



Equal Rights Coalition Thematic Group on Donor Coordination

Report of the Side Event to the Conference "Leave No One Behind: the Equal Rights Coalition Global Conference on LGBTI Human

Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

August 8th, 2018



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Executive summary	3
II. Framing discussions	5
III. Panel 1 – Intermediaries: Centering LGBTI Movement Needs and Priorities across Diverse Funding Modalities	6
IV. Panel 2 – Mainstreaming: Inclusive Development Models and Practices	10
V. Panel 3 – Lesbian, Trans, and Intersex Inclusion and Access in Assistance	12
VI. Panel 4 - Setting a Learning Agenda – Donor Coordination WG	15
VII. Consolidated recommendations	16
VIII. Annexes	
- Annex A: Agenda	18
- Annex B: Draft framework of survey scorecard	21
- Annex C: Pre-survey results by participant category	22

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Launched in July 2016 by the Government of Uruguay and the Netherlands, the Equal Rights Coalition (ERC) is a 40-member intergovernmental coalition whose purpose is to strengthen coordination, cooperation, and collaboration between States in advancing the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, intersex, and queer (LGBTIQ) individuals around the world.

Co-chaired by the US State Department and Synergía – Initiatives for Human Rights, the Thematic Group on Donor Coordination (the working group) was formed out of civil society recommendations from the 2014 conference to advance the human rights of and promote the inclusive development for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons held in Washington, DC, USA. The working group was then formalized through established terms of reference (Annex A) on the margins of the first ERC conference in Montevideo, Uruguay.

Following the first ERC conference, the group established a workplan (Annex B) to address the recommendations articulated during the conference – including the generation of additional information, inputs, and opportunities to discuss key challenges in LGBTIQ donor coordination. Included in the plan was the need to host a convening on the margins of the ERC's second global conference in August 2018. This a one-day side event offered the opportunity for members of the working group and other relevant stakeholders to:

- Share best practices in the provision of human rights and development assistance;
- Identify and address gaps in funding assistance;
- Strengthen capacity of government and multilateral funders – among others – to effectively support work that advances the human rights of and development assistance for LGBTIQ persons.

The side event was organized into four moderated panel discussion, each followed by an opportunity for other participants to contribute to the discussion. This report is intended to highlight key reflections that were shared during each panel; provide a list of recommendations offered by panelists and participants; and pose a number of outstanding questions for further exploration by the working group. While a variety of challenges and successes were shared and discussed, key themes of the side-event included:

- The need to better understand and map the various mechanisms through which funding can be channeled to the grassroots – including various government funding mechanisms and funding intermediaries;
- The need to balance funding for dedicated LGBTIQ work with an approach of mainstreaming LGBTIQ issues into broader funding programs.
- The need to leverage the working group in documenting best practices in funding LGBTIQ human rights programming to both inform current donors and to engage new donors.

¹ The report utilizes "LGBTIQ" for discussion points that did not focus on specific identities, acknowledging speakers may not have intended to be fully inclusive of the range of identities reflected in the acronym. For discussion points that related to specific identities, those identities are explicitly used.

Funding LGBTI Rights - Challenges and Solutions

- The goal of this session was to discuss the challenges and best practices for donors to ensure “do no harm” as a fundamental principle for supporting LGBTI human rights and inclusive development, while also highlighting those best practices that empower donors – in partnership with LGBTI communities – to do the most good.
- The discussion was anchored in the presentation of two compelling case studies: Nigeria and Indonesia. In both cases, panelists from civil society highlighted the critical need for donor support, particularly in emergency situations.
- Panelists encouraged creativity among both the movement and donors in their approach, including coordination among donors at country level, understanding the expectation that civil society is diverse and cannot be expected to speak with one voice, and the critical need to make funds flexible for urgent and unpredictable needs.
- Panelists underscored the importance of supporting LGBTI movement-led efforts, even if donors fund mainstream human rights organizations as intermediaries, to ensure agency, organizational growth and resilience.
- Finally, there was deep engagement by donors and civil society alike on the question of the “do no harm” principle. To employ this approach, donors should ensure efforts are LGBTI movement-led, focus on safety and security in program approach (especially in emergencies) and address funding gaps as identified by the community.
- The discussion concluded with a strong caution that taking a “do no harm” approach is not an excuse to do nothing. Instead, it is an opportunity to include LGBTI communities in donor efforts to navigate challenging environments in order to continue to respond and fund LGBTI communities.

From Final Report “Leaving No One Behind: The Equal Rights Coalition Global Conference on LGBTI Human Rights and Inclusive Development” Vancouver, British Columbia August 5-7, 2018

II. FRAMING DISCUSSIONS

The side-event was opened with remarks from representatives of the US State Department and Synergía – Initiatives for Human Rights. These remarks framed the day's discussions within the context of:

- The need to build trust within and between government donors, other funders, and civil society to make more informed and accountable decisions. This should be done by making constraints transparent and providing concrete examples of funding approaches that work.
- A number of successes having been achieved in advancing LGBTIQ human rights – indicating there is much to build on, but also much that can be lost if not properly safeguarded with adequate donor support. This was underscored through references to increasing use of successes by right-wing governments and anti-rights groups to undermine regional systems for the protection of human rights.
- The importance of having government donors in the room, whose participation represents those governments' support for the human rights of LGBTIQ people as part of their human rights and humanitarian mandates. Understanding individual government donor priorities, policies and funding strategies is the key to unlocking more support for the LGBTIQ community and making further progress towards equality.
- The importance of having civil society alongside government and private donors in the same room, acknowledging that initial international LGBTIQ donor convenings were absent of this participation. At the same time, attention was called to those who were not present, prompting the question: how are discussions within the side-event complemented with these additional perspectives?
- The intention of discussions was to develop solutions-oriented diagnoses, with solutions offering the possibility of establishing goal posts against which stakeholders will be able to measure progress.

Following the opening remarks, each panel raised a number of key points, offered recommendations to various stakeholders, and posted a number of new questions that stand to be addressed; key points and recommendations are outlined in the following sections.

III. PANEL 1 – INTERMEDIARIES: CENTERING LGBTI MOVEMENT NEEDS AND PRIORITIES ACROSS DIVERSE FUNDING MODALITIES

The definition and roles of funding intermediaries were discussed among a panel comprised of government donors who utilize funding intermediaries to support LGBTIQ human rights; funding intermediaries that receive and regrant funds for LGBTIQ work; and civil society organizations that are or were previously funded by intermediaries.

The moderator defined intermediaries as a large range of entities that possess the ability to manage large government grants that can then be regranted to in smaller amounts to groups supporting LGBTIQ human rights in the field. Through the course of the panel, government donors described why and how they work with intermediaries; civil society representatives described their positive and negative experiences receiving support from intermediaries; and intermediaries described the role they play liaising between governments and the movements they support.

Key points

Government donors

- Government donor representatives indicated a preference for using intermediaries as these entities: reduce administrative burden on smaller, nascent organizations; bring a wealth of expertise and partnerships with LGBTIQ groups to the funded work; and can serve as a conduit between the government and LGBTIQ movements, especially in closed spaces.
- For the reasons indicated above, government representatives further noted preference for working with **LGBTIQ intermediaries** that have connections with and can channel funding to smaller LGBTIQ groups.
- In addition to funding intermediaries, governments also use the **Global Equality Fund (GEF)** as a means of pooling administration and increasing the scope and breadth of funding for LGBTIQ human rights work. In some instances, governments must decide between using the GEF mechanism and funding intermediaries directly. In other instances, governments have funded intermediaries to represent its interests in the GEF.



Civil society organizations

- Representatives from civil society organizations funded by intermediaries noted that LGBTIQ-focused intermediaries are **more sensitive to the realities and needs** of their LGBTIQ grantees as compared to government funding mechanisms and/or mainstream intermediaries. Therefore, LGBTIQ-focused intermediaries have better adapted their grantmaking – including proposal processes, funding levels, and reporting requirements – so that LGBTIQ groups can better access and manage this funding.
- While intermediaries can relieve the need for LGBTIQ groups to have highly sophisticated financial management systems, some also add value by working with their grantees to **develop these systems**. Intermediaries that support LGBTIQ groups' own capacity development gradually reduce their need to mitigate more complex grant restraints.
- Civil society organizations noted a number of **challenges** in working with intermediaries, including: 1) significant lags in receiving grant payments that delay activities and potentially incapacitate organizations; 2) a reported reticence from some intermediaries to invest in staff and infrastructure – in favor of funding projects and activities; and 3) instances where intermediaries are required to impose their own government donor's grant requirements on their subgrantees, making it difficult to ease the administrative burden on LGBTIQ groups.
- As intermediaries are also grant seekers, civil society organizations may need to **compete** with their intermediaries for larger government donor resources.

Funding intermediaries

- Funding intermediaries identified areas of **added value** they offer – including providing financial and capacity building support to newer LGBTIQ groups and finding creative solutions to fund LGBTIQ work in contexts where restrictions on civil society (including funding restrictions) make government donor funding inaccessible and/or risky.
- Funding intermediaries often carry longer **institutional memory** of partnerships than government donors; government donors can rely on this institutional memory as they make their own funding decisions.
- **Regionally focused** funding intermediaries are able to access funding for broad projects addressing a common theme across multiple countries/contexts. Their added value is both the ability to tailor regranting work to the specific countries/contexts represented under the broader project, as well as the ability to provide regionally tailored capacity building support.
- Some **mainstream** funding intermediaries provide the opportunity to support the integration of their LGBTIQ subgrantees into broader human rights work (i.e., promoting integration of LGBTIQ groups into broader sexual and reproductive health rights work alongside HIV/AIDS, women's rights, and sexworker rights organizations).
- **HIV-focused** intermediaries also provide more accessible funding to provide prevention, care, and support services to LGBTIQ communities, but HIV funding is often restricted to services and often excludes support for important community-building activities.
- While intermediaries **seek to provide flexibility** to more nascent groups, they are still bound to the level of flexibility that their own donors allow. Intermediaries with significant core and/or unrestricted funding are able to address these gaps by providing this more flexible funding to more nascent subgrantees.
- While intermediaries often provide improved access to funding, at least one example illustrated how intermediaries may impose **more restrictive conditions** on grants than government donors. This may relate to the risk intermediaries bear in reporting on their own funding agreements.
- Similar to civil society organizations, funding intermediaries also face **short funding cycles**; this has an impact on the grants they can make and payments they can facilitate to LGBTIQ groups.

Cross-cutting points

- **Trust** that is cultivated between donors and their grantees is of paramount importance; trust allows grantees to take innovative risks, continue meaningful work despite possible challenges in financial management, and adapt programs in ways that respond best to realities on the ground.
- A **lack of trust** – specifically that of the expertise and capacity of trans and intersex activists and groups – limits their meaningful and/or equitable involvement in informing and implementing projects for their communities.
- Partnerships of organizations transitioning into the role of an intermediary may be affected by the new dynamics inherent in **donor/subgrantee relationships**. If trust is not maintained, partners may seek to minimize challenges or perceived failures.
- Some government donors' license to trust is limited by **certain policies** – including zero tolerance of funds mismanagement. Intermediaries can play a role in preventing and addressing issues of potential fraud to avoid complete funding withdrawals that often occur after accusations of fraud are brought to light.
- **Accountability** should be demanded, even between long-term funding partners; examples were given highlighting the ways funding earmarked for trans work has been provided to organizations that – in reality – use these funds to employ “tokenistic” staff who are unable to utilize funds for their intended purpose.
- Government donors can address accountability by engaging directly with grassroots groups. **Embassies** are the primary point of contact for making these connections and often represent critical sources of funding for grassroots groups.
- Intermediaries address accountability issues through **inclusion of LGBTIQ activists in funding processes** – as either grant assessors or in the capacity of advisors to review and make recommendations on grantmaking processes.
- **Data** is of critical importance in educating current LGBTIQ donors on areas of need and opportunities to fund. Data is also key bringing more resources into the LGBTIQ human rights funding space in an informed way. While certain resources are helpful (i.e., the Global Philanthropy Project [GPP] report), there is certain funding not captured in these resources.
- While **identity-based funding** is important to ensure LGBTIQ groups are the champions of their own advocacy efforts through dedicated allocation of resources, **mainstream funding streams** have the potential to expand resources currently available to LGBTIQ groups through identity-based streams. The integration of LGBTIQ issues into broader funding streams also reinforces the notion that SOGIE-SC concepts are part and parcel of broader human rights work.

Recommendations

Government donors should:

- Add a margin of flexibility – at least 10% of the total grant amount – to allow intermediaries to be more adaptive to local needs. This should not be considered an inability to plan, but the foresight to know contexts can change rapidly.
- Commission, share, and discuss program evaluations to improve understanding of needs and understanding of what constitutes a successful program.
- Remove country lists/restrictions when inviting calls for proposals and prioritize LGBTIQ issues in middle-income countries similar to those in low-income countries.
- Consider requesting an exit strategy from LGBTIQ groups in their support to trans and intersex work. The exit strategy should demonstrate how trans and intersex-led groups can gradually manage larger grants and engage directly with donors.
- Pursue a two-fold approach to supporting LGBTIQ work – through both the provision of resources dedicated to LGBTIQ work and integrating support to LGBTIQ work as a part of broader human rights and development assistance initiatives.

Civil society organizations should:

- Engage in dialogue with government and intermediary donors preemptively rather than reactively – especially when addressing a crisis. This will allow for donors to understand contexts precipitating changes and provide civil society with a clear understanding of government policies, priorities and strategies. This will create an opportunity for donors and grantees to work together to address issues in a more collaborative way.
- Share additional data on funding they receive from non-LGBTIQ specific sources (i.e., mainstream sources that support LGBTIQ groups under a broader funding approach).
- Share experiences – both good and bad – with funding intermediaries to inform “do’s” and “don’ts” for intermediaries to improve their roles channeling funds to the grassroots.

Funding intermediaries should:

- Find ways to learn from other grantmakers on effective models and grantmaking processes that are being used to support grassroots LGBTIQ groups.
- Better cross-section their funding data (by thematic area of focus, by country, by organization type, etc.) so that a more detailed analysis can be made on how movements react to closing civil society space in different regions.
- Focus on mapping what civil society actually needs and provide an overlay of current funding on identified needs – with specific attention to the needs and resourcing of trans and intersex individuals and queer women. This will indicate where funding is addressing actual needs.
- Commit to LGBTIQ issues over the long term to protect against sudden funding cuts that can incapacitate LGBTIQ movements.

Outstanding questions

- For what and to whom should intermediaries be held accountable given their role between formal agreements with their donors and the needs and priorities of movements?
- How can donors better ensure that groups claiming to do work (i.e., trans and intersex-specific work) are doing it, and doing it in a meaningful way?
- How can donors build trust so that grantees can be open about the challenges they face in implementing projects?
- How do government donors, civil society organizations, and funding intermediaries work together collectively to identify new streams of funding (i.e., mainstream human rights funding, funding outside of human rights donors, development assistance, funding for democracy and governance, etc.) to integrate LGBTIQ work into these other streams?
- How can funding data be improved without requiring intermediaries to provide an overly burdensome level of reporting?
- How effectively is funding being allocated to address identified needs – particularly the needs of trans and intersex individuals and queer women.
- How can mainstream intermediaries interested in supporting LGBTIQ human rights work leverage the expertise of those who have extensive experience and knowledge?



IV. PANEL 2 – MAINSTREAMING: INCLUSIVE DEVELOPMENT MODELS AND PRACTICES

The second panel explored the notion of development initiatives that seek to achieve inclusive societies and promote diversity within those societies through poverty reduction efforts. To promote this inclusivity and diversity, panelists discussed how to adopt the principles of meaningful participation, non-discrimination, and accessibility to development processes so that marginalized groups – including LGBTIQ communities – can influence these processes. These goals and principles have already been taken up by the disability rights movement and applied to the movement's own goals and priorities.

Key points

- Poverty exists not only due to a lack of resources but due to a lack of opportunity and voice. As poverty alleviation is addressed at the aggregate level, development programs cannot exclude pockets of society – all must participate, and all must benefit.
- Many LGBTIQ communities experience poverty due to exclusion – from education, employment, housing, health services, etc. As such, focusing exclusively on human rights programs that seek legal and policy change may seem to exist “far down the road” from the needs facing LGBTIQ individuals today.
- Non-discrimination is not sufficient to promote inclusive development; government panelists noted that while their development partners do not discriminate against LGBTIQ communities, it is not always evident that these partners actively promote LGBTIQ inclusion – even in areas where it would be extremely relevant.
- Because some governments do not fund development cooperation, it is incumbent on the development agencies to enforce inclusion among its development partners – through multiple approaches that may include training and/or building consensus on the notion that development and human rights go hand-in-hand.
- Similar to the conversation on funding intermediaries, development programs must consider how to balance funding that is allocated to LGBTIQ-specific work and the inclusion of LGBTIQ issues within

broader programs. This will be dependent on the difference in needs between the general population and LGBTIQ populations, as well as the difference in needs between the various identities represented by the broader "LGBTIQ" umbrella.

- It is challenging for government donors to incorporate all the necessary nuances into broad-based development programs. Thus, it is incumbent on funding intermediaries and/or larger development organizations to ensure they allocate their funding in ways that promote LGBTIQ-inclusion.
- Inclusivity is strongly impacted by the language used to describe LGBTIQ communities in various contexts; an inability to adopt contextual terminology for SOGIESC issues is likely to contribute to continued exclusion of marginalized groups.
- Government and multilateral donors are adopting LGBTIQ-inclusive policies – both internal and external (i.e., non-discrimination policies required of service delivery grantees). These adoptions – even when non-binding – reflect not only an external positioning towards LGBTIQ-inclusion, but an internal effort to institutionalize the focus on LGBTIQ issues that can outlast changes in administrations and/or evolution in funding priorities.

Recommendations

Government donors should:

- Ensure development processes must include LGBTIQ communities; reach out to LGBTIQ communities for their input; and promote LGBTIQ inclusion and balance the power dynamics between the diverse representation of communities involved.
- Ensure that funding recipients not only practice non-discrimination in development work, but also actively promote inclusion of LGBTIQ communities in meaningful ways. The starting point for this inclusion should be in processes that naturally promote LGBTIQ participation (i.e., promoting integration of women's rights, LGBTIQ rights, sexual and reproductive health rights, and HIV/AIDS programming).
- Leverage publicly available data (i.e., OECD markers) and determine whether LGBTIQ-related indicators could be added.
- Allocate funding to community development as a precondition for including LGBTIQ groups in development processes; stronger communities will result with stronger LGBTIQ participation in these processes.

Civil society organizations should:

- Complement human rights programs focusing on legal and policy change with programs promoting inclusive development.
- Understand and respond to donor government policies, including broader development policies, to hold governments accountable to their policies and access more resources.

Outstanding questions

- How can development agencies better support work in middle-income countries (i.e., crafting LGBTIQ-inclusive loan agreements in countries not eligible for development assistance)?
- How can civil society gain access to funding provided through large-scale development assistance projects – in particular, in situations where bilateral funding agreements are being negotiated with homophobic host governments?
- How are government donors held accountable to their LGBTIQ-inclusive policies – both internal and external?
- Is there an opportunity to pursue LGBTIQ priorities through the sustainable development goals (SDGs) – particularly within the 2030 agenda?

V. PANEL 3 – LESBIAN, TRANS, AND INTERSEX INCLUSION AND ACCESS IN ASSISTANCE

Within the context of increasing donor funding for LGBTIQ movements broadly, overall funding levels for LGBTIQ human rights work fail to provide a nuanced understanding of how funding is allocated among the diverse sub-groups that are intended to be reflected within the LGBTIQ acronym. The third panel intended to highlight these nuances – specifically the extent to which the needs of lesbian, trans, and intersex communities are being addressed with donor funding and the ways through which donors can better promote accountability towards these communities.

Case study: funding movements for long-term success

Over two and a half years, Fondo Centroamericano de Mujeres (FCAM), in collaboration with six other women's funds channeled a total of \$1.7 million in flexible funding to 64 grantees in 16 countries across Latin America and the Caribbean. Complementing this multi-year funding with 18 capacity building trainings and 20 peer-to-peer exchanges, this joint program created opportunities for grantees to meet and connect; learn and share from each other; debate issues; and launch collaborative efforts to support sexual and reproductive health and rights issues – including lesbian and trans issues.

By funding processes as opposed to policy outcomes, lesbian and trans-led movements were able to develop organically and formulate those priorities for future work. By funding these processes on the long-term, grantees were able to participate with peers and allies as reliable partners, deepening these relationships further. Additionally, while national opportunities were key in strengthening movements, facilitation of regional and subregional opportunities were equally important; many of the threats to human rights were and continue to be similar across borders and it was necessary to reflect and strategize around these shared experiences.

Ten years following the launch of this collaborative funding and movement building program, groups supported through the initiative. Over 10 years following the implementation of this program, those lesbian and trans groups supported through the process are still leading these movements, speaking to the success of this to the success of this approach.

Key points

Funding intermediaries

- In the second editions of its two reports – The State of Trans Organizing and The State of Intersex Organizing – the Astraea Foundation for Lesbian Justice, American Jewish World Service, and Global Action for Trans Equality identified that, among surveyed participants:
 - 55.8% of trans groups and 76.5% of intersex groups had annual budgets of US\$10,000 or less;
 - 85% of trans groups and 90.7% of intersex groups were led by trans and intersex individuals, respectively;
 - 10% of trans groups received direct government funding from embassies and 6.4% received direct government funding from bilateral donors. Almost no intersex groups received direct government funding.
- While data available on funding for trans and intersex issues is growing, the instances where research has been or is being done, trans and intersex activists are often asked to inform this research but are not adequately compensated for these time-consuming efforts.
- Data on funding LBQ women's organizing is sparse, which could be related to assumptions that LBQ women are adequately supported by funded organizations and projects that are intended to address LGBTIQ identities more broadly.
- With such limited funding going to lesbian, trans, and intersex groups, the time required to

fundraise among multiple donors for small grants is significant and detracts from these groups' ability to implement substantive work as paid staff.

- While lesbian, trans, and intersex individuals face high levels of violence, the grants supporting work are focused on long-term social and policy change and/or are too small to meaningfully address these issues of violence – not only violence experienced by community members, but also violence experienced by groups led by and for these communities.
- The International Trans Fund and the Intersex Human Rights Fund are playing two key roles; they are funding trans and intersex movements and – as funding intermediaries – are generating additional resources by proving to donors (including government donors) that trans and intersex movements can manage their own resources.
- While funding specific identities is critical for ensuring equitable access to resources, there is a concern that lesbian, trans, and intersex movements are being pitted against each other in pursuit of “minority” resources.

Recommendations

Donors should:

- Acknowledge there is expertise within lesbian, trans, and intersex movements, and should respect and trust this expertise by hiring lesbian, trans, and intersex activists to research the ways through which these movements can be better funded.
- LBQ women's issues should be recognized as a priority given a current dearth of data.
- Craft grantmaking programs in ways that permit lesbian, trans, and intersex groups to reduce the need for constant fundraising, allowing them to focus on their substantive work. This can include making larger and longer-term grants; ensure intermediaries include these groups specifically; simplifying grant application and reporting requirements; and fund unregistered organizations.
- Consider how their priorities manifest for trans and intersex movements; for trans and intersex individuals who experience high levels of poverty and restricted access to vital healthcare, the notion of “pride” is in the ability to address these fundamental human needs – not in a Western notion that “pride” is achieved through a march.
- Use a two-fold approach to avoid pitting identities against each other: 1) funding the specific needs of sub-groups underneath the broader LGBTIQ umbrella to promote specificity and ownership, while simultaneously 2) funding the integration of these sub-groups in broader LGBTIQ organizing.
- Examine ways in which groups evolve in response to their funding priorities – i.e., does funding for broad-based LGBTIQ programming motivate groups addressing the specific needs of LBQ women to adopt a broader framing of their work at the expense of their ability to focus in on specific needs?
- Support movement building through opportunities that encourage civil society groups to work together over the long term, building lasting partnerships for mutual support.
- Prioritize not only outcomes, but also processes that better position movements for future success.
- Avoid the assumption that wealthy countries have wealthy lesbian, trans, and intersex movements. Rather, they should acknowledge problems exist in wealthy countries and movements should not be artificially segregated by a Global North/Global South dichotomy.

Civil society should:

- Prevent tokenism by hiring lesbian, trans, and intersex individuals for lesbian, trans, and intersex-focused work.
- Trust in the capacity of lesbian, trans, and intersex activists to avoid occupying roles that these communities can play themselves.

Outstanding questions

- What is the effect of mainstreaming specific identities (i.e., LBQ women) within the broader LGBTIQ movement; is there a diluting effect?
- How can we make LGBTIQ funding more equitable among and across identities?
- How do donors ensure they are truly accountable to those they want to fund – both in terms of establishing their priorities and processes, but also in adhering to those priorities and processes?



VI. PANEL 4 - SETTING A LEARNING AGENDA - DONOR COORDINATION WG

As the ERC working group continues to evolve, participants completed an online survey to identify and prioritize both the challenges and the opportunities that the working group can be used to address. These survey results were consolidated among each category of side event participant – government donors, non-government donors, multilateral donors, and civil society organizations. Using these consolidated survey results, common themes between the participant categories were identified to inform the future role the working group can play to improve donor coordination. See Annex F for the draft framework of the survey scorecard which captures and groups these common themes.

Beyond the presentation of the survey results, the final panel discussion provided an opportunity for further reflection on the previous panels and to identify the next steps that should be considered by members of the working group.

Next steps of the working group

- Consolidate the draft timeline of the working group's evolution to capture and evaluate how donor coordination has and is progressing over time;
- Discuss, refine, and validate the survey scorecard;
- Develop a directory of both public and private donors of the working group;
- Consolidate more information about funding intermediaries so that governments can better identify the best channels for funding;
- Find ways of facilitating better accountability mechanisms between governments, other donors, and civil society;
- Gather information on those avenues through which government funding policies can be affected (i.e., which government donors have the latitude to respond to evolving needs and which donors have funding policies set by other arms of government that should be targets for philanthropic advocacy);
- Map out those arms of government funding agencies through which LGBTIQ issues could be integrated, putting into practice efforts to mainstream LGBTIQ issues;
- Encourage increased membership of new and potential LGBTIQ funders so that new donors can learn from the expertise of others and that potential donors can be encouraged by those already providing support;
- Consolidate more information from government donors on what has/has not been working in their funding of LGBTIQ human rights to inform new resources and donors with these previous experiences;
- Encourage increased membership of multilateral agencies so that, even for countries that are not ready to commit to LGBTIQ funding themselves, they are learning indirectly through their contributions to multilateral funders.



VII. CONSOLIDATED RECOMMENDATIONS

Government donors

- Add a margin of flexibility – at least 10% of the total grant amount – to allow intermediaries to be more adaptive to local needs. This should not be considered an inability to plan, but the foresight to know contexts can change rapidly.
- Commission, share, and discuss program evaluations to improve understanding of needs and understanding of what constitutes a successful program.
- Remove country lists/restrictions when inviting calls for proposals and prioritize LGBTIQ issues in middle-income countries similar to those in low-income countries.
- Consider requesting an exit strategy from LGBTIQ groups in their support to trans and intersex work. The exit strategy should demonstrate how trans and intersex-led groups can gradually manage larger grants and engage directly with donors.
- Pursue a two-fold approach to supporting LGBTIQ work – through both the provision of resources dedicated to LGBTIQ work and integrating support to LGBTIQ work as a part of broader human rights and development assistance initiatives.

Donors funding development work

- Ensure development processes must include LGBTIQ communities; reach out to LGBTIQ communities for their input; and promote LGBTIQ inclusion and balance the power dynamics between the diverse representation of communities involved.
- Ensure that funding recipients not only practice non-discrimination in development work, but also actively promote inclusion of LGBTIQ communities in meaningful ways. The starting point for this inclusion should be in processes that naturally promote LGBTIQ participation (i.e., promoting integration of women's rights, LGBTIQ rights, sexual and reproductive health rights, and HIV/AIDS programming).
- Leverage publicly available data (i.e., OECD markers) and determine whether LGBTIQ-related indicators could be added.
- Allocate funding to community development as a precondition for including LGBTIQ groups in development processes; stronger communities will result with stronger LGBTIQ participation in these processes.

Funding intermediaries

- Find ways to learn from other grantmakers on effective models and grantmaking processes that are being used to support grassroots LGBTIQ groups.
- Better cross-section their funding data (by thematic area of focus, by country, by organization type, etc.) so that a more detailed analysis can be made on how movements react to closing civil society space in different regions.
- Focus on mapping what civil society actually needs and provide an overlay of current funding on identified needs – with specific attention to the needs and resourcing of trans and intersex individuals and queer women. This will indicate where funding is addressing actual needs.
- Commit to LGBTIQ issues over the long term to protect against sudden funding cuts that can incapacitate LGBTIQ movements.

All donors

- Acknowledge there is expertise within lesbian, trans, and intersex movements, and should respect and trust this expertise by hiring lesbian, trans, and intersex activists to research the ways through which these movements can be better funded.
- LBQ women's issues should be recognized as a priority given a current dearth of data.
- Craft grantmaking programs in ways that permit lesbian, trans, and intersex groups to reduce the need for constant fundraising, allowing them to focus on their substantive work. This can include making larger and longer-term grants; ensure intermediaries include these groups specifically; simplifying grant application and reporting requirements; and fund unregistered organizations.
- Consider how their priorities manifest for trans and intersex movements; for trans and intersex individuals who experience high levels of poverty and restricted access to vital healthcare, the notion of "pride" is in the ability to address these

fundamental human needs – not in a Western notion that “pride” is achieved through a march.

- Use a two-fold approach to avoid pitting identities against each other: 1) funding the specific needs of sub-groups underneath the broader LGBTIQ umbrella to promote specificity and ownership, while simultaneously 2) funding the integration of these sub-groups in broader LGBTIQ organizing.
- Examine ways in which groups evolve in response to their funding priorities – i.e., does funding for broad-based LGBTIQ programming motivate groups addressing the specific needs of LBQ women to adopt a broader framing of their work at the expense of their ability to focus in on specific needs?
- Support movement building through opportunities that encourage civil society groups to work together over the long term, building lasting partnerships for mutual support.
- Prioritize not only outcomes, but also processes that better position movements for future success.
- Avoid the assumption that wealthy countries have wealthy lesbian, trans, and intersex movements. Rather, they should acknowledge problems exist in wealthy countries and movements should not be artificially segregated by a Global North/Global South dichotomy.

Civil society organizations

- Engage in dialogue with government and intermediary donors preemptively rather than reactively – especially when addressing a crisis. This will allow for donors to understand contexts precipitating changes and provide civil society with a clear understanding of government policies, priorities and strategies. This will create an opportunity for donors and grantees to work together to address issues in a more collaborative way.
- Share additional data on funding they receive from non-LGBTIQ specific sources (i.e., mainstream sources that support LGBTIQ groups under a broader funding approach).
- Share experiences – both good and bad – with funding intermediaries to inform “do’s” and “don’ts” for intermediaries to improve their roles channeling funds to the grassroots.
- Complement human rights programs focusing on legal and policy change with programs promoting inclusive development.
- Understand and respond to donor government policies, including broader development policies, to hold governments accountable to their policies and access more resources.
- Prevent tokenism by hiring lesbian, trans, and intersex individuals for lesbian, trans, and intersex-focused work.
- Trust in the capacity of lesbian, trans, and intersex activists to avoid occupying roles that these communities can play themselves.

VIII. ANNEXES

ANNEX A: AGENDA

EQUAL RIGHTS COALITION THEMATIC GROUP ON DONOR COORDINATION

The functions of this working group are to increase the quality, quantity, and inclusivity of assistance going to LGBTI communities, globally.

The goal of these sessions convened by the Donor Coordination Working Group is to build shared knowledge around best practices in provision of human rights and development assistance, to identify and address gaps in funding assistance, and to strengthen the capacity of government and multilateral funders, among others, to effectively support work to advance the human rights of and inclusive development for LGBTI persons.

E.R.C. CONFERENCE SIDE EVENT WORKING DAY AGENDA

Date : Wednesday, August 08, 2018
Venue : Sheraton Vancouver Wall Centre
Grand Ballroom A
1088 Burrard Street, Vancouver, BC V6Z 2R9, Canada

Tuesday, August 7, 2018

Donor Coordination Working Group Breakout Session (during main ERC conference)

9:15 – 10:30 Funding LGBTI Rights – challenges and solutions

In many countries where LGBTI people are persecuted and discriminated against, promoting the human rights of LGBTI persons, or supporting LGBTI organizations, may be seen as controversial. The environment where advocates and human rights defenders work can also be challenging for a number of reasons, including of different views of what strategies are best and questions around legitimacy of representation. For funders, this means that accountably funding LGBTI advocacy can also pose challenges. This panel explores some cases of difficult funding environments and provides examples of approaches and solutions to support vital efforts to protect LGBTI people. The panel will highlight specific examples from Nigeria and Indonesia, exploring general approaches and specific tools – including safeguards and non-discrimination policies - that can be employed by government funders wanting to support the human rights of LGBTI persons.

Moderator: Maria Sjodin, OutRight International

Panelists:

- Anthony Cotton, USAID
- Stefano Fabeni, Synergia
- Olumide Femi Makanjuola, TIERS, Nigeria
- Grace Poore, OutRight Action International
- Yuli Rustinawati, Arus Pelangi, Indonesia

Wednesday, August 8, 2018

9:00-9:30 Welcome and Setting the Stage

Moderators: Fanny Gomez, Synergia, and Kerry Ashforth, U.S. Department of State

- Who is in the room
- Goals for the day
- Methodologies, housekeeping, and ground rules

9:30 – 11:10 Panel 1 – Intermediaries: Centering LGBTI Movement Needs and Priorities across Diverse Funding Modalities

Government funding has significant potential to do good, advance critical issues, and address unmet community needs around human rights and development. It is also often highly constrained in its use, and subject to extensive regulation. One strategy often employed by donor governments is the use of “intermediaries” as a tool for transferring resources into the community. In this context, what is meant by “intermediary,” and what criteria govern their use? Are they the most effective tool for navigating constraints, or are other options equally effective? And how do donors maintain accountability to movements when funding indirectly? How can activists and funders develop shared frameworks to guide funding pathways that both navigate funding constraints and center accountability to needs and priorities of LGBTI movements? This conversation seeks to generate shared knowledge, explore and nuance the complexities in bridging gaps between constraints and needs, and elevate best practices.

Moderator: Julie Dorf, CGE

Panelists:

- Georges Azzi, Arab Foundation for Freedoms and Equality
- Franco Fuica, OTD Chile
- Neville Gabriel, The Other Foundation
- Lena Hasle, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway
- Rikki Nathanson, Trans* Research, Education, Advocacy & Training [TREAT]
- Midnight Poonkasetwattana, APCOM
- Jennifer Redner, American Jewish World Service
- Mark Reichwein, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands
- Bjorn van Roozendaal, ILGA Europe
- Star Rugori, Mouvement pour les Libertés Individuelles - MOLI

11:10-11:30 Coffee break**11:30-13:00 Panel 2 – Mainstreaming: Inclusive Development Models and Practices**

The most significant flows of government resource are often development/sectoral funds (e.g. education, health, justice, employment, social protection, etc.). Historically, LGBTI issues and communities have struggled for inclusion in traditional development frameworks, programs, and models. However, new programs and practices are emerging that point the way toward what inclusive development can look like. What is the process by which LGBTI development needs are identified, included, and addressed in development programming? What possibilities for alliance-building and impact exist in “mainstreaming” LGBTI issues? What are the potential risks, and how are they identified and mitigated? This conversation seeks to identify key areas of possibility for moving the needle toward more inclusive development practices and models.

Moderator: Clif Cortez, World Bank

Panelists:

- Andrea Ayala, ESMULES
- Phylesha Brown-Acton, Asia Pacific Transgender Network
- Anthony Cotton, USAID
- Felicity Daly, OutRight Action International
- Micah Grzywnowicz, RFSL
- Edmund Settle, UNDP
- Birgitta Weibahr, SIDA

13:00-14:00 Light Lunch

Opportunity for informal discussions among participants.

14:00-15:30 Panel 3 – Lesbian, Trans, and Intersex Inclusion and Access in Assistance

This session will explore models that are serving to meet the needs of lesbian, trans, and intersex (LTI) movements, increase movement autonomy, and ensure that historically under-resourced communities have equal access to the assistance needed to advance LTI human rights and development agendas. The discussion will serve to strengthen shared understandings around specific structure/s, priorities and needs in LTI movements, including the intersectional work that these movements engage in, and what it means for their funders. We will explore models that serve to meet the needs of LTI movements that also increase their autonomy, ensuring that historically under-resourced communities have equal access to assistance needed to advance their human rights and development agendas. Panelists will discuss the new ways of organizing and collaborating across movements that are emerging and that also include intersectional methods to collect and analyze relevant data for the movements. And together, we will seek to forge new alliances to protect against anti-LTI backlash, and to ensure the sustainability of gains previously made.

Moderator: Alejandra Sarda-Chandiramani, AWID

Panelists:

- Ymania Brown, International Trans Fund
- Mauro Cabral, GATE
- Jelena Colakovic, NGO Juventas
- Sarah Gunther, Astraea – Intersex Human Rights Fund
- Julius Kaggwa, SIPD Uganda
- Carla Lopez, Fondo Centroamericano de Mujeres and the Latin American Consortium of Women's Funds

15:30-16:00 Coffee break**16:00-17:30 Panel 4 – Setting a Learning Agenda – Donor Coordination WG**

Still in its nascent stage, the ERC is a new space and model for convening like-minded governments working to advance the human rights of and inclusive development for LGBTI persons. The Donor Coordination Working Group presents a rare convening mechanism to engage government funders across a range of issues, to identify and promulgate best practices, to identify and address funding and assistance gaps, and to build a shared base of knowledge toward improving and increasing resource flows toward this work. This conversation will provide a space to explore possibilities and set an agenda for this working group over time, and to identify the goal posts by which we can jointly measure success.

- How can this group work to advance integration of LGBTI issues within funding decisions made by multilateral institutions, development agencies, foreign assistance programs, health organizations, and other key funder stakeholder groups?
- What modalities should the working group use? How do we want to work together? What are key objectives and deliverables?
- What unique learning and strategic opportunities are created by gathering government and multilateral donors in this way?
- What are the goals we would like to set out for the next ERC convening, and in the intervening time?
- Where and how are Embassies part of funding flows, and how can they better be engaged in these strategic conversations?

Facilitators:

- Jessica Huber, U.S. State Department
- Fanny Gomez, Synergia
- Addison Smith, Wellspring

17:30-18:00 Closing Remarks, Summary of Discussions, Next Steps

ANNEX B: DRAFT FRAMEWORK OF SURVEY SCORECARD

Themes of Donor Coordination

- Coordination in Project Designs, Solutions Design, and "Inclusive Accountability"
 - Sharing contact lists
 - Sharing strategies
 - Establishing a **mechanism** for effective **partnership between government and non-government donors, LGBTI activists and allies to inform priorities, processes and goals of LGBTI funding**
 - Is this the ERC Working Group on Donor Coordination?
 - How is civil society resourced to engage in this mechanism?
- Coordination of Funding Flows
 - Directing dedicated SOCIESC / LGBTI funding
 - More funding
 - Setting specific targets
 - More effective funding
 - Longer term
 - More flexible and general
 - Filling gaps / calibrating
 - Building inclusion in the larger flows of funding
 - Mainstreaming SOCIESC funding
 - More funding
 - More effective funding
 - inclusive development
- Coordination and Dissemination of Knowledge, Research & Data
 - Tracking amount of funding
 - Disaggregation of data (L/G/B/T/I)
 - Case studies of effective funding partnerships
- Aligning Donor Policies & Practices – Human Resources Policies and Funding Policies (e.g. grant contracts)
 - Non-discrimination in contracts / grants
 - Training and sensitization of staff
 - Promoting values of focusing support for LGBTI-led groups and projects

ANNEX C: PRE-SURVEY RESULTS BY PARTICIPANT CATEGORY

I. GOVERNMENT DONORS

Results and Common Themes from Donor Side Pre-Event Survey

Updated: August 7, 2018 3:34PM EST

Total Respondents: 8

Q-1 Responses: Ranking of potential donor coordination focus areas

1. More real-time knowledge of what and who other donors are funding, where, how, and how much.
2. Ability to have a partnership between government donors, LGBTI activists and allies to inform priorities, processes and goals of LGBTI funding.
3. Space for in-person learning and discussion of thematic issues related to LGBTI funding.
4. Updated list of active contacts at other public and private donor agencies.
5. Space for virtual learning and discussion of thematic issues related to LGBTI funding.

Q-2 Responses: Ranking of barriers to providing meaningful input into potential donor coordination efforts

1. Insufficient human resources/personnel/staff time to dedicate to donor coordination efforts
2. Not knowing who to contact at other donor agencies when we need to coordinate (lack of an active/current contact list)
3. Inability to access information about other donors' funding policies and practices due to lack of transparency.
4. Lack of a dedicated space or mechanism (virtual, in-person or otherwise) for donor coordination efforts.
5. Insufficient financial resources for travel (e.g. to participate in a coordination meeting)

Q-3 Responses: Prioritizing thematic areas for potential donor coordination over the next two years (mid-2018 to mid-2020)

#1 Priority (common themes & examples):

- Increased coordination, communication, and knowledge-sharing
 - "Opportunities for joint projects / coordinated funding"
 - "Emergency responses, including coordination between different international and regional mechanisms."
 - "Gaining better understanding of specific donor positions on various LGBTI related topics"
 - "Information and knowledge sharing to exchange on lessons learned and innovative approaches"
- Human Rights
 - "Protecting and promoting LGBTI human rights"
 - "Support to LGBTI human rights defenders in particular in the Global South"
- Additional:
 - "LGBTI Mainstreaming/ LNOB Agenda 2030"
 - "Support to LGBTI NGOs participation at Multilateral levels"

#2 Priority (common themes & examples):

- Thematic Coordination: with an emphasis on intersectionality and marginalized populations within LGBTI communities
 - "Thematic focus on persons facing intersectional and multiple discrimination (e.g. LGBTI persons with disabilities, indigenous LGBTI persons etc)"
 - "Gender Equality"

- "Opportunities for coordination/cooperation in the area of education/inclusive policies for LGBTI children and youth"
- Enhancing donor education and increasing communication with the field
 - "Ensuring donors follow "do no harm" and "nothing about them without them" principles"
 - "Awareness Raising (identifying new partners ...)"
 - "Inspiration to country specific engagement and approach on tackling and funding LGBTI organisations and activities"
- Leveraging mutual opportunities
 - "Support synergies with UN Independent Expert and IAHRC rapporteur"
 - "Addressing data gaps and expanding the evidence base"

#3 Priority (common themes & examples)

- Supporting Human Rights Defenders
 - Supporting civil society and human rights defenders.
 - LGBTI human rights defenders
- Additional:
 - "Focus in particular in Africa"
 - "Acceptance of Gender Diversity (Trans-/Inter-), e.g. in health care"
 - "Overview of funding"
 - "Focusing on intersectionality within the LGBTQ2I community (eg: LBT women; Indigenous/2-spirited; persons with disabilities)"

Q-4 Responses: Suggestions for donors on improving coordination efforts

#1 Suggestion (common themes & examples):

- Increase and enhance online coordination
 - "Promotes using of common websites platforms or websites links for information on the matter."
 - "Sharing of information on current activities/priorities online"
 - "Keep an updated database/google doc of LGBTI POCs/contact information"
- Increase and enhance in-person coordination
 - "regular meetings of embassies of ERC countries in key cities"
 - "Meet annually in person on the margins of the ERC Global Conference to exchange knowledge and lessons learned"
- Additional:
 - "Important with coordination of donor support at the local/national level, to promote complementarity/avoid "cherry picking."
 - "Better sharing of case stories and successful approaches, be they provocative or subtle."

#2 Suggestion (common themes & examples):

- Enhance overall communication
 - "Standing quarterly conference calls w/ brief presentations from each donor"
 - "Only one-two meetings/year for persons coming from the capitals."
 - "fast & informal exchange of information, through calls, chats, mails, WhatsApp group ..."
 - "Regular interaction via teleconference"
- Additional:
 - "Evaluate bilateral regular demarches with governments to revise its commitments"
 - "Continued emphasis on pooled funding/mechanisms, like the Global Equality Fund is important. Should be upscaled."

#3 Suggestion (common themes & examples):

- Share data and best practices
 - "Promotes tool-kit for governments in order to identify and involve different institutions"

- at national level"
- "Sharing of investment data and project examples"
- Additional:
 - "Create a few large projects donors can contribute to"

Q-5 Themes: how donor coordination is important/useful for your work

- Donor coordination:
 - allows for the sharing of both resources, information from the field, best practices.
 - decreases redundancy, increases impact.
 - allows ongoing access to national and local-level information and developments, which would otherwise be more complicated to coordinate.

Q-6 Examples of coordination efforts inside or across government that led to increased or more effective funding for LGBTI communities

- "Reference is made to the GPP report on intermediaries in 2016. Good cooperation linked to funding provided from Norad to FRI, for Blue Diamond Society and direct, core funding provided by the Norwegian Embassy in Nepal, allowed for BDS to grow in both outreach, capacity and greater institutional sustainability."
- "The establishment of an LGBTQ2 Secretariat in the Privy Council Office has been an important development to support greater coordination across the federal government and with subnational and civil society actors. The Secretariat was created to support the mandate of the Prime Minister's Special Advisor on LGBTQ2 issues, and has encouraged more concerted/focused attention to LGBTQ2 inclusion in policy and program development."

Q-6 Examples of coordination efforts with OTHER governments that led to increased or more effective funding for LGBTI communities

- "The global pool of funds is finite. Diplomatic coordination at the embassy / mission level is crucial to ensure that these finite funds reach LGBTI causes. At different points in the year all of our different country missions have different funding envelopes. There are some cases where we have not had funds, but we've been able to direct LGBTI NGOs to the missions. We've also had LGBTI NGOs directed to us when we do have funding."
- "Regular demarches from committed governments (USA, Canada, The Netherlands, EU) before to our authorities are much helpful to maintain our commitments on the matter."
- "Yes - I can share an overview of USAID and Sida's approach to the LGBTI GDP, and how pooling resources increases impact and reduces the management burden"
- "Participation in the Global Equality Fund would be a good example, with positive results as documented in the external evaluation."

II. MULTILATERAL

Results and Common Themes from Donor Side Pre-Event Survey

Updated: August 8, 2018 1050AM EST

Total Respondents: 2

Q-1 Responses: Ranking of potential donor coordination focus areas

6. Ability to have a partnership between government donors, LGBTI activists and allies to inform priorities, processes and goals of LGBTI funding.
7. (Tied): More real-time knowledge of what and who other donors are funding, where, how, and how much, & An updated list of active contacts at other public and private donor agencies.
8. Space for in-person learning and discussion of thematic issues related to LGBTI funding.
9. Space for virtual learning and discussion of thematic issues related to LGBTI funding.
10. Additional:
 - a. "It is important to recognize that multilaterals are of two types: those which operate more in line with what is viewed as a donor (the development Banks), and those which operate more in line with what is viewed as a donor recipient for their own projects (UN Agencies and some other multilateral agencies and mechanisms). This is relevant as the two different type of multilaterals will have different motivations, incentives for coordination."

Q-2 Responses: Ranking of barriers to coordination efforts with other donors

6. Lack of a dedicated space or mechanism (virtual, in-person or otherwise) for donor coordination efforts.
7. Insufficient human resources / personnel / staff time to dedicate to coordination
8. Not knowing who to contact at other donor agencies when we need to coordinate (lack of an active/ current contact list)
9. Inability to access information about other donors' funding policies and practices due to lack of transparency
10. Insufficient financial resources for travel (e.g. to participate in a coordination meeting)
11. Additional:
 - a. "Among multilaterals, UN agencies in particular exhibit varying degrees of commitment to inter-agency coordination, with the disincentive being the chase for donor funds and seeing other UN agencies as potential competition."
 - b. "I have seen information about donor policies and practices effectively shared in-person, in targeted fora dedicated to closer coordination in specific geographies. "Lack of transparency" may not be the prime obstacle to sharing/accessing this information - would be helpful to unpack information about where and how this information can be shared, and to identify specific ends toward which it is useful to share."

Q-3 Responses: Prioritizing thematic areas for potential donor coordination over the next two years (mid-2018 to mid-2020)

#1 Priority:

- "LGBTI-specific data generation"
- "Identifying and addressing funding gaps, keying strategies to current geopolitical trends and challenges"

#2 Priority:

- "Ensuring more and more Bank loans and grants to governments include LGBTI-specific components"
- "Ensuring that government funders are well-informed regarding movement needs, challenges, and priorities"

#3 Priority:

- "Ensure LGBTI people are not being discriminated against in any project, and otherwise are not being denied the benefits of development project outcomes"
- "Better understanding shifts in private funder strategies and geographies, and their impacts on regional movements"
- Additional:

- "All stakeholders in the donor coordination discussion need to engage and/or stay engaged in the discussion of how we define LGBTI inclusion in all development sectors, and how we measure it. We all have a stake in ensuring we get this right as a global community - because as we build this part of the evidence-base, more-and-more of the funding is likely to flow into the areas that are defined - and so engagement is necessary as we want to ensure that how and why funding is flowing to identified priorities is transparent to everyone."

Q-4 Responses: Suggestions for donors on improving coordination efforts

#1 Suggestion:

- "All donors and multilaterals (Banks that provide funding, as well as UN agencies that receive funding) need to assist transparency by providing information to the GPP Global Resources Report updates."
- "Holding direct, in-person discussions targeted at addressing concrete challenges in specific geographies"

#2 Suggestion:

- "In terms of the multilaterals, UN agencies and other multilaterals need to be willing to coordinate and collaborate more with each other, as a start."
- "Developing a practice of absorbing and responding jointly to new research, as it becomes available (e.g. State of Trans Organizing; State of Intersex Organizing)"

#3 Suggestion:

- "Regularizing the work of the Donor Coordination working group - having more points of entry for information sharing on specific topics"
- Additional
 - "Effective solutions will need to address ongoing tensions between safety and security, and transparency"

Q-5 Themes: why coordination is useful for your work

- Ensures increase in and impact of resources
- Decreases ineffective/unnecessary redundancies
- Increases the sharing of best practices.

Q-6 Examples: how coordination efforts inside your institution or mechanism led to more effective funding for LGBTI communities

- "As a multilateral development Bank, we have a high-level Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI) Task Force, made up of reps from various Bank global practices (e.g., health, education, governance, gender, jobs and social protection, poverty, etc.), and this has begun to help ensure attention across the institution and not just in one unit. This is critical as each of those global practices help Bank country offices design and implement loan projects."
- "access to internal regional or geographic experts has strengthened the goodness of fit between LGBTI-specific programs and broader regional trends; access to M&E experts has provided support to grantees interested in a deeper dive into M&E practices; access to safety and security experts has strengthened organizational abilities to reduce and respond to threats; education of other internal funders has led to greater understanding of the high impact of the work of LGBTI movements on broader rule-of-law, democracy, and governance issues, leading to increased funding from non-LGBTI-dedicated budget streams"

Q-7 Examples: how coordination efforts with other multilaterals led to increased or more effective funding for LGBTI communities

- "Not yet but the World Bank has recently begun initial discussions with some other development Banks about their own interest in SOGI inclusion. We have collaborated on some issues with UN agencies but I am not aware that this had led to increased or more effective funding for LGBTI communities."
- "Coordination with private foundations and activists leading research on trans and intersex communities, particularly as they have reached out to government funders, has led to increased and shared political will to provide a greater portion of available funding to these communities"

III. PRIVATE/NON-GOVERNMENT DONORS

Results and Common Themes from Donor Side Pre-Event Survey

Updated: August 8, 2018 9:19AM EST

Total Respondents: 9

Q-1 Responses: Ranking of potential donor coordination focus areas

11. Updated list of active contacts at public and private donor agencies.
12. (Tied): More real-time knowledge of what and who other donors are funding, where, how, and how much, & the ability to have a partnership between government and non-government donors, LGBTI activists and allies to inform priorities, processes and goals of LGBTI funding.
13. Space for in-person learning and discussion of thematic issues related to LGBTI funding.
14. Space for virtual learning and discussion of thematic issues related to LGBTI funding.

Q-2 Responses: Ranking of barriers to providing meaningful input into potential donor coordination efforts

12. Lack of a dedicated space or mechanism (virtual, in-person or otherwise) for donor coordination efforts.
13. Not knowing who to contact at other donor agencies when we need to coordinate (lack of an active/ current contact list)
14. Inability to access information about other donors' funding policies and practices due to lack of transparency
15. Insufficient financial resources for travel (e.g. to participate in a coordination meeting)
16. Insufficient human resources / personnel / staff time to dedicate to coordination
17. Additional
 - a. "Not knowing what and how governments collectively want to coordinate funding around in terms of both (1) actual priorities of their agency and/or government, and (2) how they prefer working in cooperation."
 - b. "Many donor governments don't have explicit LGBTI funding streams, and yet do fund projects that could or should have great impact on LGBTI communities. Thus, from the outside there's a real barrier to knowledge – how do we do coordination if they are not labelling grants as LGBTI related grants, and yet (because of the issues being targeted) we believe that additional knowledge/coordination would be helpful."

Q-3 Responses: Prioritizing thematic areas for potential donor coordination over the next two years (mid-2018 to mid-2020)

#1 Priority (common themes & examples):

- Building a shared vision and framework that includes increasing support for LBQ, trans and intersex-led organizations and movements.
 - "Increasing the overall amount of funding going to LGBTI communities and the proportion of that funding specifically prioritizing women's rights and SRHR funding going specifically to LBQ women-led, trans led and intersex led organizations"
 - "Increasing support to LBQ, trans and intersex-led movements"
 - "Preserving gender and LGBTI as part of the norm of human rights across all foreign development assistance and internal funding (i.e. resisting the shift to streamline exemptions of all sorts and streamline funding to anti-gender/rights networks). Particularly in the US, this house is on fire. It's really important to recognize that threats to women's equality and reproductive rights and LGBT equality and rights are often coming from the same theoretical framework. We need coordination around building a shared vision of justice that understands rights of bodily integrity, health, privacy and sexuality are central to full participatory citizenship."
- Aligning strategies and increasing communication around mechanisms/logistics of funding
 - "Funding in focus geographic areas"
 - "pragmatic responses to current funding cuts"
 - "Information on who is funding where"
 - "Quality of grants / type of funding - core / general support vs project support; longer-term vs short-term funding; flexibility of funding from governments."
- Additional
 - Human Rights and SDGs
 - Direct civil society funding

#2 Priority (common themes & examples)

- Identifying gaps, opportunities, and potential alignment.
 - "Identifying & filling additional gaps in the funding landscape, e.g. underfunded regions like francophone West Africa or middle-income countries losing funding"
 - "Alliances with children's rights and child protection focused communities. The long-term health of all movements, especially women and LGBTI, probably begins with cultivating stronger alliances and partnerships with this sector."
 - "Increased funding for LGBTI rights"
- Responding to discrimination, violence, and insecurity.
 - "Creating publicly funded NGOs and/or government initiatives that politicize the LGBTQI community and provide them with skills to address the issue economic security and resilience. This requires a particular focus on building political perspective of the LGBTQI community itself and shifting norms of gatekeepers that fuel discrimination and prevent communities from fully accessing the services that are available."
 - "Response to violence and insecurity, and proactive safety and security planning"
- Aligning focus areas, especially around Trans issues
 - "Funding on focus themes (e.g. trans and faith)"
 - "LBQ Women and Trans Communities"
- Additional:
 - "pragmatic responses to trad. bureaucratic hurdles"
 - "Contact persons responsible for relevant geographic and/ or thematic funding"

#3 Priority (common themes & examples)

- Focus on grassroots and leadership by those who are most impacted
 - "Maintaining and providing flexible funding (including support for advocacy, security and risk management) to grassroots LGBTQI organizations, particularly in contexts where there shrinking or closing civic space, religious fundamentalisms and/or other socio-political and legal developments are significantly impacting organizations' abilities to organize"
 - "Increasing support to activist-led/participatory funding mechanisms"

- Increasing/enhancing communication
 - "A virtual space to regularly exchange information - confidential and securely when necessary"
 - "More effective comms across allied human rights sectors"
- Filling gaps, aligning priorities
 - "filling the gaps as visible in the GRR report"
 - "Geography"
 - "Donor coordination - priorities, e.g. trans, decriminalization, intersex, etc."
 - "Incremental litigation, including decriminalization of homosexuality and legal gender recognition, and protection of intersex children from harm"
- Additional:
 - "With many recent court victories around the world, it will be important to ensure focus on implementation and also on countering any backlash to rapid progression in rights in some countries/regions."

Q-4 Responses: Suggestions for donors on improving coordination efforts

#1 Suggestion (common themes & examples):

- Develop a formalized structure for coordination, and increase alignment and communication
 - "Annual donor meeting with strategy and grant information shared in advance"
 - "creating "communities of practice" for learning, exchange and ideas for coordination around specific thematic areas or geographies"
 - "Develop and agree to work towards a common set of targets (e.g. % of funding going to trans-led work)"
 - "More joint spaces for discussion private / government donors / civil society"
 - "For the ERC Donor Coordination efforts, develop and fund a secretariat model to move collectively identified priorities forward that includes a robust civil society input mechanism."
- Increase transparency
 - "Transparency"
 - "transparency and understanding: have clear statements of who is where within the institutions, who reports to whom - a visual overview of all relevant bilateral donors."
 - "Actively sharing due diligence"
- Additional
 - Funding commitment to development and implementation of good practice in participatory funding strategies in contexts of criminalization

#2 Suggestion (common themes & examples):

- Increase ongoing communication and regular convenings
 - "Regular convening, including by leveraging on existing meetings"
 - "Spaces for coordination"
 - "Actively consulting on developing and sharing strategies"
 - "Commit to an annual meeting to reflect on progress and discuss where we are lagging behind"
 - "Program-officer level meetings / sharing priorities (happening now in London and NYC)"
- Develop mechanisms/strategies for increased transparency
 - "Publication of strategies and grant lists on donors' website"
 - "Develop a scorecard for the group that sets concrete, short-term collective outcomes that can help track work related to each collective goal (this scorecard does not have to be public, but it would help the group understand how they are moving collectively)."
- Develop mechanisms/strategies for enhanced coordination
 - "have info pool for concrete, timely cooperation/co-funding opportunities"
 - "ensuring that there are linkages with regional or country-based or located funders, and that support and infrastructure is put in place to ensure that they are involved in coordination efforts"

#3 Suggestion (common themes & examples):

- Increased participation, communication, and knowledge-sharing
 - "find ways to insert GRR info into bilat's internal info services"
 - "Regular dialogue, including via webinars discussing funding trends and needs"
 - "Named staff"
 - "Commit reasonable resources - financial and/ or personnel towards coordination efforts"
 - "Find a way to integrate government and individual donors better into GPP discussions, existing coordination efforts, etc. - they are growing but are largely excluded from big thematic conversations"

Q-5 Themes: why donor coordination is useful for your work

- Government and multilateral donors "contribute significant amounts of funding to the field." Coordination is important because it:
 - Increases synergies and impact
 - Decreases unnecessary redundancies
 - Identifies how donors can move resources in complimentary ways. This increases the impact and reach of those resources, and it improves the overall strength of the field.
 - Creates opportunities to identify gaps, and to share effective strategies and best practices (and failures/things to avoid!)

Q-6 Examples: how donor consultation with government donors led to more effective funding

- "My access to Global Equality Fund information, for instance, increased my learning of the GEF strategy and its strategy development processes, which I have used in Arcus' own strategic planning (from substance to format). The GEF grants (and grant applications I had access to as a GEF partner organization) informed me and Arcus of needs and opportunities for change around the world, which in turn, influenced the Arcus strategy."
- "New direct, personal contacts with the bilateral donors were hard to establish but have brought much learning re. needs and gaps, on all sides."
- "Trans and intersex report tour has not yet yielded concrete results, but the provision of strong data combined with in-person meetings, relationship building and follow-up seems to be a promising approach, described by governments as useful."
- "The meeting with USAID (with Astraea, UHAI, AJWS, OSF, WellSpring) in 2016 is a good example of a small donor coordination effort that had an impact on more and better funding on a complex issue."

Q-7 Examples: how donor consultation with donors (of any kind) led to more effective funding

- "Honest discussions about strategies and grantees with donors led to joint applications and reporting from grantees...reducing the effort of the applicant spent on applications and reports, bringing more than one donor in the same discussion with the applicant, coordinating the timing of the grant, sharing in the outcomes of the grantee."
- "ISDAO set up in West Africa"
- "Relationship building is key - several initiatives have come out of GPP & Ariadne spaces as a result."

IV. CSO DONOR PROGRAMS

Results and Common Themes from Donor Side Pre-Event Survey

Updated: August 7, 2018 4:29PM EST

Total Respondents: 6

Q-1 Responses: Ranking of potential donor coordination focus areas

15. Updated list of active contacts at public and private donor agencies,
16. (Tied) Ability to have a partnership between government donors, LGBTI activists and allies to inform priorities, processes and goals of LGBTI funding, & More real-time knowledge of what and who other donors are funding, where, how, and how much.
17. Space for in-person learning and discussion of thematic issues related to LGBTI funding.
18. Space for virtual learning and discussion of thematic issues related to LGBTI funding.
19. Additional:
 - a. "Coordination is important as well as partnership, but we need smaller and more effective partnerships, not huge structures like ERC"
 - b. "It is important to involve community partners and local governments in this discussion so it doesn't only happen at the donor-level"
 - c. "Improving the mechanisms to create three way dialogue and synergies between recipient LGBTQ organizations, implementors/those providing technical assistance, capacity building and helping to strengthen the organization, and donors."

Q-2 Responses: Ranking of barriers to providing meaningful input into potential donor coordination efforts

18. Not knowing who to contact at other donor agencies when we need to coordinate (lack of an active/ current contact list)
19. Insufficient financial resources for travel (e.g. to participate in a coordination meeting).
20. Lack of a dedicated space or mechanism (virtual, in-person or otherwise) for donor coordination efforts
21. Inability to access information about other donors' funding policies and practices due to lack of transparency
22. Insufficient human resources / personnel / staff time to dedicate to coordination
23. Additional:
 - a. "The transparency issue often relates to protection of privacy of beneficiaries and potential security risks. Most important is knowing who to connect with rather than having full transparency."
 - b. "Lack of transparency is a huge issue, mainly between and with intermediaries and with government agencies, not so much with private foundations."
 - c. "Coordination can be efficient, on an as-needed basis and by offering great amounts of flexibility - for example, sending a work plan as is is easier than filling out a questionnaire with questions about a grantee work plan."

Q-3 Responses: Prioritizing thematic areas for potential donor coordination over the next two years (mid-2018 to mid-2020)

#1 Priority (common themes & examples):

- Increase knowledge-sharing and communication regarding funding decisions
 - "Real time information on who is funding what and where"
 - "Duplication of work and activities: how can we better coordinate to avoid duplication of

efforts without compromise to local need and demand"

- Increase flexible and responsive funding
 - "Emergencies / security threats"
 - "Solutions for flexible and easily accessible funding for non-established groups, networks and organisations operating in very repressive contexts."
- Additional:
 - "Movement building -- providing ample capacity building support to change hearts and minds, change institutions and open up space for folks to come out, build allies, build organizations and change laws and policies. These are not areas that have been well funded in the past."
 - "Work in former USSR region"

#2 Priority (common themes & examples)

- Increase support to and coordination with partners in the field
 - "Security concerns connected to the increase of threats from extremist and other non state groups, and how to best support partner organisations in such contexts."
 - "Reporting burden: how can we better coordinate and support partners to reduce partner burden who are often dealing with multiple donors with unrealistic requirements."
 - "Strategizing to ensure solid streams of funding to ensure cooperation, joint planning and coordination between implementing organizations, LGBTQ groups, and donors."
- Additional:
 - Socio-economic empowerment
 - Work on intersectionality
 - Real time info on contact persons

#3 Priority (common themes & examples)

- Overcoming shared barriers
 - "How donors can work with strategies for resilience and prevention when state driven crackdowns happen, e.g. limiting the possibility to transfer foreign funding to a country."
- Learning strategies
 - "Efficient information sharing and learning mechanisms, small and concrete"
 - "Evaluation and Impact: how do we know we are TRULY making a difference and are maximizing impact?"
- Additional:
 - "Different subcommunities, eg. trans / intersex / LBQ"
 - "Work on ESC rights in the region"

Q-4 Responses: Suggestions for donors on improving coordination efforts

#1 Suggestion (common themes & examples):

- In-person meetings
 - "Pre or post-conference meetings"
 - "Ensure annual regional coordination meetings in between CSOs (with funding or capacity-building programs) in some form. Good example of ILGA Europe who is gathering CSOs with funding programs in Eurasia in order to coordinate support/ activities."
- Increase and enhance information sharing and communication
 - "Periodic exchange of information on where/what/who/etc"
 - "Update and disclose grants real time and keep contact information up to date"
 - "Make available a directory of programs, partnerships and donors/implementers"
- Additional:
 - Engage the implementers early on and ensure they are consulting fully with recipients and that funding goals and outcomes are aligned.

#2 Suggestion (common themes & examples):

- Information sharing strategies with other donors

- “Sharing funding calls or possibilities to pass on to partners or those who have not been eligible for our funding”
- Coordinate funding strategies so that funding covers all regions of the world, now there are still gaps
- Information sharing strategies with partners in the field
 - “Contribute with transparent info to surveys on funding programs and priorities (important though to consider how to co-ordinate in very sensitive contexts when transparency might be connected to serious security concerns for the partners).”
 - “Actively seeking to coordinate with relevant partners around new work (on-going responsibility)”
- Additional:
 - “Ensure that coordination-related conference calls and meetings are not top-down – these often don’t work. Such meetings can also become meaningless unless they are driven by the work and importantly, need/local demand.”

#3 Suggestion (common themes & examples):

- “Sharing prospects, eg. we support a lot of new small initiatives and groups - who could be ready to absorb other funds at some point”
- “Keep the focus on local community and impact and let that guide coordination and collaboration”

Q-5 Responses: how coordination is useful for your work

- Building synergies: increasing impact, decreasing redundancy.
 - “To build synergies where possible and make sure that new work adds value.”
 - “To be able to get a bigger leverage and impact on grants provided, avoid duplication and make sure to have minimum additional burden for grantees”
 - “In case it helps community partners on the ground avoid duplication and lessen burden; to create greater, synergistic impact”
- Increasing accountability to and partnership with partners in the field
 - “To be a better supporter of LGBTI communities by keeping an eye on who is not funded or has limited access to funding”
 - “It makes us a better partner to the organisations which we support since we have a bigger understanding of the donor landscape that they are navigating, and how our funding can best complement other funds that they have or apply for.”

Q-6 Examples: how coordination with government donors have led to increased or more effective funding for LGBTI communities

- “Global Equality Fund”
- “Yes, around EEA grants we talked about needs & opportunities at a regional level, which has led to an increase. Same for the EU, where regular talks with DEVCO have led to more funding on LGBTI issues globally.”
- “MPact (formerly MSMGF) organized advocacy efforts in the lead up to the 2016 High-Level Meeting on HIV/AIDS with a range of civil society actors, which led to the Key Populations Investment Fund being announced. However, a lack of transparency and civil society engagement in the follow-up to submissions meant we were left out of the loop.”
- “Aidsfonds, Dutch-based donor, engaged its alliance partners, several of which are global civil society networks of key populations, to work in close partnership with the Dutch Foreign Ministry to request continued funding for Bridging the Gaps. This grant covers support for LGBTI groups in 10 countries worldwide and beyond based on both direct programming in-country and global and regional-level advocacy coordinated by COC and MPact.”
- “Advocacy efforts led by the global civil society networks’ participation of civil society in the International Steering Committee of the Robert Carr Networks Fund and regular reflection meetings

conducted with grantees ensure coordination as well as replenishment in this complex, large program."

Q-7 Examples: how coordination with different donors (of any kind) have led to increased or more effective funding for LGBTI communities

- "Cooperation with ILGA-Europe led to additional funding for Eastern Europe and Central Asia"
- "Yes, regular talks to a variety of funders (i.e. at the IE/GPP pre-conference donor conference) have led to various improvements overall, for instance better understanding of shrinking space, or sharing of strategies around crises context."
- "MPact (formerly MSMGF) has coordinated with COC - both non-government donors that jointly implement Bridging the Gaps - to increase funding for LGBTI Communities in some regions by creating efficiencies in our program. Creating efficiencies for MPact has meant creating more resources that are available for re-granting."

V. CIVIL SOCIETY

Results and Common Themes from Donor Side Pre-Event Survey

Updated: August 7, 2018 2pm EST

Total Respondents: 21

Q-1 Responses: Ranking of potential donor coordination focus areas

- 20. Tied: Updated list of active contacts at public and private donor agencies, & the ability to have a partnership between government donors, LGBTI activists and allies to inform priorities, processes and goals of LGBTI funding.
- 21. Space for in-person learning and discussion of thematic issues related to LGBTI funding.
- 22. More real-time knowledge of what and who other donors are funding, where, how, and how much.
- 23. Space for virtual learning and discussion of thematic issues related to LGBTI funding.

Q-2 Responses: Ranking of barriers to providing meaningful input into potential donor coordination efforts

- 24. Insufficient human resources/personnel/staff time to dedicate to donor coordination efforts
- 25. Tied: Lack of a dedicated space or mechanism for CSOs to provide input, & lack of donor accountability to CSO input relative to their accountability to other actors
- 26. Inability to access information about donors' funding policies and practices due to lack of transparency
- 27. Not having active contacts with the most relevant donors, and/or donors not being responsive to input or feedback
- 28. Additional:
 - a. "Experiences are different for organisations working on different issues. For example, some Australian "LGBTI" organisations are well resourced, but they are not able to provide services or work with intersex populations, and much work is simply un-resourced as a result."
 - b. Language barrier: there is no native English speaker in the organisation.
 - i. "International space are dominated by privileged people...because of the language in which those spaces function"

Q-3 Responses: Prioritizing thematic areas for potential donor coordination over the next two years (mid-2018 to mid-2020)

#1 Priority (common themes & examples):

- Increasing/Enhancing Capacity
 - "Core Funding and Financial Support for Grassroots LGBT Organizations / Community Based Organizations"
 - "active funding of wellbeing (i.e. sabbaticals and paid time off)"
 - "advocacy with donors on movement sustainability, burnout, and activist wellbeing to create funding space that supports the survival of activists running our movement"
- Lesbian and Bisexual Women's and Trans Issues
 - "Queer Women's Issues -- Lesbian and Bisexual whether cis or trans"
 - "lesbian and bisexual women's rights, visibility, representation / supporting the lesbian and bisexual women's movement"
 - "LB WOMEN and Trans men inclusion in HIV Grants - these grants must also allow coordination of advocacy on decriminalization and nondiscrimination"
- Intersex Issues
 - "Recognise that funding for intersex work is an issue in the global North as well as the global South and east"
 - "Gender-variant children & intersex Children"
 - "Incubate intersex activists to support intersex human rights in Asia"
- Advocacy and Organizing
 - "Advocacy to change punitive laws in the Caribbean"
 - "Engaging private sector in Asia region"
 - "Encourage the availability of safe space for countries that still discriminate against LGBTI persons"
- Access, Opportunity, and Finding Common Ground
 - "Equal access to funds"
 - "Marriage equality campaigns: while national specificities exist, the goal is very similar in many countries as well as the tools and framing used to achieve it."
 - "Mapping the needs of Civil Society organizations"
 - "Convening across countries so CSOs can learn from each other."
 - "Gender ideology"
- Education and Awareness
 - "Education in gender and sexual diversity"
 - "Awareness and education on LGBTI rights"

#2 Priority (common themes & examples)

- Geopolitics and International/Regional Advocacy
 - "Fighting homophobia as a tool of international politics: it is being used as a tool to divide nations and create fear in domestic affairs. In the CEE region this is very visible."
 - "Engaging more in South Asia and the Pacific"
 - "urge the government to be more inclusive of citizens with SOGIE diversity to express themselves and their rights"
 - "Impact of geopolitics on funding difficulties"
- Focus on Trans and Gender Variant people
 - "Change of Gender Marker for Trans persons"
 - "Trans childhood"
 - "The indigenous people: two spirits, muxes, hijras, etc."
- Community and Organizing
 - "Community Mobilization for Health & Rights (including HIV prevention, treatment and care, friendly healthcare services for Trans people, etc)"
 - "Community Building"

- Support for Innovation
 - "innovations for socioeconomic justice"
 - "Funding to try new things with no guarantees of outputs"
- Human Rights
 - "Human Right and Advocacy"
 - "Education in human rights monitoring and documentation"
- Capacity and Support
 - "Advocacy support"
 - "Organizational Development in Asian context"
 - "long-term operational/unrestricted funding"
- Intersex Issues
 - "Recognise that current funding caps for intersex work mean that intersex work is still greatly underresourced and marginalised (the Astraea fund has a US\$10k cap)"
 - "It is urgent to support poor and marginalized intersex people to have proper medical health access and necessary medical treatments especial finically in Asia."
- Additional:
 - More regular meetings with CSOs

#3 Priority (common themes & examples)

- Increasing Engagement with and Support for CSOs
 - "Supporting organizational growth and capacity"
 - "More support for organizations with less possibilities of support"
 - "Civil Society feedback about proposals."
- Religion
 - "Work around culture and faith."
 - "addressing the rise of the religious right and anti-gender movements"
- Tailored Technical Assistance
 - "Help with taking an idea from one country and implementing it elsewhere."
 - "Victim Support"
 - "professional development of staff and activists in line with their individual needs - not just in the form of donor-provided trainings"
- Development and Advocacy related to Science and Technology
 - "encouraging the development of scientific knowledge for state and community stakeholders on the issues of SOGIE and Human Rights"
 - "Role of technology specifically in relation to queer communities and new challenges to their safety and movement building"
- Trans Issues
 - "Formal equal employment for Trans persons."
 - "Transmen"
- Additional
 - Education
 - Advocacy and Campaigning for greater visibility of LGBT people in the public agenda (visibility is power)
 - Marriage equality
 - Income
 - LGBTI refugees in Asia
 - Health and Medical issues and other specific topic of LBI community

Q-4 Responses: Suggestions for donors on improving coordination efforts

#1 Suggestion (common themes & examples):

- Increased Transparency
 - "Request transparency and accountability in an easy and clear way for both government and civil society"
 - "Greater transparency and availability of information such as via websites"
 - "Reporting on their current activities"
- Increased Engagement with CSOs, especially at the local level
 - "work directly with local organization"
 - "Talk to activists in country - hear our voices"
 - "Stay in constant conversation with community-based groups."
 - "To extend outreach at large to more CSOs and share the fund information through contact with regional or network organizations."
 - "Listen carefully to the needs of CSOs"
- Increased Coordination around Intersex and Trans Issues
 - "True global coordination, without a presumption that the problem of funding for intersex work is solved in the global North"
 - "discuss with one another how funding goes to LGBTI umbrella orgs for trans and intersex issues, and dramatically limit these access to funds, prioritizing orgs and programs led by trans and intersex people"
- Increased Regional Coordination and Strategies
 - "Identify needs from different regions"
 - "Information in several Asian languages (Japanese, Chinese, Korean and so on)"
 - "Mapping"
- Additional:
 - "Be interested in successful innovation"
 - "Increase the voices and support to influence/pressure private sector in Asia to provide their support for LGBTI+ community"
 - "to be more sensitive to the confidentiality of the persons and institutional data related to SOGIE information"

#2 Suggestion (common themes & examples):

- Increased Coordination with Grassroots Organizations
 - "Continue funding grassroots organizations instead of big "civil society" foundations"
 - "Donors should work with Grass root organizations to build their capacity to strengthening their management system"
- Flexibility in Funding
 - "Allow CSOs flexibility on implementation of programs"
 - "Provide more flexible funding, provide resources (funding, expertise) so that the CSO could balance between projects, OD and management cost. Please DO NOT provide activities-only fund."
 - "Recognition that current funding limits for intersex work limit that movement"
- Increased Regional Coordination and Strategies
 - "Identify stakeholders in different regions"
 - "formation of regional coordinating networks"
- Additional:
 - "hire trans and intersex staff and give them funding portfolios"
 - "establish donor recipient assessment measurement that are more targeted to LGBTI people"
 - "Regular consultations with a wider range of national, regional and international CSOs"

#3 Suggestion (common themes & examples):

- Increased Transparency and Enhanced Communication with CSOs
 - "Facilitating of sharing of best practices"
 - "donor coordination meetings with CSO participation should be open and transparent, with an opportunity for a wider and more diverse CSO participation (and not confined to only a few

- privileged CSOs)"
- "Be informed of the topics of work of community-based organizations beyond knowing only what you're paying for (other programs are successful as well!)"
- "Give feedback on what are good practices so that CSO can improve their capacity to better qualify for grants."
- "Be sensitive and respectful to the unique culture, political and economic context of each CSO faces during the process of consultation."
- Strategic Networks
 - "targeted networks"
 - "Coordinate with networks such as TCEN, SAHRA, etc"
- Additional:
 - "Educate CSOs about accountability"

Q-5 Themes: how coordination has led to increased/effective funding for LGBTI communities

Transparent donor coordination can allow civil society to more effectively coordinate as well. When donor priorities and strategies are aligned and communicated openly with civil society, CSOs can navigate the "relatively unknown donor environment" better, which can lead to enhanced networks, opportunities, communication, and funding.

Q-6 Examples: how donor consultation with CSOs has led to more effective funding

- "Czech marriage equality campaign where consultations with our donor representatives are extremely valuable for building our campaign. While there are Czech specificities, the goal is very similar to goal set in other countries in terms of marriage equality. Also the tools and obstacles show great similarities. That is why having consultations with donor representatives who have experience with similar campaign from abroad is crucial for us. On the side of the donors I believe the consultations allow them to monitor our progress better, while giving them opportunity to use lessons we learn in other countries as well."
- "In Latin America, the resistance to the recognition of LGBTI rights has grown. We have communication with organizations of other countries in the region and we often share experiences about how to fight those resistances. That information should be useful for donors, so they can understand the reality and needs of the different countries/regions, that way, they can know if they are interested in funding organizations with specific needs, according the reality of their societies."