live nature of the event and the quality of the audio source some names and/or terms may be misspelled. This text may also contain phonetic attempts at sounds and words that were spoken, and environmental sounds that occurred during the event.

\*\*\*\*\*

[music]

>>KELLEA: Welcome, everyone.

Please settle in.

We'll give folks a few minutes to arrive.

Thank you for being here today.

[music]

>> KELLEA: Hello and welcome, everyone.

I am Kellea Miller.

I am the deputy director of Human Rights Funders Network.

Thank you for those of you who have joined us in this session or in our previous session.

I'm going to do a few logistics to make sure that everyone is able to participate and then we'll talk about why we are here today.

So to ensure that this is a conversation that reaches far and wide, we have interpretation.

You can see down at the bottom of your screen there should be an option for interpretation.

Please choose your language here.

You can choose French or Spanish.

You can also see the live transcript in closed captioning.

There is that CC button at the bottom for live transcript.

While on the topic of interpretation and captioning, if you speaking or joining us in voice please do so slowly.

We're going to make sure everyone has a chance to participate today.

Please mute yourself if you are not speaking.

That will be most of us.

This will ensure that we are all able to hear correctly and especially that our great team in the background is able to interpret and caption.

This session will be recorded.

We want to make sure it's a resource now and beyond this moment.  
So just please note that this will be something that is shared publicly after.  
With that, please, last but not least, go ahead and rename yourself.  
We have all been on Zoom calls where you see -- well, for me, it's usually HRFN  
Engagement, which is less exciting and less descriptive than my name.  
I have Kellea Miller, my organization, and then my pronouns.  
And that is it.  
With that, we are going to kick off today's conversation.  
So, we have been having a discussion about what it means for us to be using data to  
advance human rights activism and funding.  
We know that our movements around the world are trying to move justice forward, on the  
front lines of change but often underresourced.  
Or maybe resourced in ways that could be more effective.  
What we at HRFN and those of us on this call will speak about today are ways in which we  
can be using data and analysis to bring more resources where they are needed and to  
deepen the impact of funding.  
Our first conversation you can see in the chat in a moment was a discussion around funding  
for disability rights.  
Funding for black feminist movements, especially looking at power within funding between  
Global North and Global South and what it means to understand whose voices count and to  
bring those into the conversation.  
Today, we have another really important and vibrant discussion.  
I'm going to hand it over to our moderator for this conversation, Viviane.  
She will guide you for today.  
And bring us into the conversation later.  
Thank you for joining.  
**>>VIVIANE:** Thank you so much, Kellea.  
Welcome, everyone.  
This is Viviane Simakawa speaking to you.  
My pronouns are she and her. I'm a program officer at the International Trans Fund.  
Thank you so much for attending this session which will be focused on LGBTQI rights and  
the power of following the funding.  
Today -- sorry, just a second.  
Today we have the opportunity to share ideas with three amazing people.  
I believe we will learn together about some critical aspects related with LGBTI rights and  
funding and research from them.  
In this sense I welcome Caroline Kouassiaman, executive director at Initiative Sankofa  
d'Afrique de l'Ouest.  
ISDAO.  
Ezra Nepon, senior program officer at Global Philanthropy Project, GPP.  
And Joy Chia, executive director at The Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice.  
For this important conversation on the power of following the funding.  
In particular, as the series is focused on how we change the narrative and move more money  
to the forefront of social change through critical research and strategic relationship building,  
we had an awesome preparation meeting to focus more specifically on this.  
How research and evidence used strategically can contribute to more and better funding to

LGBTI organizations and communities.

We had all of you in mind while having this lovely moment.

I hope you can all benefit from our meeting today.

Caroline, I will start with you in this conversation.

In our conversation last week, I loved how you mentioned the importance of complementarity in the field as something important to observe.

When we think about social justice work, data research, philanthropic advocacy, and I thought it could be a good opening to our conversation today.

How do you analyze this complementarity from the ISDAO perspective and in terms of how research and knowledge are relevant for funding in other communities?

**>>CAROLINE:** Thank you so much, Viviane, and thank you to HRFN and to GPP for creating this space for this conversation.

As I was thinking and preparing for our talk today I was trying to think about the numbers.

And thinking about the numbers that stick with me.

The numbers that resonate with me.

I'm going to share as I speak a few numbers because I think it is related to the context and why it is important why we talk about numbers and we talk about the data and following the funding that we also contextualize what that funding means.

So many of you are familiar with the Global Resources Report.

The first Global Resources Report looked at across regions what the funding picture was.

I work with ISDAO, Initiative Sankofa d'Afrique de l'Ouest, focused on West Africa and funding LGBTQI movements in West Africa.

And the first Global Resources Report, funding that went to our entire region, which is 16 countries, was just over \$2.6 million.

In the two-year period.

That has increased to the number, one of four numbers I will talk about, which is 8.05.

I won't go into the whole number.

But 8.05 million.

I think it is important to note this number.

One, because there is a growth.

There is an increase.

But what does data tell us?

I think the beauty of resources like the Global Resources Report is it gives a big picture about what is shifting within the philanthropic space.

Where are resources going.

How are we actually seeing impact of our advocacy for more and better resources.

But, it doesn't tell the full picture.

It tells a picture from a very overall bird's eye view on the overall numbers.

How does it relate to what we see on the ground?

It was really important for us when we saw the numbers to look at in -- as we were developing ISDAO in 2015 and 2016 [phonetic] we know the 2-point-something million there, what does it look like on the ground?

How are movements being resourced?

What are movements doing?

So it was important as part of the very foundation of ISDAO to look at the -- to see how we create complementarity with data.

Are the resources actually being received by local LGBTQI organizations?

Are they determining their priorities?

And what is really interesting in our reexist report, which is a mapping report of the resource we did, there's a slide that always sticks with me.

It shows the priorities for funding, where most funding was coming from, and priorities for communities, and they did not match.

The great majority of funding priorities and needs for communities were around safety and security, addressing violence, talking about discrimination broadly in terms of health [phonetic] looking at employment, education, stigma, but that is not where the money was coming from.

As we think about complementarity and making the case, how do we take the big picture, the 2.6 million or 8-point-something million to actually say what does it translate to at a regional level, at a country level?

A community level?

I know we will hear from other colleagues about other research such as state of trans organizing, intersex organizing that I think are incredible examples of ways in which it is great to have the big picture but what does it mean?

Is it actually funding?

Are resources actually funding trans-led community organizing?

Are they responding to priorities? How can we take data from different organizations to have a full picture about what is getting funded and what isn't getting funded?

And the research I mentioned, for us, was so critical for helping to build ISDAO.

It was very clear from over 150 interviews that as ISDAO was building our grantmaking, our funding we could not reproduce those same dynamics.

We needed data, evidence was showing we needed to be much more intentional, much more open.

If we said we wanted to fund LBQ women's organizing, trans and intersex organizing we need to make sure systems enable us to do that.

That is really -- didn't come only from a strong conviction of people who were part of setting it up.

It also came from data we collected and was coming from the broader states.

The second number I will mention is actually two.

The number two.

I like this number because when we -- we most recently completed data collection to update the report.

When we did the first mapping there was not a single intersect-led organization in the region.

The most recent mapping there is now two.

We still have a long ways to go.

But I think what the data is showing us is that organizing is starting to happen.

It is starting to emerge.

It is underfunded, absolutely underfunded.

There is so much to know.

There is so far to go.

But being able to actually understand what is the impact of funding.

ISDAO is part of that story, part of seeding the organizations leading that work.

That's the second number I wanted to mention, because I think it is also important for us to

recognize where there are changes.

Changes and shifts we celebrate, recognize, and realize the importance of funding isn't just in the millions.

It can also be in the single digits.

The last number I want to mention here, then I'll kind of close, because I know I want to hear from my colleagues too, is 11%.

The Global Resources Report, the last Global Resources Report released by global philanthropy funding had funding LGBTQI funding to West Africa at 11% of all of Africa.

This is -- when we think about, talk about gaps and issues of equity around funding, West Africa constitutes about 30% of the countries.

More than 30% of the population on the continent.

Yet, look at the gap with level of funding going to LGBTQI organizing.

Yet, for those of us who are in the region, we know there is strong emerging organizing happening that is not getting resourced but what that report helps us to do is make the case.

So, yes, there's been growth in funding.

Yes, it's 11% of all the LGBTI funding on the continent but we are also only reaching, out of the 16 West African countries only 11 of them are actually -- have actually reported any funding.

So it means there's a lot of organizing that is not getting resourced at all.

And it also has taught us or is teaching us, showing us, the ways in which there is inequity.

Ways in which certain countries are much more resourced than others.

Ways in which equity, when we look at Lusophone and Francophone countries, level of resources going there.

This has also helped to inform our own advocacy with other funders as well as our own strategizing and our own grantmaking at ISDAO to look at how we respond to the gaps and how we ensure there is greater equity in terms of funding going to the region.

I will stop there.

I have a couple other numbers I can share if we have time at the end.

**>>VIVIANE:** That is so great.

Thank you so much for the analysis and these numbers, but also highlighting how data relevance for the communities require this complementarity, right.

I will pass to Ezra Nepon actually.

Especially because there is a strategic use of these big data.

Like higher-level data for strategic advocacy as well.

So I want to talk to you especially how this complementarity between social justice work and research development, how that is important when it comes to advocating for resources from funders and how GPP has strategized its research efforts within its location in the field, right.

So Ezra, could you share some insights from GPP's research processes and how they are part of your advocacy for LGBTI funding, thanks a lot.

**>>EZRA:** Thank you, thank you Viviane and thank you to HRFN, and all involved in this session and series, for so much generative conversation.

So I'm just going to jump in.

Global Philanthropy Project is a collaboration of 22 private and public foundations.

Together, we work to expand global financial support to advance the human rights of LGBTI people in the Global South and East.

We aim to increase global LGBTI funding and to improve that funding to more effectively

meet the needs of global LGBTI communities.

So one element of the improved part of this work is that it's something we have been talking about as movement funding equity.

So identifying gaps within LGBTI funding and mobilizing resources toward more equitable support across identities, geographies, issue areas, who is leading the work as Caroline talked about, and more.

Towards these goals, GPP commissions both public and private research.

We support our member working groups and task forces and host a variety of donor education events.

In all of this work we found that developing the research, the reports, is really only about a quarter of the work it takes to make changes in funding flows.

Getting research into the right hands, to capacitate those making funding decisions and make the case, as Caroline talked about, is really -- requires a lot of strategical and tactical work beyond development of the materials.

In 2016, GPP and funders for LGBTQ issues published the first edition of the Global Resources Report, groundbreaking and norm setting research, tracking and analyzing global LGBTI funding.

Since the publication GPP has developed an evolving cycle of engagement with donor governments, which has yielded significant commitments in terms of both amount and specificity of funding focus.

So thank you for sharing the chart.

You will see here this is the cycle I'll talk about.

Which starts with the request for donor governments to share their grants data to be included in the report.

Then, once the report is published, we go back to each government and present tailored briefs, including overall findings and also where they specifically show up within the totals.

This is an opportunity, then, to engage directly with those making spending policy decisions within the government.

At the same time, we engage with relevant non-governmental or NGO organizations, LGBTI organizations, to ensure that philanthropic representatives are not the only ones in this room for this kind of advocacy.

Not the only voices being heard.

We maintain relationships with the government representatives over the next two years of this reporting cycle, including invitations to donor education events, inviting them to advise us in different kinds of research and more.

Finally, we ask for the next set of grants data and begin the cycle again.

This year, for the first time we offered specific guidance for government -- for that data preparation.

So, you get a sense of the cycle.

Now I want to offer an example of how we have mobilized these donor government relationships.

In 2017, AJWS, American Jewish World Service, Astraea and GATE published a second edition on the report of the state of organizing for global, trans and intersex communities. GPP joined as a partner in distribution of these reports.

And organized a multi-phased tour including representatives from each of the partner organizations and the then-newly launched International Trans Fund and Intersex Human

Rights Fund.

This tour was the first ever LGBTI funder delegation to donor governments.

The concept was proven, demonstrating we were successful at meeting with high-level government contacts, making the case, and securing commitments of increased funding. The tour launched during ILGA Europe with an event including a number of government representatives and then visited three countries for in-capital meetings with government funding policymakers.

In the following months the tour moved to a donor government conference and visited with representatives in the U.S. government.

Finally, GPP and the research partners launched funder-specific briefing documents comparing data from the Global Resources Report with findings from the civil society surveys in the state of organizing reports.

So this advocacy resulted in a number of explicit commitments to increase funding focused on trans and intersex communities in the Global South and East.

And you know, part of what we want to show here is how many phases there were to achieve those commitments.

How much of an iterative process it has been.

And now the cycle begins again.

So, I want to highlight one, quickly highlight one more example of our use of research as an advocacy tool.

Another iterative, phased process.

About four years ago, Elevate Children Funders Group and Global Philanthropy Project began working together to increase philanthropic awareness of the issues facing LGBTI children and youth around the world.

This is a sensitive issue area which is vulnerable to attack by both right wing forces and those who claim a progressive orientation such as gender critical advocates.

So our work together is very focused on reaching aligned funders or those who are in the movable middle.

However, we have been able to share some of our work as public materials.

This is another example of this multi-phased advocacy work.

Starting with the members of our two networks, moving to develop some public materials to reach wider philanthropic circles and help program officers make the case internally and in some cases for civil society groups these may also be resources.

And now most recently the launch of a second report and related set of materials with very focused outreach strategies.

So thank you, thanks for the opportunity to offer these examples and this insight into the behind-the-scenes model. And back to you, Viviane.

**>>VIVIANE:** Thank you so much, Ezra.

It's always great to learn from you about this multi-layered process.

And the critical research that is underway for the [indistinct] period, right.

And by the way, you can [indistinct] materials mentioned by Ezra in the chat box if you wish.

And connecting what Caroline mentioned, right, about the dynamic process.

How to also think of the shifting process in terms of funding.

Who is getting funding.

What level of organization is really interesting to see in both your remarks.

Now I quickly turn to Joy Chia to listen to some of your perspectives as well.

When we think about LGBTI funding, from your experiences as well, including welcoming you to your executive director role at Astraea, but specifically on publications like the vibrant [indistinct] report Astraea is a part of on LBQ movements we can learn about critical issues regarding this funding.

So I would like to ask you two questions, wishing to recall our conversation last week as well. What does it mean to be inclusive of LGBTI communities when one is working on human rights funding and research.

And how we can think about better funding for whom, and to do what in terms of this funding. Thank you so much.

>>JOY: Thank you so much for those questions.

Thank you all, HRFN, and GPP, for the invitation.

I'm Joy.

I am in my first month as executive director of The Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice.

I also previously came from private philanthropy.

Some remarks today are kind of gathered from my experiences of my colleagues, work they have been doing around philanthropy and advocacy as well as my experiences with many of the other donors who have maybe different constraints and different audiences they have to engage with.

How we use numbers and how we make the case.

And how we might want to think about the way in which we also have power in determining some of these things.

I think the first thing I wanted to kind of pull together from both what Caroline and Ezra mentioned is that there is significant power in definitions.

So there is inherent power in how we present numbers.

And how we ascribe meaning to them.

And so, you know, the design of research and surveys are not [indistinct] mutual.

And who is counted as relevant has a really critical impact on how we understand the information we are receiving.

And I think for us it's been very important for Astraea and our partners to look at the data because we understand that you have different audiences for different things.

That sometimes how we think about ourselves can be affected by that work.

So if we compare the power of the collective in terms of the solidarity that we, as community have by coming together, to assert that we are standing with each other and are united, LGBTQI communities, that is a very important advocacy front and important piece for us in terms of being inclusive within our movement.

But there's a great potential that we also conflate all of us, all of our complex lives and specific experiences into a similar experience.

Especially where we take funding for one's group to be a proxy for another.

So, if we think about how some groups -- I mean, I would say that I have myself been guilty of this in that wanting to be inclusive in my definition I have talked about work on LGBTQI organizing but have not actually had the resources, capacity, or understanding to specifically be resourcing intersex groups.

I think the question, then, is not really about timeline in the short term to say, oh, I don't know anything, so you know, it's my intention.

But [indistinct] a longer period of time the question you ask yourself as a grantmaker is why? Why am I not -- why are the grants in the portfolios I have so skewed?



What does it [indistinct] my power to able to change the environment that we are in.  
I think the second piece here around power within movements, you kind of raise a question [indistinct] inclusive when talking about human rights funding.  
You know, the statistic around that 3% of foundations human rights funding goes to LGBTQI rights has many things we can think about from that.  
First, there is vast inequalities and resources that are available across [indistinct].  
That there is vast inequalities and resource available across geographies.  
But thinking a little more about that, I think this funding flow can also impact inequalities in what we consider to be success.  
In terms of influence and impact. So if we are not able to understand how much funding is going where, we might think, oh, that region is doing really well.  
Without fully recognizing there's a whole infrastructure around access and resources that prevents groups from being able to make longer-term strategic decisions.  
This is certainly the case for the LBQ funding survey we did with Mama Cash, where you can see that in North America the median external funding for LBQ groups was around like almost 250,000 U.S. dollars.  
But in every other region the median external funding was less than 10,000 U.S. dollars.  
So, this also goes to the question within our movements about, oh, why is it that some groups or the Global North, you know, might have more impact?  
Or might be thinking about -- or thought leadership in our spaces, the kind of fraught discussions we might have.  
But so much of that comes from the fact that we have actually been investing in these organizations for a longer time, for greater flexibility.  
So much so, that they can actually both present their work to funders and they kind of compound itself on that piece.  
I think the last question I want to raise is really what does it mean to have -- I mean, it's not just the power in the numbers that other people give us or power in the numbers that we are looking at and thinking about how we advocate, but really also thinking a little bit about our own power to use this information.  
I think when we think about the data we are also -- I would also urge us to think not just about the numbers but for what.  
So how much money is going to what is flexible funding, what kind of flexible funding.  
Is it multi-year?  
And what exactly are we asking of our grantees as part of this resource flow.  
I think what the pandemic has demonstrated to us especially for most of the Global North funders is that actually many of the things we consider to be non-negotiable was actually all man-made.  
It was in our minds.  
Our own limitations about how we assess risk, how we assess risk to ourself, to the community.  
Conversations about donor dependency.  
All of these things wrap up into assumption about what is a worthy investment.  
And that assumes that there is actually a scarcity.  
So we have to make the difficult choices in terms of how we allocate resources.  
We have to justify the resources according to lowering risk or ensuring that resources [indistinct] a certain way.

I don't have the answer but I do think we need to think about what it means for us right now.  
So thanks so much.

>>**VIVIANE:** Yeah, Joy, thank you so much.

I was amazed to think about from the very foundation, right, the definitions in terms of data production and research.

Also to reclaim that autonomy or critical sense in terms of data production and research production and use [phonetic].

So it's really thinking about that as I was listening to you.

How to really engage with the data as a strategic.

I don't know, I felt like recalling one moment, I think [Name] from GPP mentioned it in the conversation last week about how the strategic use of data sometimes is not about the most -- making it the most visible like sharing everywhere, but at times is about producing relevant and disseminating that really strategically.

And just as a first question for interaction, and Caroline, Ezra, Joy, please come in as you will, but, yeah, I was wondering if that would be something to think about for groups that would like to do advocacy using data and research strategically.

Like, volume and visibility are one pathway.

But not the only one to strategize around.

And just sharing this first question, invite the audience to share questions in chat.

Or if you want to speak, please raise your hand.

Yeah, I will be in the lookout for anything to call you, invite you to speak.

>> I'm happy to start.

I think one of the things that is -- to the point that was made about that you need research, then [indistinct] is separate strategy on how you reach specific targeted audiences.

What it sounds to me the question is also about is kind of being able to define your target audience for a better word in terms of are they already making commitments.

Now the question is to show them commitments they are making, that they are making progress on it or there are [indistinct] that have been taken advantage off or whether or not your target audience is -- doesn't even have your community or geography or your space or your priorities in mind.

Then that is a really different piece.

I think the other thing around volume as visibility, one of the things I wanted to sort of raise earlier, is that I think understanding who is doing the funding also matters because there is -- from Astraea's perspective, Intersex Human Rights Fund accounts for almost a vast majority of all grants are going to intersex organizations.

For us, it is really important to acknowledge the role.

But it also is a point of vulnerability for the long-term stability of the intersex movement.

And so I think on visibility and volume it's not always do more.

It could also be do something differently.

Or, it could say: Is it your responsibility.

Like it would be ours to be able to support an entire ecosystem of movement actors who could do some similar work we are able to do.

Thanks.

>>**VIVIANE:** Thanks, Joy.

Would you like to add something, Caroline, Ezra?

I will take the chance to invite everyone who would be able to share to turn your video on if

you want.

Just for us to have this conversational sense.

I don't know.

As a dialogue here.

Also please share any questions or raise your hand if you want to speak.

Caroline, -- oh Ezra, please.

**>>EZRA:** A great question.

I think for us, for different reports, things come down a little differently.

One thing, like, if we did a report and -- an organization made a million dollar grant, like that would be -- make then the report, the cost and time of the report, was already, you know, leveraged into greater funding, right.

So in some ways there's one grant could make -- would be a win, right.

We know for Global Philanthropy Project, our focus, we are organizing in philanthropy.

We organize grantmakers.

That's the audience for all of our materials.

But we know that civil society organizations also use these materials to make the case.

And so you know, there is a way, you know, a secondary goal is, you know, this increased -- increasing the tools for the movements in general to understand something that's often really not transparent.

To be able to, then, advocate more effectively within that non- -- not transparent world of funding flows.

So you know, like for the Global Resources Report we would like everyone to read that, you know.

That is the thing that is the most, you know, like get it out there to any hands that can use it.

It is an advocacy tool.

You know, for writ large.

But for some materials it's like we want to make sure this organization can use it.

You know?

If anybody else can use it, that's a secondary, you know, use or something.

So it really varies.

And I don't know, I mean, even when it's more focused I think we hope the ripple effects, you know, our goal is to educate our members and beyond in philanthropy to be more effective grantmakers in general.

So even when it is, like, we really want this organization to like change the way they're working we really hope it ripples.

So some of our strategy has to be there.

Thank you for that question.

**>>VIVIANE:** Yeah, and I believe the very formation of ITF, intersex human rights fund, ISDAO, this complex place of appropriating, reclaiming data, and also using -- having the data as a tool to see the need for an organization that is expertise-related or regional-related, expertise on the regional level too, something to consider.

**>>** There is a question in the chat for me but I want to respond to this.

I want to respond to this question and to ask a question.

I'm going to try to do this in as quickly as possible.

Because I think it is a question that is worth exploring for this broader philanthropic community.

Ezra [indistinct] and Dave know in almost every conversation [indistinct] I ask about what are we doing with this report on humanitarian funders, a lack of funding for LGBTI communities, the COVID response by humanitarian funders.

I actually think, Ezra can probably help with the exact title of it, but I think it was one of the most important pieces of work that was produced in the last year from GPP.

That is also the one of the toughest pieces of work to actually use in terms of changing money and changing practices.

And so there is, for me, it's a tension, right.

Because there was a need for that research to exist and there's a need for that research to go somewhere and to push and to -- and to be used as a tool for advocacy for -- in the humanitarian sector.

But in a way the strategy for, then, how we move from it's here to there is a little less clear than when it's a bilateral funder who is already funding some LGBTI work.

And it is possible that those who are best-positioned to actually use that tool are not members of GPP.

Those who may be best positioned to use the tool to actually advocate and advance the conversation may not be those who were part of the development of the tool.

So there is ... it's a question and it's also a statement.

You know, as we think about the kind of research that gets produced, sometimes there might be -- it may be research that is really critical and contributing to key need.

But the line between that and the influence, the line between that and in terms of how we advocate and strategize for greater resources may not be as straightforward.

So that's kind of a reflection.

Maybe that might be from me sitting outside.

Perhaps for those inside the staff of GPP it is clearer.

But that's a kind of tension I wanted to surface.

And then I will ask my question very quickly.

So one of the -- a conversation we have been having a lot internally at ISDAO is a little of the tension as funders when we are trying to capture disaggregated information.

Especially around from our partners for self-reporting.

Because there is this dynamic that exists, that's true, with funders.

Because there is power dynamics, right.

So sometimes partners will say things they think we want to hear.

And we have gotten this a bit around our questions related to who are your focus communities or your priority communities.

Our first application cycle we asked the question.

We had about 24 organizations say intersex communities are their priority communities.

That is absolutely not the case in our region.

Unfortunately I wish it were so.

That is absolutely not the case.

As a fund and staff who are based in the region, we know it's not the case.

I think a number of organizations checked "yes" or checked intersex because they felt ISDAO wants to hear that.

So how do we navigate that?

And at the same time, we don't want to go and correct what people are saying they do.

But we know it's not the reality in the region.

So, I think it's a question.

It's a tension we sit with around we don't want to define for organizations.

At the same time, we don't want definitions that actually are not a reflection of the reality.

So how do we navigate that?

So maybe that that is a question to the broader community.

So very quickly, a question to me about West Africa, why do I think West Africa receives lesser funding compared to other regions.

I think there's historical dynamics around certain regions having greater access to funding.

Partially because so much of funding historically across the continent has been related to HIV and HIV targets and HIV statistics and parts of the region that have had higher prevalence rates.

I would say not higher prevalence but higher documented or research prevalence rates or infection rates, oftentimes that historically has been connected to money.

So even -- so there is that dynamic.

The level of broader visibility with certain -- with organizing especially in Southern and East Africa historically has been more visible, international spaces.

So you know, especially for funders who may be outside the region who don't have an understanding of context or actors, you go with what you see.

You go with what you see.

You go with what is visible, you go with who you know.

And I think there's been a history of that that has been built.

Certainly I think the questions of language are there and are a reality.

I would also say our organizing has not been historically as, you know, kind of formally NGO structured across the board but I think that that has been a reality, our level of visibility has been a reality.

But also the question around language, particularly because the majority, if you look at the countries in West Africa, the majority are French speaking, excuse me, with a few Portuguese speaking countries there.

So the issues around access to funders, access to information is a big challenge historically. That is changing.

But, we have a long ways to go around that.

Then I'm done talking.

**>>VIVIANE:** Thanks a lot, Caroline.

I think you highlighted political dimensions of data production, how groups and organizations, communities, can relate to that somehow.

Would anyone have a question for the panel?

Speakers.

Kellea, then [Name] afterwards.

**>>** Thank you all so much.

I know that I got to be part of the invitation inviting you, now I feel I have just gotten to see a really beautiful discussion between you all.

In the last conversation we had, Lorraine Wapling from the Disability Rights Fund talked about the experience of doing analysis of funding for girls with disabilities and having a program say, oh my gosh, we didn't know we had all of these girls in our class, we have to stop everything.

She said, wait, wait, it's the opposite.

We were always there. We were always there.

Now that you know, the question is what are you going to do with it?

I have been thinking a lot about the question of resourcing.

We know the pie isn't necessarily going to get much bigger.

Or we want it to, but there's a limited amount of funding.

And I think in this conversation what is really striking me is of course driving resources to places that are underfunded, but also power of visibility and the need to stop and say we are here, we are already here, LBQTI people are already in humanitarian spaces, affected by climate crisis, in racial justice movements. So I guess now I have stated it, it is more a comment than a question.

But to just underscore that it is not always about getting new funding.

It's about strengthening, deepening, and making visible the investments in the communities that are already part of every single social justice issue.

I'll wrap up there.

**>>VIVIANE:** Thanks a lot, Kellea.

Just before passing to [indistinct], to mention in the chat box Ryan made a question -- two questions actually about the GPP intermediary funding, how it is reflected in reports, and how LGBTQI groups access resources through known population specific funding.

So I'll open that for comments from the speakers as well, invite [Name] for your question or comments.

>> Thank you, Viviane.

I'm Mariam from Astrea. I think what Kellea said, my question is related to that.

That question is to all panelists.

In my understanding, all this funding reports really are kind of like based on a premise or assumption we have shared values.

And shared vision around grantmaking.

And that's kind of like some of us use this funding reports to shift our strategies of build grantmaking strategies or programmatic strategies.

We also want to advocate with other funders, other sectors, or other types of foundations to do the same, right.

That's the premise.

But do we have that shared vision and understanding of what strategic grantmaking looks like?

I think that is where I'm getting stuck.

Because what if some funders' vision around strategy is not about need and gaps and like kind of fixing the inequalities or inequities within philanthropy or how resources are moving, but impact.

Sometimes impact is very narrowly understood, right.

Kind of going deeper, legislative changes, like quick fixes.

I mean, maybe I'm being a little critical here, but I feel like sometimes what we are advocating for is maybe not kind of seen as priority or strategic for them.

So how do we bridge that gap?

How do we talk to funders who have -- I mean, do you talk about, like, the power.

Kellea, you talk about we are here, we have the power, we have the solution.

Are we trying to shift the communication or narrative strategies too on how we are communicating the need for strategic rethinking of grantmaking.

Or what is our approach?

**>>VIVIANE:** Thank you so much, Mariam.

And I would like to invite Joy, Caroline, Ezra.

Would you like to add something?

To also comment on the questions or also be mindful of time.

Any general remarks as well.

**>>EZRA:** Want to go first?

**>>JOY:** You can go first.

**>>EZRA:** I can talk about Ryan's question but I feel like, Joy, if you have thoughts about Mariam's, why don't you go for it.

**>>JOY:** I think my response to Mariam also links to Caroline's question which is around like a macro level of how we define priority.

So in terms of when you were talking about West Africa, language, colonial legacy, it is also about what legal system was transplanted, then how does that interact with the way in which we in the present are being told what should be the priorities for some of our work.

What does it mean to be the most marginalized.

We have a whole stream of work around decriminalization that is framed around British law.

How does that interact with legacies of other powers.

That is the kind of thing I feel as if the specificity is really helpful in understanding.

And I think the definition of priorities are also ones in terms of -- it's also one in which I do not think we as -- we as everybody in the world do not have to passively agree on what definitions of priority are.

Working in private philanthropy you might get a mandate from trustees about where geographic mandates make sense or just I like the country, want to go there. There is creativity in being able to work in those constraints.

As a public foundation, I think our work really is to also set priorities for ourself to say, yes, there might be ways we are narrowly defining impact but let us tell you also around a short-term, medium-term and long-term goals how we are defining impact as well.

So these are pieces that are extremely important.

Also, hold ourselves accountable.

Because I think, you know, whatever the term is, there has to be impact, performance, the difference between intention and impact.

To do better we need to know how well we are doing in order to be able to kind of pursue and be more effective.

Thank you.

Sorry about that.

**>>EZRA:** I will jump in and say both to Caroline and sort of Ryan's question, yeah, so one of the things GPP is weighing now is whether and how our work should or could encompass or include as a new goal advocacy with humanitarian funding streams.

This really came up because we see that, you know, if LGBTI people aren't explicitly focused on within a funding stream the chances that they are receiving funds are really small.

That might be because it's not worth applying because they know it doesn't happen.

It might be they apply and get discriminated against.

You know, they don't have the capacity to apply because it requires a level of organizational size or structure.

You know, there's so many reasons.

But even when noted as an important group to receive focus priorities and other documents, it's not happening.

So -- or rarely happening.

So you know, that would for us be a new area of work, a new goal.

So we are not moving super fast.

We're going to be doing some additional research about what LGBTI funding in that field looks like, recommendations for us to consider as a group.

But it is, you know, I think the theory of the Global Resources Report and -- that we bring to sort of other work is that if you aren't explicitly funding trans groups or intersex groups or LBQ groups, LGBTI groups, if funding is not explicit we don't think just because it's inclusive of that needs are being met.

I think that is our theory of documenting funding and that is also applied to the questions of sort of the broader issue areas that may be inclusive of LGBTI groups.

But I think what we basically organize around as a concept is: If you can't show it as explicitly meeting needs of this community, then it's not -- that's -- there's no proof of impact, right.

Or no proof of needs being met.

So, that's how we work with this question.

**>>VIVIANE:** Thank you so much, Ezra.

Maybe for our last minutes I would invite you, start with Caroline, a call to action.

Would you suggest a call to action for funders, for our philanthropic field in the sense of mapping the funding, using that strategically.

Thank you so much for today.

**>>CAROLINE:** Thank you so much, Viviane.

Increased resources, expand resources.

Especially to locally-led LGBTI organizations to -- there is also a whole infrastructure that exists of regional funds.

Like ISDAO, like International Trans Fund, that are regional, community activist led funds.

There is important work intermediaries are doing especially for those who are in the Global North or maybe a bit more disconnected from the community there's an infrastructure that exists to increase resources, increase, expand, improve resources to local organizations is my first point.

My second point, disaggregate your data.

I think that is work we all need to intentionally do.

But maybe thinking with our communities around what does that look like, what does the process look like that is authentic, that reflects community priorities and identification.

That helps us better understand the nuances of who is getting funding and for what.

**>>VIVIANE:** Thanks a lot.

Joy, Ezra.

A quick call to action before we close?

**>>** I love the disaggregated data.

I think it's really important we do that.

Look at definitions, which is the theme of my remarks.

But I also think remember that we have the power to examine your own choices and question how decisions are taken and challenge ourselves about whether or not [indistinct] constraints are real.

Imagine what would happen if we didn't have them.



Thanks.

**>>VIVIANE:** Ezra?

>> I will put the link for -- to submit grantmaking data to the Global Resources Report. And we extended the deadline to November 15.

I think there may be folks on here that are part of, you know, activist groups, civil society groups.

I especially want to say a lot of groups that may not be technically grantmakers made emergency grants during COVID or may be continuing to do that.

And you know, that counts as grantmaking.

So I just want to encourage, you know, as much as possible that we want to be able to document how did money move through our institutions to meet the needs of our communities in 2019 and 2020 and so, you know, if you have questions about whether what you did is a match for what we document in the report, feel free to follow up with me. And, again, just thank you to everyone who helped put this together, so much.

**>>VIVIANE:** Thank you so much Caroline, Joy, Ezra.

Yeah, I learned a lot from today.

It was a great conversation.

Pass it back to Kellea for our closing.

**>>KELLEA:** We are at time.

What a great discussion.

This will be shared out on our website and we'll reach out to you all.

Viviane, thank you so much for your moderation. And to our interpreter and captioner team, Shari, Dionella and Miluska, for making this accessible world-wide.

Thank you all.

Have a wonderful day.

Bye.