

HRFN POWER IN NUMBERS WEBINAR SERIES, PART 1
September 28, 2021

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.

>> KELLEA: All right, welcome, everyone.

I'm here in California, so it's 8:00 a.m. Thought a little morning music could help us settle in. For those of you in the end of your day perhaps you are listening with anticipation for the call.

We're so glad you are here today.

As we start I want to first encourage you to make sure that you check your interpretation channel.

I'm walk you through in a minute.

I'm Kellea Miller. I go by she and her, and I'm the deputy executive director at Human Rights Funders Network.

I am based in California, and I'm so pleased to get to be bringing together this wonderful conversation.

I had a little preview and we are in for a treat with today's speakers on Power in Numbers:

Evidence-based advocacy to move money to social justice movements.

Today is the first of our series.

We have another session focused on advocacy for L.G.B.T.Q.I. rights and we will share more about that after this call.

All right, so, to settle in, I want to walk you through just the housekeeping aspects of this before we frame the conversation.

We are really lucky today to be joined by human rights-focused feminist interpreters and captioners. We have our captioner, Shari. And we have Miluska translating for Spanish and we have Dionella interpreting for French.

To make sure you are in the right channel you can see on the screen here there is an interpretation slide.

It looks somewhat like a globe at the bottom of your screen.

To select your language, you go down there and you should have the option to see.

You can also turn on the live transcript at the bottom of the screen.

So, that we can access it and we can all here each other, we have a few requests.

Please mute yourself when not talking.

We love having engagement and wish we were in the same room but we know there are dogs, kids, and sirens happening in the background.

So that we hear people and so our interpreters and closed captioner can accurately interpret what we say, please stay muted.

The last thing is, this will be recorded.

While we are here, please make sure your name is accurate and add your pronouns.

This will also help for interpretation.

All right, without further ado, it is now my pleasure to bring us in to today's conversation.

I'm looking at who is on this call and seeing that many of you are already very actively engaged in trying to think about how we can resource movements most actively and most effectively.

We are thinking about how we get money to the front lines, how we fund in intersectional ways.

And one of the things that we at Human Rights Funders Network think a lot about and are trying to do very deliberately is bring evidence into the case to help us sharpen that resourcing.

And also advocate for more and better funding.

We know that there is often a lot of rhetoric and a lot of speaking about movements and about human rights issues that's not matched by the funding.

So for over ten years we have been mapping the overall landscape, but what we have been seeing is that it is most powerful, most effective, and most meaningful at shifting funding when this kind of research and data is paired with the actual reality of those working to advance human rights.

Today you will hear from three people.

Tynesha McHarris, a co-founder of the Black Feminist Fund.

Tariro Tandi, who is the head of partnerships and development at Urgent Action Fund Africa, and Lorraine Wapling, who leads Impel Consultancy and is also chair of the board for the Disability Rights Fund.

Each of them have done a lot of this work of bringing together the data and the advocacy.

As we said, no stories without numbers, and no numbers without stories.

They have brought the analysis and the evidence with real successes in places that we think can help inform the way that human rights movements across the board and individually can advance their causes.

Before we dive in and get to hear from them, I want to do a quick poll for those of you on the call to get a sense of your familiarity with where we are in the funding landscape right now.

We're going to put three questions -- no pressure, I cannot see your answers, just the aggregate.

Three questions in the Zoom poll for you to answer.

These are a little sampling of where we are and what the evidence is pointing to from the last analysis that Human Rights Funders Network did on the funding in the human rights field.

So if we can pop up that first poll.

You will see it is in multiple languages.

The question is: Which group saw a decline in human rights funding between 2017 and 2018?

So that is the first question.

You can select from Indigenous peoples, migrants and refugees, persons with disabilities, or women and girls.

[Pause]

The second question you will see in that poll is: What percentage of human rights grants name more than one population.

That is, what percentage of grants that are saying this is for human rights, identify more than one group that is part of the focus of that grant?

You can guess if you are not sure.

The final question is: What percentage of money to benefit Sub-Saharan Africa, that is money that will go to programs working in that area, in that region, actually go to groups based there?

So, what money for work in Sub-Saharan Africa goes directly to Sub-Saharan Africa?

[Pause]

Give you another minute to fill this out.

All right.

So our trusty team is working on this right now.

Let's see.

HRFN folks, can we show results of the poll?

Do we have enough responses yet?

Here we go.

So here are guesses for number one.

It's a pretty even split between Indigenous people, migrants and refugees, women and girls.

We have 56% of folks who identified the correct group.

So in our analysis, we found that persons with disabilities, it was the one category where there was a decline in funding from year-to-year.

So some of you definitely have been reading although I think the concern this could be any population shows us that we are certainly underfunded in general.

The next one -- so, the percentage that named more than one population.

2/3 of you said 22%.

And depressingly, that is correct.

So this is something we have been trying to dig into.

We're going to talk about it today.

But what does it mean when human rights funding reaches only one group?

Names one group?

When we know the ways in which we organize, the ways in which we live, are

across issues, across identities.

Debora, that is a great question in chat around the decline in funding.

That is in the percentage of total funding.

We can get into more of the details later for the decline in funding for persons with disabilities.

It was in the percentage of funding that went to them.

Finally, the last question.

So what percentage of group -- of money meant to benefit work in Sub-Saharan Africa actually goes to groups based there.

Again, at 80%, 33% of that funding actually goes to groups based there.

This is another area where we are trying to use the analysis to really shine a light on something we have experienced and known, which is that money often does not reach the people who themselves are in the context or leading the issues that we are trying to support or advance.

This is something at HRFN we are calling the Trust Gap and we will dig into it more.

I'll go ahead and close this poll.

Thank you Rachel and Debbie on the team behind-the-scenes for pulling it together. And thank you all of you who obviously been doing some of your reading and have been thinking critically about what it means to resource human rights.

Now, without further ado, we are going to get into the conversation.

You know who your speakers are.

I want you to hear directly from them.

We will start with Tynesha.

At the end of each speaker we would love to hear what resonated most.

So, please think about engaging with questions and then we will have a chance for question and answer toward the end.

So Tynesha, then we'll hear from Lorraine, and then Tariro. Over to you, Tynesha.

>>TYNESHA: Thank you. Well, first I'm really grateful to be here.

There are not many more important discussions and conversations to have than how we can use every tool in the toolbox to organize resources to movements.

So I'm honored and excited the Black Feminist Fund was invited to participate.

First, I will share a bit about the Black Feminist Fund and how it came to be.

And then I will dig into the research and some of our findings. And much of it is in part because of our collaboration with the Human Rights Funding Network.

So we are grateful for that partnership and for today.

So the Black Feminist Fund.

It is hard for me not to get mushy every time I talk about it because the truth is, it really was the dream in response to just the struggle and challenges to move resources to Black feminist movements.

It was really a conversation and dreaming over the past 8 to 9 years, really, with Black feminist leaders around the world that knew, one, we needed an intervention to move resources to movements.

Then two, that we needed a space we can have honest, courageous and dreaming conversations about what is possible if we move money like we want movements to win.

Big shoutout to Hakimma Abas and big shoutouts to her, who is leading a lot of our research around where is the money for Black feminist organizing.

And Amina Doherty and all of the Black feminist leaders and dreamers that got us here.

So that's the Black Feminist Fund.

I'm going to jump to the findings.

You will watch me make sure I follow my notes.

Because what I want to do is honor this research team.

One, I will say again that we are grateful for the Human Rights Funding Network and the work that we have done together, including the piece that was released on Inside Philanthropy that talked about the dire funding and resourcing of Black feminist movements. I'll be talking about the research there.

And also we have an amazing research team of Black feminist researchers, scholars and activists around the Diaspora so honoring, naming their leadership. And when done I will try to make sure I remember names.

Because we name and honor Black feminists and we say their name.

So I will jump in.

So, here's some findings.

You will see it in the article we collaborated with HRFN.

There's more context and, I will say, juiciness, goodness there.

I will share a few of the preliminary findings.

We are in the beginning.

Our hope is to release the fuller report by end of the year.

That fuller report, our hope is that it is a resource for feminist movements to have data acknowledging where money is moving and not moving the Black feminist organizing.

As mentioned earlier, it's not how just money is moving but is money moving in ways that honor movements.

And that means it is actually moving to organizations that are in communities, that are in the lived experience, and that are led by Black feminists themselves.

So more on that.

We have -- I will say show me the numbers, right.

Because that's what we are talking about.

I'll show you, I guess read to you, some numbers.

Again, shoutouts to HRFN.

Much is rooted in the most recent data we have from 2018.

I will read a few data points there.

In terms of resources that are moving to Black women, girls and Trans people, only 5% of human rights funding has been moving to Black women, girls, and Trans people.

The important part of that is work that's centering Black women, girls, and Trans people isn't necessarily always Black feminist funding work.

The reason why that is important is because Black feminist funding is really about moving analysis that is centering a human rights agenda, centering the movements that are working and organizing to build power so that it addresses and challenges and hopefully changes structures and systems.

So out of that, in terms of what we track around Black feminist movements, out of the 5%, which ain't a lot in human rights funding, out of that only .1 and .35% -- 35% of annual grant moneys of foundations go to actual Black feminist movements.

We find that to be critically important because Black feminist movements are necessary.

We have seen them globally around challenging structures whether addressing state and police violence, or addressing gender-based violence or addressing multiple forms of state oppression and repression.

Black [indistinct] leaders are often relied on in order to be their labor leadership and talent and genius, but the money is not tracking.

I will share a bit about geographically in terms of show me numbers by region. We find it to be important.

Part of the Black feminist analysis is to make sure that resourcers are moving with what we call geographic or global solidarity.

So of the 1200 grants that move to Sub-Saharan Africa, [overlapping speakers] actually 2500 grants that moved to Sub-Saharan Africa, about half went to women and girls.

It might seem kind of okay.

But it is not, because most of that, as mentioned earlier, didn't go to organizations that were based in -- on the continent of Africa.

We find that to be critically important because the reality is the genius and leadership comes in community, and from folks in that experience, and in context.

So we see a lot of resourcing, when it's about a people but not led by a people, it can do meaningful harm.

So only 18 million in the same year went to support people in the Caribbean. That's where my people are from.

Again, much of that resource did not go to Black feminist leaders working to build power to create change for everyone across the Caribbean.

I will say that only one went to the Middle East and North Africa.

And only one went to global work for Black feminist organizing.

We find that to be really important because as the Black Feminist Fund we're the first vehicle to move resources globally.

We consider global solidarity to be really important.

I'll say really quickly because I know my time is up, we are hearing a few things from Black feminist movements.

That funding is critical. In the political economy that we're in right now, funding is critical to be able to move to women's rights and feminists and organizations. Foundations are not matching.

We need data, more data, about how this is moving and working so we can be

able to organize even better.

And that autonomous funding is possible.

It is possible.

We see it happening in other places and spaces.

It needs to happen for Black feminist movements considering what Black feminist movements are relied on, in order to be and do work necessary to transform society and also to live good and healthy lives.

I'll pause there.

Excited to hear from the other panelists.

>>KELLEA: Thank you so much, Tynesha.

This is Kellea again.

We said we will ask you to share in chat what resonated most.

I'm also going to encourage you to come on video, if you are comfortable. As a speaker in our own homes it can sometimes feel we speak into the void and it's really nice to be able to see your reactions. When we get to the question and answer I will also encourage this again.

So if you are comfortable and able to come on video, it is really nice for the speakers to see your responses. And we'll come back to that in a little bit.

Now, over to Lorraine.

Really excited to hear from Lorraine, who also has worked around data and advocacy.

Lorraine.

>>LORRAINE: Thank you very much.

This is wonderful.

My name is Lorraine Wapling.

I've been invited to collaborate also with the HRFN on a blog with the Disability Rights Fund and Disability Rights Advocacy Fund of which I am a co-chair.

I see we have our executive director here, as well, so I better be on my best behavior!

So it's an interesting collaboration.

Because also in my day job I work with disability inclusion and disability rights.

So when I read the reports of which we'll talk about, I was shocked.

This comes from 2018.

Yes, data, this is the latest report.

It comes from 2018.

What was good, I thought, is to see, yes, the majority of human rights grantmaking does address equality rights and freedoms.

Around about 17% will actually go to addressing equality rights, which is great.

But, of that, only 2% of those grant dollars went specifically to support the work of persons with disabilities.

Just 2%.

Worse still, as we saw from that poll, persons with disabilities were the only population group for whom the funding decreased by around 14% from the previous year.

So we know from the amazing research that Human Rights Funders Network

had been doing that almost half of all those grantmakers that support persons with disabilities decreased their support.

And nearly all of them, 89%, gave fewer than 10 grants. Half just gave one.

So I mean, these are pretty, you know, pretty depressing figures considering that it's not only a small amount going directly to persons with disabilities and their representative groups but the fact that it's decreasing.

And we can't really make sense of that.

The data also shows there are other aspects to marginalization.

For example, the fact is that there isn't very much money that goes to the intersection between disability and other identities.

So gender identity, age, Indigenous status, that sort of thing.

So when you look at human rights funding for women and girls, for example, only 1% of that funding goes to women and girls with disability so it is incredibly difficult to access funding.

A shocking picture, because disabled people, persons with disabilities, make up 15, 20% of the population, the global population.

We know that persons with disabilities and their families are much more likely to experience marginalization from education, health, employment, all of which lead to potentially high rates of poverty so this lack of funding doesn't really make sense.

I think, secondly, what struck me is we know from data numbers it doesn't capture everything.

We know that.

We know that there probably will be many grantmakers out there who are funding disability rights but they don't disaggregate their data by disability and it's a situation across the board and we are struggling to find actual data on persons with disabilities.

And so I think, you know, data is a hugely powerful tool.

We really, really need more organizations, grantmakers across the board, to start to think about disaggregating data by disability.

Because it helps. It helps in terms of being able to shine a light on those who are being left behind.

We know it doesn't change the situation.

Data doesn't actually make the situation any different.

What happens is that we become aware of the inequalities and when we see numbers like this, that makes people sit up and think, you know, what is going wrong here.

I think what the data does is help us to understand, okay, now we know that this is the case, what are we going to be doing about it?

Because we certainly can't continue to sort of ignore it.

So, this kind of data is really incredibly important.

I think the third thing I wanted to sort of mention is that organizations of persons with disabilities, OPDs, have been working incredibly hard around the world promoting rights and challenging exclusion and discrimination.

But, they are incredibly underfunded despite the expertise they bring to the

table. All OPDs are managed and run by persons with disabilities, so just as our previous speaker was talking about, this is people who have lived experience or have caregiver responsibilities.

So they know their stuff.

I work in the field of disability inclusive development.

I have seen first-hand how effective OPDs and disability rights activists can be at challenging those deep-rooted discriminatory policies and behaviors.

But they, themselves, have continued to be marginalized from wider development programs and from grant funding.

Most recently, I was involved in research that looked at how the COVID-19 pandemic affected organizations of persons with disabilities.

I was struck by the number of young disability activists who were telling me of their frustration at not being included in disaster response operations.

As -- we actually, as is very, very timely with things like this, we actually just produced the report today.

It was launched today.

I put a link in the chat for you.

It's worth a read.

Because it is very powerful.

Time and again, resources, we were told, were being denied or even taken away from OPDs who were perfectly set up, perfectly capable of providing support to their communities.

They were exasperated and angry at their exclusion.

Even as they went about doing what they could with limited resources they had.

I think all of this comes together to show it's just not acceptable.

It is really not acceptable that this kind of work is continually being marginalized and that, you know, in terms of grantmaking, the amount of dollars seems to be going down.

It just doesn't make any sense.

I mean, so that is kind of what struck me from the reports.

But very, very happy to be part of this discussion.

And particularly very, very interested in looking at how our movements speak to each other.

Because I know there are many, many things that all three of us are going to be saying to you today which actually bring us closer together, I think, in terms of waking the world up to their responsibilities.

Thank you very much.

I think I kept to time.

>>KELLEA: Lorraine, thank you so much.

And thank you to those who are sharing reflections in the chat.

Feel free to keep those coming.

I'm reading them and will bring them into the discussion at the end.

So now we are going to hear from Tariro, based in Zimbabwe and representing Urgent Action Fund Africa.

>>TARIRO TANDI: I'm really excited to be part of this conversation that I really

think is timely.

Looking at the issue around data, around research, around who does the research, who uses research, and the conversations that are currently going on. So I really want to start by saying the question of data is really a divisive one where I come from, which is the African feminist movement.

Because we see data sometimes associated with being a colonial, oppressive tool for subjugation, controlling the extraction of African people by Western-based agents.

And funders, unfortunately, are included in this.

It is also not really surprising that people feel like when [indistinct] African women and girls are the most researched group globally.

We also have data that gets shared with funders and governments speaking to people's lived experiences, trauma, and pain.

Yet, we don't necessarily appreciate or see how that data is treated with dignity. So in most instances it's viewed as being extractive and antithesis to what is meant to change.

I believe personally that data is a great weapon for change to funders and all of us, even implementers, if it is given the recognition that it deserves.

Data if properly used has the possibility of shifting power, aligning resources for what is most needed.

It will help us greatly in being able to tackle poverty and ensure we deliver for the majority sustainable livelihoods and justice.

It's widely documented that during times of emergencies like pandemics, civil unrest, economic hardships, we have an increase in cases of sexual and gender-based violence.

It is no wonder at this point in time that GBV has been pervasive during COVID-19 and is now being referred to as a shadow pandemic.

But surprisingly, we all know that when we were bracing for this looming pandemic, there were no preventative measures that were put in place to [indistinct] gender-based violence either by governments or philanthropic players and we now find ourselves in a reactive mode. And this in the end really challenges the efficacy of our interventions because we are not following what data told us before, to be able to plan ahead, to be able to really prevent gender-based violence ahead of time.

So my question is: Where did we go wrong?

We all really seemed to agree that data does not lie.

Not only is it relevant, but it is imperative to inform policy and practice.

And then one questions why is there such a huge resistance to data?

Why is there such a sense of fatigue when the issue of data is raised?

What is apparent is that time and time again, data has stared in our faces with hard facts.

But unfortunately, those that are not steeped in, for instance, for us in the Global South, have the innate power to decide whether or not to resource the data.

This again inevitably challenges the effectiveness of the data that is available.

Year in, year out, we have institutions from the Global South churning out data

in the form of research, in the form of evaluations, in the form of reports. And yet donors continuously ask organizations to prove their impact, provide evidence and provide numbers.

The people being researched are usually the marginalized.

Can you imagine the level of harm and vicarious trauma communities feel?

The need to provide empirical evidence of global problems facilitates data fatigue and resentment of data-driven advocacy and development.

Because the over-researched people question the relevance of data when data is palmed [indistinct] out but there is no transformative response that is aligned to the data.

A case in point is the struggles that we are currently facing around accountability when it comes to sexual and gender-based violence.

Yet, we have widely available data from various research institutions that can guide us in terms of you know what needs to be done, what is currently presenting in the different contexts.

It is undeniable data is a powerful accountability tool.

I think the previous speakers alluded to that.

And funders always find themselves sitting on a wealth of data without necessarily acting on it.

The report from HRFN and Candid shows much of the funding meant to benefit the Global South is awarded to organizations based elsewhere.

I think Kellea said it in the beginning.

For example, only 33% of funding for Sub-Saharan Africa goes to groups based in Sub-Saharan Africa.

This has been researched and talked about repeatedly.

But the modalities of funding haven't changed to [indistinct]

The report talks about the Trust Gap.

This is quite a conundrum in philanthropy, is how do funders financially support institutions in the Global South if there is no trust?

There is need to trust and center those who have been pushed to the margins.

There is need to understand who is being obliterated.

Funders really have to interrogate the presenting data to be informed as to who they should support and, by supporting those who have the least support, putting them at the center. And listening to them is the most crucial step in shifting the need in the Global South where movements have, since time immemorial, been seen and not necessarily heard.

From my experience at UAF Africa, direct funding to constituencies allows them to self-determine their priorities.

Thereby, recognizing them as agents and drivers of change, as they pursue deep, informed, empowering and lasting solutions.

As a fund, one of the key reflections in the past two years has been the pandemic has given room to Global South partners to assert themselves on the basis of their superior knowledge of local needs and imperatives.

For example, partners in Uganda long predicted the clamping down on CSOs before it happened.

But if only we had listened.

UAF Africa worked with partners to strengthen digital security, finding alternative ways to move resources, because our intelligence gave us early warning alerts.

History and data has shown on whose back crisis falls.

It is mostly on marginalized communities.

Of which women and gender non-conforming people are the majority.

Support for these constituencies has mostly been reactionary instead of being supported by data that gets shared by women's rights organizations with their funders on an annual basis.

So where is the problem?

Because we do have data.

But data is not necessarily being used.

So let's honestly ask ourselves questions such as with all the data that funders have received from their grantees, how has that data influenced philanthropy?

On which -- how has that data influenced philanthropy decisions on which issues need the most funding?

What impact marginalized communities are really generating, even with little resources?

Funders need to urgently recognize that social and feminist activists and movements are banking on them from the front lines, where they are fighting for their land, their rights, and their lives at most times.

Funders need to take responsibility and use the front line stories and data available to them to shift power and resources to where it is really needed.

That is, on the ground.

Where is the money currently going?

To whom?

And how?

And lastly, where are the current gaps?

>>KELLEA: I think we can all pause, take a deep breath. And gratitude for our three speakers today.

You can see a lot of enthusiasm in chat and a lot of resonance.

Now is the time I'm going to really push you to please come on to video.

This is the chat portion of our discussion.

I encourage you also to use the gallery view. So if you are using the speaker view before, come on gallery.

This is a conversation.

We want to make sure that even though we are far apart we can feel a little bit closer together.

Thank you for those who are complying and joining us wherever you are!

I have been watching questions come through.

I have a few I want to first pose to the group.

I might also encourage you to post in chat as well.

I'm really struck by how each of you spoke in some ways about the importance of naming and visibility.

How we cannot push until we actually name and make visible where some of

the gaps are.

And one of the things that I am sitting with is whether -- what happens when we do that?

I know from conversations we have had that you all have seen some successes when you have done that.

I wonder if any one of our speakers can share a success?

Something you have seen shift, whether an awareness, or a program or in funding, when you have taken that step of naming and identifying where the money is actually going or isn't going.

Yeah, Lorraine, please jump in.

>>LORRAINE: Sure, yeah.

I mean, I think we have seen the power that particularly disability disaggregated data can have on large development programs.

I did some work for a girls education challenge program, a big global fund, which is focused on getting girls into school.

In the beginning they did not have any focus at all on disability so they weren't thinking about girls with disabilities getting into education because of that invisibility, the assumptions that go behind, well, you know, it is not our responsibility, that sort of thing.

What we did was a simple thing.

We got all of the grantees to disaggregate data by disability. By disability status.

We used Washington Group Short Set, which is a bit niche, but for those that know, it's a very -- a human rights way of asking questions about disability.

Because you are asking people what difficulties they have.

It's very crude, it's very basic.

But what it did is it suddenly showed up that I think 99% of the grantees had girls with disabilities already in their programs.

And it shocked them.

And they started coming back, saying what are we going to do about this, we need to change the program, blah blah blah.

There's a lot of concern and anxiety generated from programs.

We had to sort of calm them down and say, well, you know, nothing has changed.

These girls were always in your classrooms.

They were always there. You just didn't know they were, because you didn't count them, you didn't make them visible, you didn't put the spotlight on them.

And what the disaggregation by disability did was simply highlight them.

So we know for sure that data can be really powerful in just spotlighting groups and people, persons who are invisible essentially.

But they're there.

It doesn't change the situation.

It just allows you to see what's there.

I think that was the most powerful example of where, you know, using data carefully can actually help to, you know, shine a spotlight on things.

And you know, people did start doing things a bit differently.

>>KELLEA: I love the piece that "they were always there."

The other question, then I promise to let other people ask questions, but this has been coming to me.

Most of us in this room and most of us who are working to advance human rights also have limited resources.

We are trying to do the best we can.

Sometimes we get into conversations like we need to move more money to this issue or this issue.

There just is not more money in our pot.

We know we can influence, we can bring more money in. And when we talked before the call in preparation I loved the discussion around how each of us in the room carried multiple identities.

No one was showing up as just a Black feminist or just a disability rights activist. So I am curious if any of you could speak to how we can work with the existing resources to more deeply meet the needs of all of us to advance issues you are working on, but also recognizing the intersectionality piece.

How do we do that in a way that those of us in the room who want to do it but have limited resources can be more effective at reaching our movements.

Tynesha, I see you nodding.

I don't want to put you on the spot, but I'm going to if you don't mind jumping in.

>>TYNESHA: Happy to.

I often think in threes. But two things are coming to me, maybe the third one at some point too.

I think the first, as what Tariro shared is on my heart and what Lorraine just shared is on my heart.

A part of the first is what we talked about in the conversation.

I think it's much in the question you asked.

How do we even lead with solidarity in the way that we collect and share data with the world.

Oftentimes, and this isn't new to anyone on this call, is that sometimes because of the scarcity we are often -- many of us can be called to even have scarcity as a part of our call to action or approach in the research.

So: Fund this and not this.

This is what is going to create radical transformation. That's less important.

This is what is urgent right now and so forget about these other regions, communities, issues and movements.

I think one of the things I'm so grateful for everyone leading research that spoke today is the call for us to be in solidarity around our research and data.

The fact is we need to lead with abundance even though we don't have abundance of resources, and that means that we say you cannot choose one of us over the other.

That's a hard stop.

We won't frame our research questions or even our research recommendations that is about choosing some of us over others.

That is not the way we can organize.

Because we know if we are not really prioritizing our family in the Global South that is going to be at a cost to all of us.

If we are not prioritizing Black feminists with disability, that's a cost to all of us. And so all of these intersections matter because all of our communities matter. We won't allow ourselves to be pieced and parceled apart just because there's not enough resources to fund our work.

I think the second piece which is the larger conversation, and what Tariro mentioned earlier around, there is the research, there is the data.

We continue to consistently produce this data.

And funding isn't matching although we do have some moments of light and good stories.

It's, I think, a part of what we're naming here.

How does our research work together to build power across the philanthropic sector that needs to move more resources.

We can't continue to only have a corner of us who are doing the right thing, trying to move the right thing and trying to organize very few funders.

We have to be able to organize and build power across the left, the center of the sector.

There's more money, enough resources, for us to move with abundance.

We can't be tricked into believing that is not the case.

What we have to do, and folks are talking to this, is be able to demand, name, and call folks in.

Sometimes call them out a bit.

To move more resources to our movement so we are not ever being put in competition with each other.

But in the meantime, we can't be tricked to thinking we are in competition.

The resources are there. Folks just have to move it.

>>KELLEA: Beautiful.

So I want to welcome anyone to ask a question.

We have time for just a few questions.

You can use the fancy "raise hand" option in Zoom or post a question in chat.

I'll try to keep a lookout for that.

[Pause]

Any questions coming our way?

>> Hi, everyone!

I have a lot of thoughts.

One of the questions when it comes to supporting Afro descendant [phonetic] and Black activists in general.

For me what's been coming up quite a bit in my own work is the fact that there is, I think, a need for deeper articulation around what Black leadership means, Black feminist leadership, in the geographical locations that are not the U.S.

For example, when we look at funding this work and looking at, say, private philanthropy, even bilaterals, you have the U.S. and European donors. And I worry that when it comes to supporting Black-led initiatives in Europe, for

example eastern Europe and other places, much of that funding would be coming from European sources.

So I am afraid that from that context I think there's not enough analysis and might be perceived as something that is specific to places where there's a strong presence of Black and Afro-descendant [phonetic] communities in the context of specific historical context, right.

Just finally, you know, when it comes to funding let's say, [indistinct] South Asia, a lot of other places where there is -- [audio difficulty]

That issue of race doesn't exist, even though it does, I think that is where maybe a need for conversations to sort of educate the broader community that is outside of U.S.

Kind of like question/comment.

>>KELLEA: Thank you, Meerim.

Ari, I see your hand up. Let's have you jump in and then we'll turn it over to the panelists.

>> Me also, Kellea?

I turned on my video just because you told me to!

So hi, everyone!

This is fantastic. One of those rare and beautiful opportunities for us to talk about something in the field we don't -- that we talk about not enough publicly.

Around data.

So I appreciate that.

I feel we could have this conversation weekly for the next year, and we probably need to in some way.

That's not a pressure to HRFN.

My question is around funder organizing.

For those of us that are trying -- some of us move money, have grantmaking capacity, and some do -- try to move the field forward in a different way.

Also internationally.

So it speaks a little bit, Meerim, to what you were sharing around what would be -- or what are you noticing when speaking with funders that they need to be educated on?

How can those of us as funder organizers support that in relation to data.

Hope that was clear.

Thank you.

>> Great.

And one question in the chat from Kerry, asking with regard to collecting disability data, what do you say to organizations that say one of the struggles to collecting that data is the law prevents us from asking about disability?

So I will have those be the three questions that guide the last five minutes until we close out.

So anyone want to jump in on any of the three questions?

>>LORRAINE: Okay, Lorraine here.

I can speak to the disability one particularly.

I mean, I think there's often an assumption made also that if you talk about

disability, then you can label people inappropriately.

These are excuses, essentially.

In terms of asking questions about disability, the Washington Group data, I'm not here to promote the Washington Group particularly, but the way those questions are worded does not use the word "disability."

Which seems a bit counter-intuitive but it actually works.

Because if you ask -- if you literally ask people about disability, you get very unreliable data anyway.

So by asking around "difficulties," then you can collect proxies for disability.

That is essentially what it is.

It is not accurate.

It's not about trying to, you know, diagnose people or anything like that.

These are proxy indicators.

But they are pretty good and have been tested, validated, all of that.

But you don't have to use the word disability at all so you get around a lot of these problems.

So, they're excuses, essentially.

Very often when people come back at you and say "oh, there's this problem," they're just excuses because people don't see the value, you know, why are we having to do this? Disability is not very important or whatever.

When we talk about invisible populations often I think there's a sense, well, there's not many of them, or it's not a really big issue, a particular field.

Therefore we don't need to put the effort in to this.

And they're all just excuses.

I think we need to stop making excuses.

>> Every speaker has had a mic drop moment and that might have been one of Lorraine's.

Tariro, will you close us out before the final closing on questions around bringing a more deep anti-racist consciousness?

And also the piece that Ari was raising around how we do funder organizing to meet what you said at the beginning.

We know we have data, we can be prepared ahead of time, yet it is not always happening.

>>TARIRO TANDI: So I would want to say that I think we need to respect that in our -- in movement building or in organizing there are nuances that would exist.

And to be able to appreciate that context, are different.

When you look at it, when you actually engage in deeper analysis, you actually realize that the issues we are fighting, the battles are similar.

For me, I think one of the things that I have learned over time, even as a fund we learned to appreciate working within different regions across the continent, is that terminology sometimes really then becomes, you know, colonizing. And we need to decolonize some of the approaches that we use in terms of terminology, in terms of the expectations we expect people to express themselves and be able to actually just, you know, get the authentic

experiences of people and be able to run with those and understand what those intricacies and nuances are and be able to fund as such.

And I think if we do that as funders, we will be able to actually ensure that activists are actually supported in ways that are meaningful to them, and we are not imposing ourselves on to activists.

Because I think the danger is in us wanting to have one story.

There are so many different stories. And let's respect that and understand the diversity of stories makes this world so beautiful and colorful and it is good to have them as such.

>>KELLEA: Thank you so much, Tariro.

We don't want to leave you all without something to take home.

So I'm going to turn to our speakers and ask for you each to share one call to action.

One call to action for funders or for those of us in this work.

What do you have for us?

>>TARIRO TANDI: So I can start.

I will say something that would probably be a bit controversial.

One of the things I have been thinking about is how I think that the pandemic has somewhat really challenged all of us whether from the Global North or Global South.

Because we had people from the Global South really on their narratives.

Having pandemic-induced changes that have had to be infused in our grantmaking, like direct funding, like flexibility in funding, and I honestly just hope the funders that are within the space can actually probably learn from that experience and probably hang on to that.

Because I think that's a good experience.

We all really benefited from it.

I think so many activists can attest to the fact that that was really good in terms of them being able to respond to the different issues they had to do within their communities.

>>LORRAINE: Okay. Lorraine Wapling.

Thanks for that. I also agree with that.

I think my little two-penny worth would be don't be scared.

I think there's a lot of fear around some issues we have been talking about and about a fear of making mistakes and not doing it right.

I think, you know, there are activists out there who know exactly what it takes.

There are organizations, you know, like DRF, like our organizations, who, you know, can help.

I think, you know, just don't be scared.

Don't make any excuses and don't be scared.

>> I'll end it.

If we're going to be able to address this Trust Gap, it's about trusting and leadership.

It isn't about knowing everything.

So data is an invitation to learn more about movements and about strategy and

most importantly learning about the role of funders to step in and play a meaningful role.

It's not to know everything.

Because if the ask is to know exactly what a movement is doing will only fund movements that are familiar to us and that's not trust.

>>**KELLEA**: Beautiful.

Well, I would love to have you all join us if you can on the next call as well.

On October 19th.

We will be talking about funding for L.G.B.T.Q.I. rights.

We have a great panel and group of folks who have used -- who had a whole advocacy tour and seen major shifts in funding, reaching especially Trans, intersects and LBQ communities so it's another opportunity to deepen this conversation.

But before we do, just huge, huge thanks to Tynesha, Lorraine, and Tariro. For those who can either with your reactions, your hands, or if you want to come off of mute and say thank you, we will close out our call here.

Thank you all for sharing your time, your heart, and your data interests with us.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you, everyone.

>> Thank you.

>> Have a wonderful rest of your day.

>> Thank you.

>> [chorus of goodbyes].