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## ABOUT THE ADVANCING HUMAN RIGHTS: KNOWLEDGE TOOLS FOR FUNDERS INITIATIVE

The Advancing Human Rights: Knowledge Tools for Funders initiative is a multi-year effort to track the evolving state of global human rights funding, create a set of interactive data and research tools to help human rights funders and advocates increase their effectiveness, and, ultimately, support a more sustainable human rights field.

Since 2013, the International Human Rights Funders Group, Foundation Center, Ariadne-European Funders for Social Change and Human Rights, and Prospera-the International Network of Women's Funds have released three annual analyses about the state of human rights grantmaking, as well as an interactive website through which funders, advocates, researchers, and academics can explore funding flows by issue, region, and population.

In response to feedback from donors and advocates, we are excited to launch two new areas of research in this report: data on strategies supported by human rights funding and on bilateral and multilateral support for human rights. We will continue to track funding in these areas on an annual basis.

We will also continue to support funders and advocates to apply the research to strengthen their work. Since launching the benchmark analysis in 2013, we have shared the findings with nearly 2,000 funders and advocates through 70 presentations in 14 countries and discussed concrete ways in which the data and tools can be applied.

Funders are using the data and tools to:

- Inform their funding strategies;
- Identify new funding partners and grantees;
- Better understand the funding landscape for particular issues, regions, or populations; and
- Leverage additional resources to address funding gaps.

Most recently, funders have used the data to coordinate responses following the spring 2015 earthquakes in Nepal, to enhance donor collaboration at the intersection of women's rights and rule-of-law, and to advocate for increased government funding for human rights.

The research has also contributed to in-depth analyses on funding for specific areas, such as the anti-slavery and anti-trafficking sector, indigenous women's rights organizing, trans* and intersex rights, sex worker rights, countering hatred in Europe, young feminist activism, and local philanthropy in Turkey.

Collecting grants data from funders based outside of North America remains a key priority for this initiative. Since we began this research, the number of funders based outside of North America submitting data has increased from 49 sharing 2010 data to 109 sharing 2013 data.

We are committed to ensuring that funders and advocates have access to information about funding flows and key actors within human rights philanthropy without jeopardizing the safety of activists and organizations. In our grants database, recipients of sensitive grants are listed as "anonymous" with minimal location information. All grant examples in this report and on the Advancing Human Rights website have been approved for posting by the funder.

For more information about this initiative, visit:
humanrightsfunding.org.

# The State of Foundation Funding for Human Rights in 2013 

In 2013, challenges to human rights-and human rights philanthropy-intensified. Governments around the world cracked down on the right to peaceful protest, freedom of association, and civil society at large, often in the name of counterterrorism or protecting national interests. Pushback came from both authoritarian and democratic regimes, with examples ranging from Mexico's money laundering legislation to Uganda's antihomosexuality act, and was often coupled with restrictions on "foreign funding" - philanthropic support from abroad upon which many rights organizations depend.

Responses to significant global issues, such as the humanitarian crisis in Syria and the threat of climate change, were offen inadequate compared with the scale of these problems. However, advocates took action to push for rights and justice in strategic and innovative ways. Activists used mega-sporting events to call attention to rights violations, from the misappropriation of resources for the World Cup in Brazil to the crackdown on LGBT rights leading up to the Olympics in Russia. Human rights advocates applauded the conviction of former Guatemalan president Ríos Montr-the first time a former head of state was tried for genocide in a national court. Finally, as the post-2015 development agenda gained speed, human rights funders and advocates called upon multilateral bodies to include the voices of civil society and marginalized communities in the process.

In 2013, foundations allocated $\$ 2.3$ billion in support of human rights. ${ }^{1}$ The Advancing Human Rights initiative defines human rights grantmaking as funding in pursuit of structural change, often in support of marginalized populations, to advance rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and subsequent rights treaties. All grantmaking consistent with this definition was included in this research, including grants by funders who do not consider themselves to be human rights funders but who support work in intersecting fields.

The 803 foundations included in this edition of Advancing Human Rights: Update on Global Foundation Grantmaking made 20,300 grants supporting human rights. These foundations range from the top-ranked Open Society Foundations, Ford Foundation, and Nationale Postcode Loterii, each reporting over $\$ 250$ million in giving for human rights in 2013, to foundations awarding one or two human rights grants.

This third annual report explores 2013 human rights grantmaking by funder, region, issue, population, and-for the first time-strategy. To provide a more complete picture of giving for human rights, this year's update also includes 2013 data on bilateral and multilateral aid.

Advancing Human Rights: Update on Global Foundation Grantmaking also highlights key changes in foundation giving between 2012 and 2013. To control for year-to-year variations in the data set, the report limits this comparison to a set of

649 funders whose grants were included in the research for both 2012 and 2013. Among this matched subset, ${ }^{2}$ total grant dollars for human rights rose by 23 percent and the number of grants awarded increased by 6 percent.

Year-to-year changes in grantmaking levels can be influenced by the actions of one or a few foundations, the authorization of multiyear grants in a single year, ${ }^{3}$ a small number of very large grants, especially in issue areas that account for relatively smaller overall shares of grant dollars and grants, or a foundation submitting more detailed and comprehensive grants data. Therefore, readers should be cautious about drawing long-term conclusions about shifts in grantmaking based on single-year changes.

## WHO MAKES HUMAN RIGHTS GRANTS?

The following analysis combines grants data collected from the International Human Rights Funders Group (IHRFG), AriadneEuropean Funders for Social Change and Human Rights, and Prospera - the International Network of Women's Funds with data collected by Foundation Center from the largest U.S. private and community foundations.

O Human rights philanthropy is global: the 803 funders included in this analysis span 46 countries and seven major world regions.

O The Open Society Foundations ranked as the largest human rights funder in 2013 (as well as in 2011 and 2012) by grant dollars ( $\$ 304$ million) and number of human rights grants $(2,262),{ }^{4}$ followed by Ford Foundation ( $\$ 271$ million) and Nationale Postcode Loterii (\$270 million).

- The 20 largest funders by grant dollars accounted for $\$ 1.7$ billion, or 65 percent of total funding, while the top 20 funders by number of grants provided nearly half of the total human rights grants identified for 2013. Ten of the top 20 funders by number of grants are located outside North America.
- North America accounted for the largest number of funders included in the overall data set, ${ }^{5}$ comprising 86 percent of funders who made at least one human rights grant, largely reflecting the relative accessibility of grants data for U.S. foundations.

O Nonetheless, the number of funders based outside North America included in this research has more than doubled since our initial analysis, from 49 foundations for 2010 to 109 for 2013. These 109 foundations accounted for over a quarter of human rights funding.

O Twenty-three percent of grantmakers included in this research made just one grant meeting the human rights definition, almost all of whom are donors based in the United States.

## HUMAN RIGHTS FUNDERS: A CLOSER LOOK

The data set for this research includes grants from 243 members of IHRFG, Ariadne, and Prospera, located across the globe, along with data from an additional 560 funders collected by Foundation Center, the vast majority of which are based in the U.S. These non-member funders may not consider themselves human rights funders but made at least one grant that fell within the definition used for this analysis. The following provides funders but made at least one grant that fell within the definition used for this analysis. The following provid
a more in-depth look at the funding priorities of IHRFG, Ariadne, and Prospera members, the majority of whom self-identify as human rights funders and who provide 75 percent of all dollars and 81 percent of grants included in the full data set. This section also highlights funding from the growing number of human rights grantmakers based in the Global South and East. ${ }^{6}$

WHERE ARE IHRFG, ARIADNE, AND
PROSPERA MEMBERS BASED?
O While non-member foundations making at least one human rights grant are highly concentrated in North America, the geographic distribution significantly differs when looking only at network members. Fifty-six percent are based in North America, with 26 percent in Western Europe, and 18 percent based in the Global South and East.

WHAT DO NETWORK MEMBERS SUPPORT?

- The top issues supported by IHRFG, Ariadne, and Prospera members were equality rights and freedom from Prospera members were equality rights and freedom from
discrimination, followed by human rights - general and health discrimination, followed by human rights - general and health
and well-being rights. Among non-member foundations, sexual and reproductive rights received the most funding, largely due to the Susan Thompson Buffelt Foundation's significant support for this issue area. Equality rights attracted the nextlargest share, with health and well-being rights in third.

WHERE DO NETWORK MEMBERS FUND?
O Among members of IHRFG, Ariadne, and Prospera, the region receiving the most human rights funding was North America, followed by support for globally focused work, and SubSaharan Africa.

- Compared with non-member foundations, network members allocate a larger percentage of their grants dollars to all regions other than North America. Thiry-two percent of network members' funding supported work in North
America, in contrast to 69 percent of non-members' funding America, in contrast to 69 percent of non-members funding
In 2013, members awarded 15 percent of their funding to Sub-Saharan Africa and 8 percent to Asia and the Pacific, while non-members allocated 6 and 3 percent to these respective regions.

Number of Human Rights Funders by Region: IHRFG, Ariadne, \& Prospera Members, 2013


62

18


8 $\qquad$

Source: Foundation Center, 2016 . Figures based on grants awarded by the 243 member foundations affiliated with 1 HRFG, Ariadne, or Prospera. There are an additional
560 non-member foundations 558 based in North America and 2 based in Eastern Europe) included in the full data set referenced elsewhere in the analysis.

Human Rights Funding Focus: IHRFG, Ariadne, \& Prospera Members, 2013
243 funders authorized 16,517 grants totaling \$1.8 billion


## HUMAN RIGHTS FUNDERS BASED IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH AND EAST

Support for human rights comes from a diverse community of grantmakers based across the globe, including a growing Support for human rights comes from a diverse community of grantmakers based across the globe, including a growing
number of foundations in the Global South and East. Many of these funders are at the forefront of shifting local cultures of charitable giving to advance the rights of all people over the long term.
O Of the 243 members of IHRFG, Ariadne, and Prospera, 45 are based in the Global South and East, representing 2 percent of members' total grants dollars and 11 percent of total number of grants.
O In total, funders based in the Global South and East gave $\$ 31.4$ million in support of human rights through 1,871 grants to 1,560 organizations and human rights defenders.
O Among the funders based in the Global South and East, the top funded issue area was equality rights and freedom from discrimination ( 24 percent), followed by environmental and resource rights ( 20 percent) and economic and labor rights discrimination (24 percenti), followed by environmental and resource rights ( 20 percent) and economic and labor rights
(11 percent). By comparison, within the overall set of funders, environmental and resource rights was the eighth most (11 percent). By comparison, withhin the overall set of funders, environmental and res
funded area, while economic and labor rights ranked ninth out of the 13 categories.

## Foundation Name

(1) Open Society Foundations*
(2) Ford Foundation*
(3) Nationale Postcode Loterij*
(4) Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation
(5) Atlantic Philanthropies*

6 Oak Foundation*
(7) National Endowment for Democracy*

8 Hivos*
(9) Comic Relief UK*

10 Vanguard Charitable Endowment Program*
(11) NoVo Foundation*
(12) Bill \& Melinda Gates Foundation

13 W. K. Kellogg Foundation*
(14) American Jewish World Service*

15 John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation*
16 EEA and Norway Grants*
17 Sigrid Rausing Trust*
18 California Endowment
(19) Open Doors International

20 William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
21 Public Welfare Foundation*

Location
USA
USA
NETHERLANDS
USA
USA
SWITZERLAND
USA
NETHERLANDS
UNITED KINGDOM
USA
USA
USA
USA
USA
USA
BELGIUM
UNITED KINGDOM
USA
USA
USA
USA

## Amount

\$303.8 MILLION (M)
\$270.9 M
\$269.6 M
\$120.9 M
\$115.1 M
\$72.7 M
\$64.8 M
$\$ 50.0 \mathrm{M}$
\$49.6 M
\$49.4 M
\$46.7 M
\$39.4 M
\$39.0 M
$\$ 37.1 \mathrm{M}$
\$28.3 M
\$26.6 M
\$26.5 M
$\$ 26.1 \mathrm{M}$
\$22.1 M
\$20.8 M
\$18.5 M

## Leading Foundations by Number of Grants for Human Rights, 2013

Foundation Name
(1) Open Society Foundations*
(2) Ford Foundation*
(3) National Endowment for Democracy*
(4) American Jewish World Service*
(5) Global Greengrants Fund*
(6) Global Fund for Women*
(7) EEA and Norway Grants*

8 Hivos*
(9) Fund For Global Human Rights*

10 Tides Foundation*
(11) New Israel Fund*

12 NEO Philanthropy*
(13) Fundación ONCE*
(14) Sigrid Rausing Trust*

15 Fondo Centroamericano de Mujeres*
16 Abilis Foundation*
(17) Oak Foundation*

18 Foundation for Civil Society*
19 Mensen met een Missie*
(20) Fundación AVINA*
21) Foundation for Human Rights*

Location USA
USA
USA
USA
USA
No. Grants
2,262
824
795
$-\quad 631$
USA 529
BELGIUM 438
NETHERLANDS 418
USA 297
USA 286
USA 271
USA 262
SPAIN 235
UNITED KINGDOM 209
NICARAGUA 204
FINLAND 192
SWITZERLAND 191
TANZANIA 189
NETHERLANDS 186
PANAMA 165
SOUTH AFRICA 163

Source: Foundation Center, 2016. Figures based on grants awarded by 803 foundations located in 46 countries. The amounts presented here reflect the full value of each funder's grantmaking for human rights, including grants to other foundations in the set. To address potential double-counting in figures, recipients who are also funders were removed to arrive at the $\$ 2.3$ billion for 2013 total human rights grantmaking figure that appears in other sections of the analysis. The figures presented here have been updated from the original version of this report based on additional information provided by one funder. This adjustment is not reflected in other figures included in the report.
*Denotes membership in IHRFG, Ariadne, or Prospera in 2013.

## WHERE DO HUMAN RIGHTS GRANTS GO?

Organizations and advocates in every major region of the world receive human rights funding. The following analysis considers the full data set and examines the distribution of human rights funding by geographic focus (regardless of whether the grant recipient was based in or outside of the region-see page 10).

O Approximately 41 percent of human rights funding in 2013 (\$961 million) focused on rights-related work in North America, from advancing the rights of immigrants to eliminating disparities in access to healthcare. See page 3 for a few contributing factors as to why North America accounts for such a large proportion of human rights funding.

O The second most supported region was Sub-Saharan Africa, with 12 percent of overall funding ( $\$ 289$ million). Funding to Sub-Saharan Africa included support for electoral transparency and accountability in local governance, for slum dwellers to advocate for improved living conditions, and for research around strategies to address violence against women.

O Western Europe followed with 11 percent, supporting issues such as countering hatred and promoting tolerance, advancing children's rights, and increasing access to mental health services.

O Asia and the Pacific ranked fourth with 7 percent, including support for economic independence of women, ensuring respect for resource rights, and domestic law reform to incorporate human rights.

O Based on the consistent subset of funders ${ }^{7}$ from 2012 to 2013, seven of the eight major regions exhibited growth in grant dollars received. Western Europe showed the largest increase in grant dollars (up 62 percent), as well as in the number of grants (up 29 percent). A large investment by the Atlantic Philanthropies to multiple organizations for measures to combat child poverty (including a $\$ 19$ million grant to the Ireland-based Probal) partially accounted for this rise. Other regions that experienced a significant increase in funding include the Middle East and North Africa (up 38 percent), North America ( 26 percent), and Asia and the Pacific ( 20 percent).

Foundation Funding for Human Rights by Region, 2013


[^0]
## HUMAN RIGHTS GRANTMAKING

803 FOUNDATIONS IN 46 COUNTRIES MADE $\mathbf{2 0 , 3 0 0}$ GRANTS TOTALING $\$ \mathbf{2 . 3}$ BILLION


Human Rights Funding to Recipients Based in the Region, 2013


Source: Foundation Center, 2016. Figures based on grants awarded by 803 foundations located in 46 countries.

- The only region to see a decline in funding from 2012 to 2013 was the Caribbean, which received less than 1 percent of overall funding for human rights. Foundation funding to the Caribbean declined by 13 percent in terms of grant dollars and by 6 percent in number of grants. This decrease comes after a spike in grantmaking to the Caribbean in 2012, when a few grantmakers authorized large multi-year grants for the region. ${ }^{8}$

O Human rights funding focused on a specific country or region may be given to recipient organizations based in that region or to an organization based elsewhere. For example, Humanity United awarded a grant to the U.S.based International Refugee Rights Initiative for human rights protection in South Sudan. The foundation also awarded a
grant to the West Africa Civil Society Institute in Ghana for civil society capacity-building around the responsibility to protect. Both grants are coded as support for Sub-Saharan Africa.

- Among grants supporting human rights in the Global South and East, 65 percent of grant dollars ( $\$ 529$ million) went to organizations based there. ${ }^{9}$ Of these, 48 grants were authorized for amounts of $\$ 1$ million or more (compared with 64 grants awarded to recipients based in the Global North for the benefit of the Global South and East). Multimilliondollar grants awarded to Global South and East recipients included support for sexual and reproductive rights in South America, women's rights in West Africa, and children's rights in South Asia.


## WHAT DO HUMAN RIGHTS GRANTS SUPPORT?

The human rights grantmaking described in this study has been classified into 30 unique issue areas grouped into 13 overarching categories. ${ }^{10}$ In this report, grants are assigned to one issue category only. Where grants support multiple issue areas, researchers drew on available information to determine the most relevant category.

- In 2013, funding for equality rights and freedom from discrimination accounted for the largest share of human rights grant dollars ( 15 percent). This issue area includes grants focused on the rights of particular populations where a separate issue focus was not named. For example, Foundation for a Just Society gave a three-year general operating grant to the South Asian Women's Fund to support women's human rights work in Nepal.
- The second-largest category of human rights funding based on grant dollars was human rights - general ( 13 percent), which includes grantmaking in support of organizations that work on numerous human rights issues-such as a general support grant to the South Africa-based Lawyers for Human Rightsas well as grants that foundations have left intentionally vague to protect the safety of their grantees.
- From 2012 to 2013 , the consistent subset of funders ${ }^{11}$ reflected growth in a majority of issue areas, led by migration and displacement, which rose by 80 percent due to a number of multimillion-dollar grants from a collection of funders to the Alliance for Citizenship, a coalition founded in 2013 to support the movement for fair and humane immigration reform in the United States. Other issue areas benefiting from well above average growth ${ }^{12}$ in human rights grant dollars in 2013 included health and well-being rights (up 44 percent), sexual and reproductive rights (up 38 percent), and environmental and resource rights (up 34 percent).

Foundation Funding for Human Rights by Issue Area, 2013


[^1]
## WHO IS THE FOCUS OF HUMAN RIGHTS GRANTS?

Most human rights-related grantmaking includes an explicit focus on specific population groups. In the following analysis, the full value of a grant is counted toward all of the population groups identified by the grantmaker as being an explicit focus of the grant. For example, the full amount of a human rights grant to support girls is counted within the totals for both "children and youth" and "women and girls."

Seventy-nine percent of human rights grants in 2013 included an explicit focus on specific population groups or supported organizations whose missions focus on specific populations.

O In 2013, 21 percent of grant dollars and 26 percent of grants specified a focus on women and girls. The purpose of this giving ranged from supporting women human rights defenders to ensuring girls' rights to education to ending genderbased violence.

O Human rights funding focused on children and youth accounted for 19 percent of grant dollars in 2013, supporting such topics as the right to inclusive education for children with disabilities and children's right to freedom of expression.

- Migrants and refugees were the focus of 12 percent of foundation human rights grant dollars, ranging from support for fair wages to addressing the pressing needs of Syrian refugees in Jordan.

O Funding priorities in terms of population focus show some variation by region. While women and girls as well as children and youth account for the largest proportions of funding in most regions, in Latin America and Mexico, for example, funding focused on indigenous peoples accounted for a substantial share of grant dollars ( 21 percent). And in Eastern and Western Europe, funding intended to benefit people with disabilities represented 15 and 14 percent, respectively, of all grantmaking for the region-compared with the 4 percent of overall funding dedicated to support that population group.

## Foundation Funding for Human Rights by Population Group, 2013

$\square \%$ of Grant Dollars $\quad$ \% of Number of Grants
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## WHICH STRATEGIES ARE SUPPORTED BY HUMAN RIGHTS FUNDERS?

For the first time, this research is tracking the strategies supported by human rights funding. Strategies describe the approach a recipient uses to achieve the goals of a program or grant. In this inaugural analysis, we identified 11 strategies and mapped grants data to these categories. We found that 56 percent of grants in the 2013 data set supported at least one specific strategy; for the remaining grants, information was not sufficiently detailed to make a determination. For grants that employ more than one strategy, the full value of the grant is counted toward all relevant categories.

- Activities related to advocacy, systems reform and implementation received the single largest share of funding dollars, at 27 percent. Forty-three percent of the 803 funders in the set made at least one grant to an organization using these strategies. Specific examples include grantmaking to strengthen health systems for marginalized populations in Vietnam and to reform the New York Police Department's "stop and frisk" policies.
- Capacity-building and technical assistance accounted for the next-largest share of human rights funding ( 15 percent), with efforts to increase the financial strength of community organizing groups in Haiti as one example.

O Thirteen percent of human rights funding employed research and documentation as a strategy. Grantmaking included support for documenting the impacts of violence in post-war Sri Lanka and research on the effects of the global film industry on gender perceptions.

- Funders located in the Global South and East dedicated the largest proportion of their grantmaking to support capacitybuilding, allocating 27 percent to this strategy - versus 15 percent among the overall set. Coalition-building and collaboration also received more focus from funders based in the Global South and East, with 16 percent of dollars supporting this strategy-more than three times the proportion provided by the full data set (5 percent).

Foundation Funding for Human Rights by Strategy Supported, 2013


Source: Foundation Center, 2016. Figures based on grants awarded by 803 foundations located in 46 countries. Figures represent only grants that could be identified as employing specific strategies, either through the recipient's mission or through the grant description itself. In addition, grants may use multiple strategies, e.g., a grant for grassroots organizing and policy advocacy around land rights, and would therefore be counted more than once. As a result, figures do not add up to 100 percent.

## BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL FUNDING FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

In order to provide a more comprehensive picture of the human rights funding landscape, in 2016 the Advancing Human Rights: Knowledge Tools for Funders initiative began tracking bilateral and multilateral support. Using the OECD's Creditor Reporting System (CRS), one of the most comprehensive data sets available on aid, researchers mapped the data to the Advancing Human Rights taxonomy using a combination of OECD-CRS coding and key word searches to categorize aid disbursements by issue area, region, and population. ${ }^{13}$

O $\ln 2013$, researchers identified 13,721 human rights disbursements from bilateral and multilateral donors reporting to the OECD-CRS, representing $\$ 3.7$ billion out of a total $\$ 126$ billion in bilateral and multilateral funding.

O While the United States topped the list of overall aid donors, Sweden was the leading donor for human rights, providing 14 percent of the total identified human rights funding. The United States was the second-largest human rights donor (12 percent), followed by European Union Institutions and Norway (both 11 percent).

O Twenty percent of bilateral and multilateral human rights funding was not directed toward a specific country or region. This includes disbursements providing a global benefit or used to cover the donor's administrative costs.

O Among identified countries, top recipients of OECD-CRS funding were Afghanistan, Rwanda, Colombia, and Indonesia, which each received over $\$ 80$ million in human rights-related aid.

- Regionally, Sub-Saharan Africa received the most support, accounting for 30 percent of bilateral and multilateral human rights funding, followed by Asia and the Pacific, which received 20 percent.

O Among issue areas, the single largest share of aid focused on civic and political participation ( 16 percent), followed by human rights-general ( 16 percent) and freedom from violence (13 percent).

O Just over half of the human rights disbursements in the set supported at least one specific population. Of these, 24 percent included a focus on women and girls and 21 percent on children and youth.

Official Development Assistance (ODA) for Human Rights by Issue Area, 2013


[^3]|  | Amount | No. Grants |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Access to Justice/Equality Before the Law | \$149.2 M | 1,111 |
| Civic and Political Participation | \$163.2 M | 1,530 |
| Right to Peaceful Assembly and Association | \$136.7 M | 1,342 |
| Voting Rights | \$26.5 M | 188 |
| Economic and Labor Rights | \$149.4 M | 1,360 |
| Environmental and Resource Rights | \$150.9 M | 2,114 |
| Cooperative Rights/Sustainable Agriculture Rights | \$7.7 M | 122 |
| Right to a Healthy Environment/Share in and Determine the Distribution of Lands, Territories, and Resources | \$120.0 M | 1,650 |
| Right to Own Property | \$6.1 M | 72 |
| Right to Water | \$17.1 M | 270 |
| Equality Rights and Freedom from Discrimination | \$343.5 M | 3,827 |
| Expression and Information Rights | \$103.6 M | 1,030 |
| Freedom from Interference with Privacy, Family, Home, and Correspondence | \$2.6 M | 26 |
| Freedom of Opinion and Expression | \$12.7 M | 124 |
| Freedom of Information | \$88.3 M | 880 |
| Freedom from Violence | \$159.7 M | 1,911 |
| Freedom from Domestic Violence | \$17.1 M | 222 |
| Freedom from Gender/Identity-based Violence | \$22.4 M | 172 |
| Freedom from Slavery and Trafficking | \$31.0 M | 299 |
| Freedom from Torture and Degrading Treatment | \$81.7 M | 1,193 |
| Freedom from Other Forms of Violence | \$7.5 M | 25 |
| Health and Well-being Rights | \$264.0 M | 1,954 |
| Right to Adequate Housing | \$38.4 M | 215 |
| Right to Rest and Leisure | \$12.7 M | 200 |
| Right to the Enjoyment of the Highest Attainable Standard of Physical and Mental Health | \$212.9 M | 1,539 |
| Migration and Displacement | \$135.5 M | 1,136 |
| Right to a Nationality and Freedom to Change Nationality | \$86.5 M | 723 |
| Right to Asylum in Other Countries | \$49.0 M | 413 |
| Sexual and Reproductive Rights | \$212.2 M | 926 |
| Right to Decide Freely and Responsibly on the Number and Spacing of Children | \$209.6 M | 895 |
| Right to Sexual Expression | \$2.6 M | 31 |
| Social and Cultural Rights | \$164.8 M | 1,504 |
| Freedom of Belief and Religion | \$29.1 M | 128 |
| Right to Education | \$97.7 M | 879 |
| Right to Marriage and Family | \$14.9 M | 103 |
| Right to Participate in the Cultural Life of a Community/ Engage in Community Duties Essential to Free and Full Development | \$23.1 M | 394 |
| Transitional Justice and Peacebuilding | \$40.4 M | 433 |
| Human Rights-General | \$309.2 M | 1,465 |
| Total | \$2.3 B | 20,301 |

## Endnotes

1. This figure excludes 481 grants, totaling $\$ 202$ million, awarded by foundations to other foundations included in the 2013 set. Generally, these awards were made either to support re-granting programs or build the capacity of the recipient foundations. They have been removed in order to avoid double-counting of grant dollars.
2. Grants awarded by a consistent set of 649 foundations included in both the 2012 and 2013 Advancing Human Rights project data sets were included in this analysis. Their giving represented 87 percent of human rights grant dollars tracked for 2012 and 82 percent for 2013.
3. For this analysis, the full value of the grant is attributed to the year in which it was authorized. Therefore, if a multi-year grant was authorized in 2013, the full value of that grant was included in the 2013 totals.
4. Data on giving by the Open Society Foundations include all grantmaking by the U.S.-based Open Society Institute and Foundation to Promote Open Society and self-reported grantmaking by selected Open Society Foundations based in other countries
5. Figures for North America include three Canadian funders: the International Development Research Centre, MATCH International Women's Fund, and the Cloverleaf Foundation. All others are U.S.-based funders.
6. Global South and East includes all countries outside of Western Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan.
7. Grants awarded by a consistent set of 649 foundations included in both the 2012 and 2013 Advancing Human Rights project data sets were included in this analysis. Their giving represented 87 percent of human rights grant dollars tracked for 2012 and 82 percent for 2013.
8. For this analysis, the full value of the grant is attributed to the year in which it was authorized. Therefore, if a multi-year grant was authorized in 2013, the full value of that grant was included in the 2013 totals.
9. Global South and East includes all countries outside of Western Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan.
10. In the inaugural Advancing Human Rights report, the issue-focus framework included 26 issue areas combined into 10 overarching areas of activity. Subsequently, several codes were added to more accurately capture human rights grantmaking. These include dividing the overall category of "Individual Integrity, Liberty, and Security" into "Equality Rights and Freedom from Discrimination" and "Expression and Information Rights"; adding a category for "Transitional Justice and Peacebuilding"; adding "Voting Rights" as a sub-category of "Civic and Political Participation"; and adding a population code for "Human Rights Defenders." In this report, a category for "Other Forms of Violence" was added under "Freedom from Violence" and "Labor Rights "was changed to "Economic and Labor Rights" to more accurately reflect the range of activity captured.
11. Grants awarded by a consistent set of 649 foundations included in both the 2012 and 2013 Advancing Human Rights project data sets were included in this analysis. Their giving represented 87 percent of human rights grant dollars tracked for 2012 and 82 percent for 2013.
12. Average growth refers to the 23 percent increase in grant dollars from 2012 to 2013 among the matched subset of 649 funders whose grants were included in the research for both years.
13. The CRS data set includes aid funding flows from the 29 donor members of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC), as well as a select number of non-DAC countries and multilateral organizations who choose to report (in 2013, this included 34 multilateral organizations and 18 non-DAC member donors) and only includes aid to countries qualifying for Official Development Assistance (ODA). For a list of donors submitting data to the OECD's Creditor Reporting System, visit www.oecd.org/dac/stats/dataportals.htm.

## WHAT DO YOU THINK?

The International Human Rights Funders Group (IHRFG) and Foundation Center, along with AriadneEuropean Funders for Social Change and Human Rights and Prospera-the International Network of Women's Funds, welcome your feedback on the methodology of this research and on the resources produced.

We are committed to expanding understanding of global human rights funding. As this research moves forward, we will continue to broaden the scope of data collected to ensure that rights funding is captured as fully and accurately as possible and to analyze trends in human rights funding.

## Your input and feedback is critical to this effort to support more strategic, effective, collaborative, and transparent human rights philanthropy.

To submit data, provide feedback, or discuss how to apply this research in support of your work, please contact Sarah Tansey at stansey@ihrfg.org.

# To download this report or to access more detailed information about the state of global human rights funding, visit humanrightsfunding.org. 

The Advancing Human Rights: Knowledge Tools for Funders initiative is funded by the Ford Foundation, Oak Foundation, Open Society Foundations, and John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. We are grateful for their support.

32 Old Slip, 24th Floor * New York, NY 10005
(800) 424-9836 * foundationcenter.org

International Human Rights Funders Group c/o Liquidnet 498 7th Avenue, 15th Floor * New York, NY 10018
(646) 381-7580 *ww.ihrfg.org


[^0]:    Source: Foundation Center, 2016. Figures based on grants awarded by 803 foundations located in 46 countries. Figures represent only grants awarded to support specified regions. Grants may benefit multiple regions and would therefore be counted more than once. As a result, figures do not add up to 100 percent.

[^1]:    Source: Foundation Center, 2016. Figures based on grants awarded by 803 foundations located in 46 countries. Due to rounding, totals may not equal 100 percent.

[^2]:    Source: Foundation Center, 2016. Figures based on grants awarded by 803 foundations located in 46 countries. Figures represent only grants that could be identified as serving specific populations, either through the recipient's mission or through the grant description itself. In addition, grants may benefit multiple population groups, e.g., a grant for female refugees, and would therefore be counted more than once. As a result, figures do not add up to 100 percent.
    Grants for human rights defenders include those that explicitly reference human rights defenders in the grant descrption, as well as those from funders that identified all of their funding as supporting this population.
    Red Umbrella Fund, Mama Cash, and Open Society Foundations recently conducted an in depth analysis of sex worker rights funding in 2013 and identified a total of $\$ 11$ million in support. This additional support was identified through targeted data collection, including from non-governmental organizations, from which we do not collect funding data. To learn more: www.redumbrellafund.org/report/.

[^3]:    Source: Foundation Center, 2016. Figures based on analysis of ODA commitments compiled in the OECD Creditor Reporting System. Due to rounding, totals may exceed 100 percent.

