

Tracking Philanthropic and Gender Equality Financing





Tracking Philanthropic and Gender Equality Financing

Prepared by

Carmen Cañas

Development Gateway, Inc.
1100 13th Street NW Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005 USA

Cover photo: Carmen Cañas

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Abbreviations and Acronyms	3
Executive Summary	4
Introduction	6
Defining Philanthropic Funding	6
Philanthropic Funding Data Sources	7
Philanthropic Funding by Data Source	8
SDGfunders	8
360Giving	13
OCHA Financial Tracking System	17
OECD Creditor Reporting System	21
The International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI)	27
Discussion of Research Questions	36
To what extent is philanthropic funding marked with a gender equality policy marker in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala?	36
What organizations are mainly receiving philanthropic funding for gender-related projects in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala?	36
What sectors & sub-sectors/thematic areas does gender-related philanthropic funding mainly target in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala?	37
To what extent can we track which philanthropic commitments have already been disbursed in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala?	37
On a geographical scale, how disaggregated are philanthropic funding flows that we can track for Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala?	38
To what extent can we track the results/impact of gender-related philanthropic funding in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala?	39
Conclusion	40
Philanthropic Financing is Not a Term that is Shared Across Platforms	40
Gender Equality Tracking Challenges	40

Cross-Country Programs and Projects are Difficult to Track	41
Philanthropic Funding Data are Fragmented	41
Limited Publishing of Philanthropic Financial Flows	41
Recommendations	42
General Recommendations	42
Recommendations by Data Source	42
Annex – Raw Data	46

Abbreviations and Acronyms

API	Application Programming Interface
BMGF	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
CSV	Comma-separated values
CRS	Creditor Reporting System
DG	Development Gateway
d-portal	Development portal
FTS	Financial Tracking System
GAM	Gender with Age Marker
IATI	International Aid Transparency Initiative
IDRC	International Development Research Center
IRS	Internal Revenue Service
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
XML	Extensible Markup Language

Executive Summary

Friends of Publish What You Fund, Publish What You Fund, and Development Gateway (DG) seek to understand where funding for gender equality and philanthropic funding overlap, with a focus on three countries: Kenya, Guatemala, and Nepal. Philanthropic funding is defined as the transactions from the private sector that promote economic development and welfare of developing countries as their main objective, and which originated from foundations' own sources.¹

This report looks at six funding data sources that are used to track official development assistance to understand if philanthropic funding, and specifically philanthropy aimed at improving gender equality, is accessible and which sources are more reliable. It also reviews how existing platforms publishing data on philanthropic funding can be improved to facilitate access to information. Philanthropic flows for development are published within two types of repositories: country specific repositories and cross-country. The repositories that specialize in tracking funds for organizations based in a specific country include SDGfunders, which focuses on American-based foundations, but that stopped publishing data in 2017, and 360Giving which focuses on charity organizations based in the United Kingdom. Cross-country repositories have historically been used to track financial flows for development from national governments – and are now also used to track philanthropic financial flows. These repositories include the Financial Tracking System (FTS) from the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), which focuses on humanitarian assistance; the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) data source; and the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) Query Builder and development portal (d-portal).

Analysis of these data sources showed that the main challenge to understanding philanthropic financial flows is the lack of available information. There is currently no data source that centralizes what activities are being funded by national and international foundations for the target countries, and for all countries in general. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) is the main foundation publishing data in the IATI Standard. IATI shows that it has financed over 300 million dollars since 2018 in Kenya (a priority country for the foundation) for activities targeting gender equality. For Guatemala and Nepal, it was not possible to identify enough philanthropic financial flows that would make foundations a key player in the gender equality sector, but this information is more nuanced by the fact that the available data are incomplete.

The research uncovered another general trend around philanthropic funding targeted at gender equality. Assistance is implemented by a mix of universities, research organizations,

¹ OECD (2018), *Private Philanthropy for Development*, The Development Dimension, OECD Publishing, Paris. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/private-philanthropy-for-development_9789264085190-en

international Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and national NGOs. Gender equality activities often occur in the health, education, and good governance sectors.

The research concludes with several recommendations that apply both across data sources, and to specific data sources in question:

- **Streamline naming.** Data sources should refer to philanthropic funding with the same vocabulary. The official terms from the OECD could be replicated in the IATI Standard: Private Philanthropy for Development to refer to the funding of philanthropic activities by private donors.
- **Promote transparency among national and international philanthropic organizations.** The biggest active repository of philanthropic funding information is the OECD CRS, which publishes data for 38 foundations worldwide.² These foundations could also publish their data in the IATI Standard, in addition to publishing their information to the OECD CRS. Data published in the IATI Standard is published more frequently and contains different data fields than the OECD CRS, such as results information.³
- **The OECD could promote the publication of data from more foundations in its database.** Currently the 38 foundations publish their data to the OECD CRS.
- **IATI needs to improve its definition around philanthropic funding for development.** The official IATI Standard documentation does not include a definition of private sector outflows.
- **Foundations need to commit to publishing information on their financial flows.** As philanthropic funding becomes a bigger player in the development sector, there is a need for increased coordination and information sharing. As governments committed to publishing information in the IATI Standard, foundations could also commit to publishing information on their financial flows. IATI includes other data fields, and is updated more frequently than OECD CRS. Publishing data in the IATI Standard could provide complementary information to improve coordination for activities targeting gender equality.

² As of June 2, 2021, there appears to be an additional private foundation, but it is likely that this donor was added in the OECD DAC codelist update, which took place on April 23, 2021, after the research for this paper concluded.

³ More information on IATI results: <http://iatistandard.org/en/guidance/standard-guidance/results/>

Introduction

The Gender Financing Project of Friends of Publish What You Fund in collaboration with Publish What You Fund aims to improve publication of gender related financial and programmatic data to improve development outcomes.⁴ As part of this work, Friends of Publish What You Fund, Publish What You Fund, and Development Gateway (DG) seek to understand where funding for gender equality and philanthropic funding overlap, with a focus on three countries: Guatemala, Kenya, and Nepal. This report summarizes research into philanthropic funding sources to answer two core questions:

- To what extent can the public track philanthropic funds that targets gender equality within Guatemala, Kenya, Nepal, and globally?
- What are the entry points to improve publication of data related to gender-related philanthropic funding?

This report will provide some brief context on philanthropic funding and review the current online repositories where data about philanthropic funding is published. It will then include an analysis for each data source on how easy it is to identify funding that targets gender equality, the quality of the data published, the frequency of publication, and the sectors that are targeted by gender equality when available. Finally, the report will conclude with some practical recommendations to improve the availability, quality, and potential use of philanthropic funding data that target gender equality.

For the purposes of this report, all amounts are in US Dollars unless otherwise noted.

Defining Philanthropic Funding

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has defined private philanthropic flows for development as the transactions from the private sector that promote economic development and welfare of developing countries as their main objective. Generally these transactions originate from foundations' own sources, notably endowment, donations from companies and individuals (including high net worth individuals and crowdfunding), legacies, as well as income from royalties, investments (including government securities), dividends, lotteries, and similar.⁵ In general, philanthropic organizations take the form of foundations, trusts, funds, and lotteries. Each country has their own legal definition for these entities, but they are all vehicles to manage philanthropic funding which give varying levels of control to the donors over how the funds are managed, and provide different tax advantages depending on the country.

⁴ More information on the Gender Financing project: <http://www.friendsofpublishwhatyoufund.org/gender-aid-data>

⁵ OECD (2018), *Private Philanthropy for Development*, The Development Dimension, OECD Publishing, Paris. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/private-philanthropy-for-development_9789264085190-en

Philanthropic Funding Data Sources

Philanthropic flows for development are published within two types of repositories: country specific repositories and cross-country repositories. The repositories that specialize in tracking funds for organizations based in a specific country include SDGfunders, which focuses on American based foundations; and 360Giving, which focuses on charity organizations based in the United Kingdom (UK). Cross-country repositories have historically tracked Official Development Assistance (ODA) from national governments, and are now also used to track philanthropic financial flows. Cross-country repositories include the Financial Tracking System (FTS) from the United Nations (UN) Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), which focuses on humanitarian assistance; the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) database; and the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) Query Builder and IATI's development portal (d-portal).

Philanthropic Funding by Data Source

This section summarizes the results from efforts to track philanthropic funding that targets gender equality through six data sources: SDGfunders, 360Giving, UN OCHA's Financial Tracking System, the OECD CRS database, IATI's d-portal, and IATI's Query Builder. The research focused on the countries of Guatemala, Kenya, and Nepal from 2018 through 2021.

SDGfunders

SDGfunders Overview

SDGfunders.org is a dashboard that was created by the American non-profit organization Candid.^{6,7} The objective of the dashboard is to track philanthropic investment across the world as they relate to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Through the website, users can search the database to visualize philanthropic funding, which can be filtered by SDG, region or country, and population group. It includes a knowledge hub with reports, background papers, case studies, and outcome documents that can be filtered by theme, SDG, and country or region.

For each query, the dashboard displays the following visualizations and data:

- Total foundation funding
- Total funding by SDG
- Top 25 foundations and their funding for the time period
- Top 25 recipients and funding received
- Distribution of foundation funding by target population

SDGfunders Data Collection Methodology

SDGfunders defines itself as a dashboard that enables users to see how foundations are supporting the SDGs. Any private donor that is considered a foundation by SDGfunders is included in the SDGfunders query results, and presented in this report for foundation funding.

The information published at SDGfunders.org was collected by Candid using three data sources:

- Internal Revenue Service (IRS) 990 tax forms. All US foundations are required to submit this form, which contains information about each grant awarded by the foundation. The majority of the data published on the website comes from this source.
- Grants reported directly to Candid through their eReporting program.
- Publicly available sources. SDGfunders includes publicly available information about grantmaking, including from open databases and news sources.

⁶ SDGfunders.org: <https://sdgfunders.org/>

⁷ Candid: <https://candid.org/>

As a result of this data collection methodology, 97% of the data published on the dashboard are from foundations based in the United States.

One of the most interesting features of the SDGfunders interface is that it is possible to query the database by SDG, which means it is possible to visualize projects associated with Goal 5: Gender Equality (“SDG 5”). In order to associate funding to each SDG, Candid developed algorithms for identifying funding that was consistent with the seventeen SDGs.⁸ Therefore, the representations included throughout this website are not alignments to the SDGs that have been reported by the foundations. To align projects with the SDGs, Candid developed the SDG Indicator Wizard which analyzes the text of project goals, targets, direct beneficiaries, indirect beneficiaries, and indicators to determine the SDGs that align with the project.⁹

SDGfunders Search Query Filters

Table 1. Filters applied to the SDGfunders dashboard

SDGfunders Search Filters	
Goal	Single select Gender Equality
Population group	Empty
Region or county	Single select target country (Guatemala, Kenya, and Nepal)
Time period	Single select 2016+

SDGfunders Search Query Results: Gender Equality Funding

The search results of this query correspond to the 2016+ time period but the methodology appears to only include data for the 2016-2017 data period. The results of the query are outside of the scope of this report which is 2018-2021 data, but we have included them as they provide important context for our target countries.

According to SDGfunders, for the 2016+ period in Guatemala, 37% of funding by philanthropic organizations targeted SDG 5. For the same time period in Kenya, 38% of projects funded by philanthropic organizations targeted gender equality and in Nepal it was 40%.

Table 2. Foundation funding according to SDGfunders for Guatemala, Kenya, and Nepal¹⁰

Year	Foundation Funding Type	Guatemala	Kenya	Nepal
2016+	Foundation funding	\$77,424,803	\$241,133,290	\$63,699,649
2016+	Funding with SDG 5 marker	\$42,769,916	\$150,786,224	\$42,769,916
2016+	Percentage of projects with SDG 5 marker	37.33%	38.47%	40.17%

⁸ More information on the SDG indicator wizard: <https://sdgfunders.org/methodology/>

⁹ SDG indicator wizard: <https://sdgfunders.org/wizard/>

¹⁰ An Excel version of this table is available [here](#).

SDGfunders Search Query Results: Gender Equality Funding by Sector

In Guatemala, 56.9% of project funding that targeted gender equality for the 2016+ period overlapped with project funding that targeted SDG Goal 3: Good Health and Well-Being. In Kenya, the overlap for the same period and goal was 67.7%. For both Guatemala and Kenya, health appears to be the priority sector for philanthropic funding. In the case of Nepal, project funding targeting gender equality overlapped by 40% with SDG 4: Quality Education, but there was only an 8.7% overlap with Health. The overlap between gender equality and education funding by private foundations in Nepal might be because according to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) gender parity index, the value for primary enrolment in Nepal was 0.93 in 2017, significantly lower than Guatemala at 1.01 in 2018 and Kenya at 1.04 in 2012.¹¹ This means that for every 100 boys enrolled in primary school in Nepal, only 93 girls are enrolled.

Table 3. Overlap between SDG 5 funding and other SDGs per country

Year	% of Funding overlap between SDG 5 and other SDGs	Kenya	Nepal	Guatemala
2016+	SDG 1: No Poverty and SDG 5	3.3%	0.9%	14.5%
2016+	SDG 2: Zero Hunger and SDG 5	1.2%	4.7%	15.1%
2016+	SDG 3: Good Health and Well-being and SDG 5	67.6%	8.7%	56.9%
2016+	SDG 4: Quality Education and SDG 5	3.6%	40.1%	2.7%
2016+	SDG 6: Clean Water and Sanitation and SDG 5	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
2016+	SDG 7: Affordable and Clean Energy and SDG 5	0%	0%	0%
2016+	SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth and SDG 5	6.4%	11.1%	14.4%
2016+	SDG 9: Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure and SDG 5	2.1%	2.2%	1.1%
2016+	SDG 10: Reduced Inequality and SDG 5	12.8%	7.8%	9.8%
2016+	SDG 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities and SDG 5	3.4%	4.6%	1.9%
2016+	SDG 12: Responsible Consumption and Production and SDG 5	1.2%	1.7%	1.1%
2016+	SDG 13: Climate Action and SDG 5	1.7%	3.4%	0.4%
2016+	SDG 14: Life Below Water and SDG 5	0%	0%	0%
2016+	SDG 15: Life on Land and SDG 5	1.3%	0%	0.3%
2016+	SDG 16: Peace and Justice Strong Institutions and SDG 5	5.6%	12.8%	0.3%
2016+	SDG 17: Partnerships to achieve the Goal and SDG 5	2.6%	1.8%	1.7%

¹¹ Information on the Gender parity index for primary education enrollment: <http://data.unicef.org/topic/gender/gender-disparities-in-education>

SDGfunders Search Query Results: Top Financing Foundations

In Kenya, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) is the biggest philanthropic funder for the 2016+ period targeting SDG 5: Gender Equality with \$82 million. This represents 20% of the total financial flows from foundations received by Kenya over the same time period. The second biggest funder of projects targeting SDG 5 in Kenya is The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, with a funding flow of \$6.9 million. Given the difference between the first and second largest funder, the BMGF is an unmissable actor in Kenya in the gender equality sector.

Table 4. Kenya top 10 foundations targeting SDG 5, 2016+ by funding amount

#	Foundation	Funding Amount
1	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	\$82,050,000
2	The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation	\$6,880,000
3	Novo Foundation	\$5,750,000
4	Ford Foundation	\$5,150,000
5	Comic Relief	\$4,450,000
6	Human Dignity Foundation	\$3,500,000
7	The UN trust Fund to End Violence Against Women	\$3,000,000
8	Segal Family Foundation	\$2,840,000
9	African Women's Development Fund	\$2,080,000
10	Wellspring Philanthropic Fund, Inc.	\$2,080,000

In Nepal, the top funder of SDG 5 is the Foundation for A Just Society. Their financial flows targeting gender equality only represent 4.9% of all philanthropic funds received by Nepal in the 2016+ period. The BMGF, which is among the top three donors in Guatemala and Kenya, is number eight in Nepal.

Table 5. Nepal top 10 foundations targeting SDG 5, 2016+ by funding amount

#	Foundation	Funding Amount
1	Foundation for A Just Society	\$5,240,000
2	The Kendeda Fund	\$3,750,000
3	The Global Fund for Women, Inc.	\$2,000,000
4	Margaret A. Cargill Foundation	\$1,990,000
5	Schwab Charitable	\$1,690,000
6	Women's Fund Asia	\$1,670,000
7	Comic relief	\$1,390,000
8	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	\$1,340,000
9	The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation	\$1,300,000
10	Tides Foundation	\$1,260,000

In Guatemala, the Susan Thompson Buffett foundation is the biggest funder for SDG 5, followed by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The 2016+ philanthropic funds in Guatemala are estimated at a total of \$77,424,803, meaning that funding from the Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation for Gender equality represents 9.2% of all funding received by Guatemala from private foundations over that time period.

Table 6. Guatemala top 10 foundations targeting SDG 5, 2016+ by funding amount

#	Foundation	Funding Amount
1	The Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation	\$11,400,000
2	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	\$6,230,000
3	Foundation for A Just Society	\$4,090,000
4	Oak Foundation	\$3,070,000
5	Margaret A. Cargill Foundation	\$2,500,000
6	Fondo Centroamericano De Mujeres	\$2,320,000
7	The Summit Foundation	\$1,620,000
8	The Cummins Foundation	\$1,570,000
9	International Development Research Centre	\$1,210,000
10	Novo Foundation	\$1,080,000

SDGfunders Challenges and Data Gaps

The main challenges in the use of SDGfunders are:

- The inability to download raw data, so users can only visualize the data through their online visualizations. To analyze the data, users need to manually copy the data to an Excel document.
- The margin of error for using their “SDG Indicator Wizard” is unknown. It is uncertain whether the algorithm used to associate SDG 5 to the reported funding is effective or not. Gender equality might be overrepresented or underrepresented.
- The methodology used by Candid focuses mainly on American foundations. It does not give a full picture of the philanthropic funding in the target countries from all private foundations worldwide.
- The dashboard seems to be out of date. According to their methodology, Candid was working on updating 2015-2017 data but there is no information available about the latest update date nor about the years for which there are data after 2016.
- It is only possible to access visualizations for two time periods: 2016+ or historical data 2010-2015. It is not possible to disaggregate data per year.
- There are no data available about the number of projects, the project names, type of assistance (e.g., ODA, blended finance).
- It is not clear if the funding corresponds to commitments or actual disbursements made by the foundations.
- There is no information about the results/impact of the activities that are funded.
- SDGfunders publishes foundation data, but within their list of foundations there are organizations that are not foundations – for example, the International Development Research Center (IDRC). The IDRC is a Canadian Crown Corporation. Canadian Crown Corporations are owned by federal or provincial organizations and are structured like private or independent companies.

360Giving

360Giving Overview

360Giving is a charity organization based in the UK.¹² Their work focuses on supporting organizations to openly publish their grants data. 360Giving supports UK-based organizations to publish grants data in an open and standardized format. From the data sources analyzed in this report, 360Giving is the only one that does not focus on funding flows to developing countries. Its structure and focus is on grants implemented within the UK. Although it focuses on projects implemented within the UK, 360Giving has been included in this report because its search engine GrantNav includes grants that have been implemented in the target countries of this report: Kenya, Guatemala, and Nepal.

¹² 360Giving website: <https://www.threesixtygiving.org/>

There are multiple ways to access the data published using the 360Giving Data Standard:

- GrantNav: A search engine that allows users to explore grants data and download data about where funding goes and how much funding is given in grants across the UK. This is the interface selected to conduct the queries for this report.¹³
- 360Insights: A tool to access data published by each funder. There is a distinct dashboard view for each file published by a funder. As the views are by donor and file, it is not possible to view multiple donors at the same time.¹⁴
- Data Registry: A list of all the organizations that currently publish their grants data in the 360Giving Data Standard, with direct links to their data sources.¹⁵
- Datastore: The 360Giving Datastore requires users to send a request to 360Giving to directly query the database. Access is provided through a Google Colab Python notebook or by using SQL queries against the Postgres database that holds the data.¹⁶

360Giving Data Collection Methodology

360Giving has developed its own data publication standard called the 360Giving Data Standard.¹⁷ Currently 188 organizations based in the UK publish their data using the 360Giving Data Standard. The focus of 360Giving is to track UK funders who predominantly fund within the UK, they do not focus on UK funders that center their funding internationally.

The 360Giving Data Standard does not currently include a categorisation of data, the model used by 360Giving tools allows users to use advanced text searching to query data. To identify projects working towards gender equality, there is not a gender marker, users have to query the database using text search.

360Giving Search Query Variables

GrantNav was used to query the 360Giving database. The query process was done in two stages. The first step was to query their database using their filters in GrantNav in order to obtain a comma-separated values (CSV) file. The second step was to transform the CSV into an Excel document and to query the data by keywords. The following keywords were selected: "gender", "women", "girl", "woman", "men", "boy", "LGBTQ", "queer", "lesbian", "gay", "transgender", and "bisexual".

¹³ GrantNav: <http://grantnav.threesixtygiving.org/>

¹⁴ 360Insights: <https://insights.threesixtygiving.org/>

¹⁵ Data Registry: <https://data.threesixtygiving.org/>

¹⁶ Datastore: <https://www.threesixtygiving.org/data/360giving-Datastore/>

¹⁷ More information about the 360Giving Data Standard: <https://standard.threesixtygiving.org/en/latest/>

Table 7. Filters applied to the 360Giving dashboard to find philanthropic investment for Guatemala¹⁸

360Giving Search Filters for Guatemala	
Search all fields	Write "Guatemala."
Award year	Multiselect 2018 and 2019. There are no data available for 2020 onwards.
Funding Organizations	Multiselect the Wellcome Trust and Staples Trust.

Table 8. Filters applied to the 360Giving dashboard to find philanthropic investment for Kenya¹⁹

360Giving Search Filters for Kenya	
Search all fields	Write "Kenya."
Award year	Multiselect 2018, 2019, and 2020. There are no data available for 2021.
Funding Organizations	Multiselect The Tudor Trust, The Wellcome Trust, Comic Relief, Oxfordshire Community Foundation, The Dulverton Trust, Nesta, Seafarers UK, The Segelman Trust, True Colours Trust, Cheshire Community Foundation, Indigo Trust, OVO Foundation, Somerset Community Foundation, The Bishop Radford Trust, and The Fore.

Table 9. Filters applied to the 360Giving dashboard to find philanthropic investment for Nepal²⁰

360Giving Search Filters for Nepal	
Search all fields	Write "Nepal."
Award year	Multiselect 2018, 2019, and 2020. There are no data available for 2021.
Funding Organizations	Multiselect Comic Relief, The Wellcome Trust, The Dunhill Medical Trust, The Funding Network, ARCADIA, Oxfordshire Community Foundation, and The National Lottery Heritage Fund.

360Giving Search Query Results: Gender Equality Funding

The search results of this query do not bring any significant data for Guatemala or Nepal. From 2018 to 2020, four projects were funded by UK foundations in Guatemala and only one of them targeted gender equality. In Nepal, 16 projects were funded by UK foundations, and among them six projects targeted gender equality.

According to 360Giving, UK-based foundations funded 114 projects from 2018 to 2020 in Kenya for a total value of £30,984,218.23. It is important to note that while only 15.8% of all projects funded by UK-based foundations for the 2018 to 2020 period in Kenya included a gender keyword in its description, their budget represented 48.8% over the total philanthropy funding for those years.

¹⁸ 360Giving Guatemala query results are available [here](#).

¹⁹ 360Giving Kenya query results are available [here](#).

²⁰ 360Giving Nepal query results are available [here](#).

Table 10. 360Giving query results²¹

Year	360Giving Results: queried March 23, 2021	Kenya	Nepal	Guatemala
2018	Number of projects funded by foundations	34	4	1
	Number of projects funded by foundations with gender keywords	4	1	0
	% of projects funded by foundation with gender keywords	12.0%	25.0%	0%
	Budget of projects funded by foundations	£3,114,745	£999,435	£12,670
	Budget of projects funded by foundations with gender keywords	£241,625	£250,000	£0
	% of budget for projects funded by foundation with gender keywords	8.0%	25.0%	0%
2019	Number of projects funded by foundations	47	10	3
	Number of projects funded by foundations with gender keywords	7	4	1
	% of projects funded by foundation with gender keywords	14.8%	40.0%	33.3%
	Budget of projects funded by foundations	£20,999,834	£6,615,563	£345,090
	Budget of projects funded by foundations with gender keywords	£12,988,322	£1,532,505	£47,104
	% of budget for projects funded by foundation with gender keywords	61.8%	23.2%	13.6%
2020	Number of projects funded by foundations	33	2	0
	Number of projects funded by foundations with gender keywords	7	1	0
	% of projects funded by foundation with gender keywords	21.2%	50 %	0%
	Budget of projects funded by foundations	£6,869,638	£509,462	£0
	Budget of projects funded by foundations with gender keywords	£1,889,637	£500,000	£0
	% of budget for projects funded by foundation with gender keywords	27.5%	98.1%	0%
Total 2018-20	Total number of projects with philanthropic funding		134	
	Total number of projects funded by foundations with gender keyword		25	
	Total % of projects funded by foundation with gender keyword		18.7%	
	Total budget of projects with philanthropic funding		£39,466,438	
	Total Budget of projects funded by foundations with gender keyword		£17,449,193	
	% of budget for projects funded by foundation with gender keyword		44.2%	

360Giving Search Query Results: Gender Equality Funding Recipients

Projects funded by UK organizations in the target countries of this report are mostly awarded to research organizations, universities, and to local organizations.

The only project targeting gender equality in Guatemala for the 2018-2020 period was awarded to the University of Nottingham to conduct pilot research on cross-border abortions and had a budget of £47,104.

²¹ An Excel version of the 360Giving results is available [here](#).

For Nepal, among the six projects funded between 2018 and 2020 targeting gender equality, one was awarded to a university, one to a local Non-Governmental Organization (NGO), and four were awarded to international organizations or funds.

In Kenya, 18 projects that target gender equality were funded between 2018 and 2020. Among the recipients of these funds were four universities, seven local NGOs, and the rest were awarded to international organizations or funds.

360Giving Challenges and Data Gaps

- As the 360Giving Data Standard does not include a gender marker, users have to use advanced text search to identify projects working in gender equality. As of April 2021, 360Giving is working with a group of funders to develop a shared framework for collecting equalities data. They will be developing an extension to the 360Giving Data Standard to allow equality data to be shared alongside grants data. This extension will identify projects that are supporting women and girls.²²
- The GrantNav location field was designed to filter only by locations within the UK. Users have to do a search by keyword to identify projects implemented outside of the UK.
- 360Giving as an organization focuses on UK-based charities. It does not target activities outside of the UK.
- At the time research was done for this report it was not possible to separate the funder by philanthropic organizations. Users had to manually select from a list of funding organizations to identify the foundations. This meant that users needed to have a good understanding of UK-based charities to correctly identify philanthropic funding. Recently, 360Giving added a filter for organization type which includes the following categories: “central government”, “grantmaking organization”, and “national lottery”. Private sector funding can be identified by selecting the following organization types in the filter “grantmaking organization” and “national lottery”.
- The GrantNav interface uses the “amount awarded” as the main field to track funding amounts. This is because the “amount awarded” field is a required field in the 360Giving Data Standard. The 360Giving Data Standard also includes an “amount disbursed” field, which is not mandatory and is currently used by 30 funders.

OCHA Financial Tracking System

OCHA Financial Tracking System Overview

The Financial Tracking System (FTS), started in 1990, is the oldest database managed by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and acts as one of

²² More information on the equalities data extension:
<https://www.threesixtygiving.org/2021/03/30/extending-the-360giving-data-standard/>

the main curation points to centralize data on humanitarian aid flows.²³ Users are able to query data by predefined filters and can access data online in the form of a list where each item is a financial flow. Users are also able to download the data in Excel format or to access the data through an API. FTS data are also cross-published and are available via the IATI Datastore.

OCHA Financial Tracking System Data Collection Methodology

Data published to the FTS is self-reported by funding organizations. Public and private organizations can share their data with the FTS through an assigned focal point. Nevertheless, the main focus of the FTS is government donors, UN-administered funds, UN agencies, and NGOs.

According to the FTS's glossary, FTS uses the Gender with Age Marker (GAM) to screen activities that target gender equality.²⁴ However, at the time of this report it was not possible to use the GAM in the FTS database to do queries. The only gender-related query available within the FTS is the sector filter with the gender-based violence variable.

OCHA Financial Tracking System Search Query Variables

Table 11. Filters applied to OCHA FTS to identify humanitarian philanthropic funding of gender-based variable

OCHA's Financial Tracking System search filters for Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala	
Year from	Single select 2018
Year to	Single select 2021. Selected 2021 but there are no data for this year corresponding to the selected filters.
Location	Single select target country (Guatemala, ²⁵ Kenya, ²⁶ or Nepal) ²⁷
Source organization type	Single select Private organization/ Foundation;
Sector	Gender-based violence

²³ Financial Tracking System: <https://fts.unocha.org/content/about-fts-what-fts>

²⁴ More information on the Gender with Age Marker: <https://fts.unocha.org/glossary>

²⁵ OCHA's financial tracking search query result for Guatemala:

<https://fts.unocha.org/data-search/results/incoming?usageYears=2018%2C2019%2C2020%2C2021%2C2022%2C2023%2C2024&locations=91&globalClusters=13>

²⁶ OCHA's financial tracking search query result for Kenya:

<https://fts.unocha.org/data-search/results/incoming?usageYears=2018%2C2019%2C2020%2C2021%2C2022%2C2023%2C2024&locations=116&globalClusters=13>

²⁷ OCHA's financial tracking search query result for Nepal:

<https://fts.unocha.org/data-search/results/incoming?usageYears=2018%2C2019%2C2020%2C2021%2C2022%2C2023%2C2024&locations=156&globalClusters=13>

OCHA Financial Tracking System Search Query Results

Between 2018 and 2021, Kenya received 23 paid contributions for humanitarian response from private organizations/foundations for a total value of \$10,193,240. For that same period, Nepal received 16 paid contributions with a value of \$660,271, and Guatemala received one for a value of \$140,809. Across the three countries, not a single paid contribution was marked as targeting gender-based violence. This could be explained by the fact that 67% of the flows from private organizations within the FTS for Kenya were not associated with any sector, while it was 43.7% for Nepal. In the case of Guatemala, the only reported activity did include a sector.

The current data available suggest that philanthropic organizations are not a key funder in the humanitarian sector. For the 2018-2021 period, across the three target countries, \$10 million in funding was identified, this is likely due to the fact that philanthropists seem to favor investing in stable, middle-income economies,²⁸ and not in humanitarian settings.

²⁸ OECD (2018), Private Philanthropy for Development, The Development Dimension, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264085190-en>.

Table 12. Search results to identify private organizations/foundations funding targeting gender-based violence²⁹

Year	Funding flows by private organizations/foundations: queried March 19, 2021	Kenya	Nepal	Guatemala
2018	Total number of paid contributions	6	4	0
	Number of paid contributions targeting gender-based violence	0	0	0
	% of number of paid contributions targeting gender-based violence	0%	0%	0%
	Total amount paid contributions	\$832,793	\$171,988	0
	Paid contributions amount targeting gender-based violence	0	0	0
	% of paid contributions amounts targeting gender-based violence	0%	0%	0%
2019	Total number of paid contributions	14	6	1
	Number of Paid contributions targeting gender-based violence	0	0	0
	% of number of paid contributions targeting gender-based violence	0%	0%	0%
	Total amount paid contributions	\$2,239,392	\$395,436	\$140,809
	Paid contributions amount targeting gender-based violence	0	0	0
	% of paid contributions amounts targeting gender-based violence	0%	0%	0%
2020	Total number of paid contributions	14	6	0
	Number of Paid contributions targeting gender-based violence	0	0	0
	% of number of paid contributions targeting gender-based violence	0	0	0
	Total amount paid contributions	\$7,121,055	\$92,847	0
	Paid contributions amount targeting gender-based violence	0	0	0
	% of paid contributions amounts targeting gender-based violence	0%	0%	0%
Total 2018-21	Total number of paid contributions		51	
	Number of Paid contributions targeting gender-based violence		\$0	
	% of number of paid contributions targeting gender-based violence		0%	
	Total amount paid contributions		\$10,994,320	
	Paid contributions amount targeting gender-based violence		\$0	
	% of paid contributions amounts targeting gender-based violence		0.00%	

OCHA Financial Tracking System Challenges and Data Gaps

- For funding flows that are reported with more than one country as a location and/or more than one year, the funding amount is marked as having a value of 0. The total funding across the years and countries is included in a separate column called “Amount shared on boundary (USD).”
- There is no marker that allows users to query using the Gender with Age Marker. The only gender equality related marker available is to filter by the gender-based violence

²⁹ Excel version of OCHA's results is available [here](#).

sector. This parameter probably leaves out other projects that are working towards gender equality outside of gender-based violence.

- For 2018-2021, the sector field, which is used to query by gender-based violence, is empty for 57.5% of foundation's financial flows in Kenya, 47.7% in Nepal, and 0% in Guatemala.

OECD Creditor Reporting System

OECD Creditor Reporting System Overview

The Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) is a central statistical reporting system. Bilateral and multilateral providers of development co-operation, including foundations, report all financial flows to developing countries. All reporters use a set of rules and classifications that allows the CRS to publish aggregated data that are comparable across countries and donors.

Data related to philanthropic funding of development activities can be accessed through two interfaces:

- The Private Philanthropy for Development (CRS) dashboard: an information table with multiple filters (donor, recipient, sector, flow, flow type, amount type, and year).³⁰ Data can be exported into CSV, Excel and Extensible Markup Language (XML). Although this table allows users to easily access total gross disbursement or commitments from philanthropic organizations by country, it does not allow users to filter using any type of gender marker. As a consequence, it is not possible to use this interface to understand how philanthropic organizations are funding gender equality in Guatemala, Kenya, or Nepal. When data from the dashboard are exported to CSV or Excel, it does not include underlying CRS data like the gender equality policy markers (Values 1, 2, or 0).
- The full CRS database from the OECD's statistics: an online repository that allows users to download the full dataset of development data in zip format for a single year.³¹ To be able to access these data, users need to have a good understanding of Excel or other data analysis tools. Using the datasets downloaded from the online repository gives users the ability to filter funding by private philanthropy organizations and by the OECD DAC gender equality marker. For the purpose of this research, the analysis has been conducted on the full CRS database.

OECD CRS Data Collection Methodology

Data published by the OECD CRS is self-reported by OECD members and partners. For the development financing sector, these partners can include private philanthropy organizations.

³⁰ Private Philanthropy for Development dashboard: http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=DV_DCD_PPF

³¹ CRS database in zip format: <http://stats.oecd.org/DownloadFiles.aspx?DatasetCode=CRS1>

The development financing database includes data from 2009 to 2019 for private philanthropy organizations. Data are published every year in January.

The OECD tracks and analyses development financing in support of gender equality and women’s rights, using the OECD DAC gender equality policy marker. Created in 1997 and updated in 2006, the OECD DAC gender equality policy marker is a statistical tool based on a three-point scoring system. Each activity is analyzed to determine whether an activity: has gender equality as a principal focus (2 rating); has gender equality as an important focus, but not the sole purpose of the activity (1 rating); or does not target gender equality at all (0 rating). Funding that is not assigned a gender marker score is considered to be untagged. While DAC members have been using the OECD DAC gender marker to report their activities for the past two decades, private philanthropy organizations have progressively started to use the policy gender marker only recently in their reporting to the CRS. As a consequence, information available on private sector financing for gender equality is increasingly complete, even though there is still scope for more development actors to report more of their development finance against the OECD DAC gender marker.³²

OECD CRS Search Query Variables: Disbursement per Donor with Gender Marker

The following search filters were applied to the dataset in Excel using a pivot table to identify disbursements from private philanthropy organizations to Guatemala, Kenya, and Nepal by donor with gender marker.

Table 13. Filters applied to OECD to identify private philanthropic funding of gender equality

OECD CRS search Filters for Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala	
Year	Single select 2018 or 2019. There are currently no data available for 2020 or 2021.
Donor name	Multiselect Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Dutch Postcode Lottery, Swedish Postcode Lottery, People's Postcode Lottery, MetLife Foundation, MasterCard Foundation, Grameen Crédit Agricole Foundation, IKEA Foundation, Bernard van Leer Foundation, MAVA Foundation, Oak Foundation, H&M Foundation, Laudes Foundation, Charity Projects Ltd (Comic Relief), Children's Investment Fund Foundation, Gatsby Charitable Foundation, Conrad N. Hilton Foundation, David & Lucile Packard Foundation, John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, Michael & Susan Dell Foundation, Omidyar Network Fund, Inc., Rockefeller Foundation, William & Flora Hewlett Foundation, Arcus Foundation, Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation, Ford Foundation, Wellcome Trust, UBS Optimus Foundation, World Diabetes Foundation, McKnight Foundation, Citi Foundation, LEGO Foundation, Norwegian Postcode Lottery, BBVA Microfinance Foundation, Jacobs Foundation, Arcadia Fund and Margaret A. Cargill Foundation. The list of private donors provided in the OECD DAC CRS code list was used to identify the list of donors that should be included in this query to reflect philanthropic funding.

³² OECD DAC Network on gender equality (GenderNet), *Development Finance for Gender equality and Women's empowerment: a 2021 Snapshot*, 2021. <https://www.oecd.org/development/gender-development/Development-finance-for-gender-equality-2021.pdf>

In addition to using the filter above, the following configurations were made to the pivot table:

- Adding the “gender field” as a row. This allows for identifying disbursements that have the OECD DAC gender equality policy marker value of 1 or 2.
- Adding the field of “USD_disbursement as Values”. After adding this field, users have to modify the format to a number with comma separators and multiply it per 1,000,000 to be able to do their own calculations.

OECD CRS Search Query Results: Project and Disbursement with Gender Marker

Private philanthropy organizations working on gender equality that report to the OECD CRS finance more projects and direct more funding to Kenya than to Nepal or Guatemala. According to the OECD, for the 2013 - 2015 period, the BMGF provided over half of the total philanthropic funding worldwide based on a survey of 143 foundations.³³ Since Kenya is a priority country for the Gates foundation, this explains the difference in funding received between Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala.

For the 2018-2019 period, philanthropic funding targeting gender equality in Kenya represented 23% of the total philanthropic funding received. For Nepal and Guatemala for the same period, it represented over 50% of the total philanthropic funding received.

³³ OECD (2018), *Private Philanthropy for Development*, The Development Dimension, OECD Publishing, Paris.
https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/private-philanthropy-for-development_9789264085190-en

Table 14. Search results from OECD CRS to identify private philanthropic funding of gender equality³⁴

Year	OECD CRS Results: queried March 12, 2021	Kenya	Nepal	Guatemala
2018	Number of projects – philanthropic funding	339	39	30
	Number of gender projects – philanthropic funding	96	17	10
	Percent of gender projects – philanthropic funding	28.3%	43.6%	33.3%
	Disbursements – philanthropic funding	\$142,995,821	\$11,527,835	\$6,795,165
	Disbursement for gender projects – philanthropic funding	\$30,410,843	\$6,554,343	\$3,942,770
	Percent of disbursements for gender projects – philanthropic funding	21.3%	56.9%	58.1%
2019	Number of projects – philanthropic funding	443	46	35
	Number of gender focused projects – philanthropic funding	105	10	6
	Percent of gender focused projects – philanthropic funding	23.7%	21.7%	17.1%
	Disbursements – philanthropic funding	\$19,738,922	\$1,178,305	\$922,942
	Disbursement for gender projects – philanthropic funding	\$6,413,007	\$390,637	\$33,882
	Percent of disbursements for gender projects – philanthropic funding	32.5%	33.2%	3.7%
Total 2018-19	Number of projects – philanthropic funding		932	
	Number of gender focused projects – philanthropic funding		244	
	Percent of gender focused projects – philanthropic funding		26.2%	
	Disbursements – philanthropic funding		\$183,158,990	
	Disbursement for gender projects – philanthropic funding		\$47,745,483	
	Percent of disbursements for gender projects – philanthropic funding		26.1%	

OECD CRS Search Query Variables: Disbursement per Sector with Gender Marker

The following search filters were applied to the dataset in Excel using a pivot table to identify disbursements from private philanthropy organizations to Guatemala, Kenya, and Nepal by sector with gender marker.

³⁴ An Excel version of these OECD CRS data is available [here](#).

Table 15. Filters applied to OECD to identify private philanthropic funding of gender equality by sector

OECD CRS search filters for Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala	
Year	Single select 2018 or 2019. There are currently no data available for 2020 or 2021.
Donor name	Multiselect Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Dutch Postcode Lottery, Swedish Postcode Lottery, People's Postcode Lottery, MetLife Foundation, MasterCard Foundation, Grameen Crédit Agricole Foundation, IKEA Foundation, Bernard van Leer Foundation, MAVA Foundation, Oak Foundation, H&M Foundation, Laudes Foundation, Charity Projects Ltd (Comic Relief), Children's Investment Fund Foundation, Gatsby Charitable Foundation, Conrad N. Hilton Foundation, David & Lucile Packard Foundation, John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, Michael & Susan Dell Foundation, Omidyar Network Fund, Inc., Rockefeller Foundation, William & Flora Hewlett Foundation, Arcus Foundation, Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation, Ford Foundation, Wellcome Trust, UBS Optimus Foundation, World Diabetes Foundation, McKnight Foundation, Citi Foundation, LEGO Foundation, Norwegian Postcode Lottery, BBVA Microfinance Foundation, Jacobs Foundation, Arcadia Fund and Margaret A. Cargill Foundation. The list of private donors provided in the OECD DAC CRS code list was used to identify the list of donors that should be included in this query to reflect philanthropic funding.
Gender	Multiselect 1 and 2. This enables users to get totals only for projects with the OECD DAC gender equality policy marker.

In addition to using the filter above, the following configurations were made to the pivot table:

- Adding "SectorName" as row. This enables users to get total disbursements per sector.
- Adding the field of "USD_disbursement" to 'Values'. After adding this field, users have to modify the format to number with comma separators and multiply it per 1,000,000 to be able to do their own calculations.

OECD CRS Search Query Results: Disbursement per Donor with Gender Marker

Private philanthropy organization funding of gender equality across Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala concentrates around three OECD sectors: Government & Civil Society; Population Policies/Programmes & Reproductive Health; and Banking & Financial Services. Among these three sectors, the Population Policies/Programmes & Reproductive Health sector concentrates the majority of the gender equality funding from foundations with 55% of funding targeting this sector for the three target countries in 2018.

Table 16. Search results from OECD CRS to identify overlaps between private philanthropic funding of gender equality and OECD sectors³⁵

Year	OECD Sector	Disbursements			Disbursements as a % of overall gender equality funding		
		Kenya	Nepal	Guatemala	Kenya	Nepal	Guatemala
2018	Agriculture	\$217,436	\$0	\$0	0.1%	0%	0%
	Banking & Financial Services	\$1,382,989	\$0	\$164,385	4.5%	0%	4.2%
	Basic Education	\$201,143	\$0	\$0	0.7%	0%	0%
	Basic Health	\$125,064	\$0	\$0	0.4%	0%	0%
	Business & Other Services	\$206,261	\$0	\$0	0.7%	0%	0%
	Education, Level Unspecified	\$56,060	\$0	\$0	0.9%	0%	0%
	Forestry	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	0%	0%	1.3%
	General Environment Protection	\$0	\$552,334	\$0	0%	8.4%	0%
	Government & Civil Society-general	\$6,115,384	\$1,425,351	\$544,000	20.11%	21.75%	13.80%
	Health, General	\$239,385	\$0	\$0	0.79%	0.00%	0.00%
	Non-communicable diseases (NCDs)	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$50,000	0.33%	1.53%	1.27%
	Other Multisector	\$110,099	\$0	\$420,000	0.36%	0.00%	10.65%
	Other Social Infrastructure & Services	\$2,737,428	\$87,818	\$164,385	9.00%	1.34%	4.17%
	2019	Population Policies/Programmes & Reproductive Health	\$18,161,688	\$4,388,840	\$2,550,000	59.72%	66.96%
Secondary Education		\$757,907	\$0	\$0	2.49%	0.00%	0.00%
Education, Level Unspecified		\$4,000	\$0	\$0	0.06%	0.00%	0.00%
Basic Education		\$28,050	\$0	\$0	0.44%	0.00%	0.00%
Secondary Education		\$235,523	\$0	\$0	3.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Post-Secondary Education		\$103,147	\$0	\$0	1.61%	0.00%	0.00%
Health, General		\$103,613	\$0	\$0	1.62%	0.00%	0.00%
Basic Health		\$195,024	\$3,785	\$0	3.04%	0.97%	0.00%
Population Policies/Programmes & Reproductive Health		\$2,188,106	\$374,218	\$0	34.12%	95.80%	0.00%
Government & Civil Society-general		\$261,386	\$11,459	\$3,667	4.08%	2.93%	10.82%
Other Social Infrastructure & Services		\$26,350	\$1,176	\$15,108	0.41%	0.30%	44.59%
Banking & Financial Services		\$2,614,678	\$0	\$15,108	40.77%	0.00%	44.59%
Agriculture		\$524,906	\$0	\$0	8.19%	0.00%	0.00%
Construction		\$121,976	\$0	\$0	1.90%	0.00%	0.00%
General Environment Protection	\$6,250	\$0	\$0	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	

³⁵ An Excel version of this OECD CRS data can be found [here](#).

OECD CRS Data Challenges

- Data are updated every January. Data for 2020 will be available in January 2022.
- Users need to have experience using Excel and pivot tables to be able to access the gender marker data and philanthropic funding information at the same time.
- Sector names include the sector code in the same cell, this means users need to modify the sector names to clean the data they process. For example, “I.1.b. Basic Education” could be replaced by “Basic Education.”
- Within the type of flow variable, there is an option called “private grants,” which could potentially be used to filter philanthropic funding without having to manually select all foundations in the donor filter. Nevertheless, the definition of this flow type notes that it includes NGOs and other civil society organizations (e.g., philanthropic foundations) based in the reporting DAC country. By including NGOs in addition to philanthropic foundations, it limits the effectiveness of filtering by philanthropic organizations only.
- For this research, we have only used the OECD official private donor list to analyze philanthropic funding. While there are discrepancies between the listed foundations in the official private donor list and other foundations reporting to OECD, this does not impact our focus countries. However, for future research, researchers should review the agency list for the targeted countries and identify if there are any disbursements from foundations that are not included in the private donor list. Some of the foundations listed as agencies but not included as private donors include the Doha Institute, Qatar Foundation, King Abdullah International Foundation for Humanitarian Activities, Folke Bernadotte Academy and The Nordic Africa Institute.
- Currently 38 foundations report their data to the OECD. At the time of research, these foundations correspond to the 38 foundations listed as private donors in the OECD DAC CRS code list.³⁶ The codelist was updated on April 23, 2021. The data published to the OECD CRS database therefore, do not provide a full picture of philanthropic funding in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala.

The International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI)

Overview of IATI

The International Aid Transparency Initiative brings together governments, multilateral institutions, private sector, and civil society organizations to increase the transparency and openness of resources flowing into developing countries.³⁷ To facilitate this, they have developed the IATI Standard, which dictates how data should be published in order for it to be interoperable.

IATI provides access to data published using the IATI Standard through different tools:

³⁶ Full OECD CRS code list accessed April 5, 2021 is available [here](#).

³⁷ IATI website: <https://iatistandard.org/>

- The d-portal is a development portal that allows users to explore and visualize IATI data on development and humanitarian aid activities.³⁸ d-portal refreshes daily and takes data directly from the IATI Registry. New publishers should appear on d-portal on the Monday after their first publication. It has a user-friendly search engine that allows users to more easily find activities, budgets, and other financing information by using a set of filters like recipient country, publisher, sector, activity status, and year. Data can be downloaded in CSV format. Data from d-portal have been selected for analysis in this report.
- The IATI Datastore provides access to data published by organizations according to the IATI Standard on their resources and results. The IATI Datastore offers two ways to access IATI data: the Datastore API and the Datastore Query Builder. For the purpose of this report, the Datastore Query Builder will be used to analyze IATI data. Users can select options through drop-down and freetext filters to access the information they need.

IATI Data Collection Methodology

IATI data are self-published by different actors using the IATI Standard.³⁹ Publishers upload their data into the IATI Registry. Data that are uploaded into the registry by publishers are then accessible through the d-portal and the IATI Datastore. IATI is an ecosystem of open datasets, not a singular, unified database. As a result users should expect that results may differ between the IATI Datastore Query Builder and the d-portal. IATI uses the OECD DAC gender equality policy marker scoring system to analyze the degree of an activity that is focused on gender equality.

IATI d-portal Search Query Variables

The following search filters were applied to d-portal to identify commitments and expenditure from private philanthropy organizations to Guatemala, Kenya, and Nepal by donor with gender markers.

Table 17. Filters applied to IATI d-portal to identify private philanthropic funding of gender equality

IATI d-portal Search Filters for Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala	
Country	Single select Kenya, ⁴⁰ Nepal, ⁴¹ or Guatemala. ⁴²
Policy Marker	Multiselect Gender Equality (significant objective)(1_1)and Gender Equality (principal objective)(2_1).
Collaboration type	Single select private sector outflows.
Min year	Single select 2018. It queries actual and planned dates for activities that ended after the start of the min year. The query results will include any projects published or with data available up to the extraction date of March 30, 2021.

³⁸ d-portal FAQ: <http://d-portal.org/faq.html#gen6>

³⁹ More information on the IATI Standard: <https://iatistandard.org/en/iati-standard/>

⁴⁰ d-portal query results for Kenya are available [here](#).

⁴¹ d-portal query results for Nepal are available [here](#).

⁴² d-portal query results for Guatemala are available [here](#).

IATI d-portal Search Query Results

Over 95% of private sector outflows reported to IATI and published in IATI’s d-portal for Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala correspond to the BMGF. In Kenya, 236 projects were funded by private organizations during the 2018+ time period, corresponding to \$1.7 billion in spending. From this amount, only 7.6% targeted gender equality. Nepal has 35 projects funded by philanthropic organizations for the same period while Guatemala has 11. For both countries, the project expenditure by philanthropic organizations that targeted gender equality represented less than 1% of all funding by philanthropic available via IATI’s d-portal.

The difference between the number of projects and expenditures between Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala may be because Kenya is a focus country for the BMGF.⁴³ From the information available via IATI’s d-portal it is not possible to get a full picture about the philanthropic funding to Kenya, Guatemala, and Nepal.

Table 18. IATI d-portal search results to identify private philanthropic funding of gender equality⁴⁴

Year	IATI d-portal Results: queried March 30, 2021	Kenya	Nepal	Guatemala
2018 +	Number of projects with private sector outflows	236	35	11
2018 +	Number of projects with private sector outflows with gender equality policy marker	47	3	1
2018 +	% project number with private sector outflows with gender equality policy marker	19.9%	8.5%	9.1%
2018 +	Spend private sector outflows	\$1,708,936,914	\$202,146,758	\$88,959,814
2018 +	Spend private sector outflows with gender equality policy marker	\$130,828,091	\$351,287	\$100,000
2018 +	% of spend private sector outflows with gender equality policy marker	7.6%	0.2%	0.1%

IATI d-portal Search Adjustments and Challenges

- The filter dates in d-portal are by start date and planned start date according to the glossary, but in d-portal’s frequently asked questions it notes that it uses the transaction value date/transaction date (e.g., in the “spend columns” tables) for a given year. As a result, it is not clear which dates are used for the date filter in d-portal. It is not possible to obtain a CSV dataset with an associated date per spending. This means it is not possible to download spending per year using the d-portal interface.
- Although it is possible to filter by gender equality policy marker, there is no column in the data available for download with the value of this field. As a consequence, to identify which activities correspond to the “gender equality policy marker 1” and which

⁴³ More information on focus countries for the BMGF is available [here](#).

⁴⁴ Excel version of IATI d-portal results table is available [here](#).

correspond to the “gender equality policy marker 2”, users have to run two separate queries.

- In the data available for download, the activity status is a code not the actual status. Users have to then look for the status codes to understand its status.
- As commitment and spending often have the same values, it is probable that reporting agencies are not reporting actual spending.
- To identify funds from philanthropic organizations, users can filter by the “collaboration type” field with the value of “private sector outflows”. The definition of private sector outflows is not clear, as in the documentation for the IATI Standard there is no description for this value.⁴⁵ It was not possible to identify through the d-portal how many reporters use the “collaboration type” field when they do their data reporting.
- The expenditure included in the CSV download for d-portal includes a column for spend. This corresponds to disbursements and expenditures aggregated together. It is not possible to get only disbursements in the CSV file.
- When a user filters by the same year for start and end date, and then does the same for another year, the system provides the same total amount of commitments and spending for each year for any activity taking place in both years, duplicating data. In the CSV download there is no date field, making it impossible to filter by year when doing multi-year queries.
- The visualizations in the dashboard allow users to see expenditures per sector, but it is not possible for users to add the sector as a column to the CSV file that appears by default. It is not possible to see the sector per activity, it is only possible to access aggregates per sector.

IATI Datastore Query Builder Search Query Variables

Within the Datastore Query Builder, two separate queries need to be run to obtain disbursements and to obtain the number of projects per year. This is due to needing to select one transaction per row in order to split apart the different types of transactions (e.g., commitments, disbursements, and expenditures) in order to filter for disbursements. However, not all IATI reporters include disbursements in the data they publish. If users only count the number of projects with disbursements, they would be excluding projects that are reported but do not include disbursement information (transactions). The two queries for this report are:

- Report by financial transaction
- Report by unique activity

⁴⁵ More information on collaboration type: <https://iatistandard.org/en/iati-standard/203/codelists/collaborationtype/>

IATI Datastore Report by Transaction Search Query Variables

The following search filters were applied to the dataset in the IATI Datastore to identify disbursements from foundations to Guatemala, Kenya, and Nepal with a gender equality policy marker.

Table 19. Filters and configurations applied to IATI Datastore to identify private sector outflows targeting gender equality⁴⁶

IATI Datastore Search Filters for Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala		
Core filters	Recipient country	Multiselect Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala.
Core filters	Filter by date	Single select yes
Core filters	Activity/budget start date	January 1st, 2018
Additional filters	Policy marker	Gender
Additional filters	Collaboration type	Single select private sector outflows
Additional filters	Transaction type	Disbursement
Output format	Row format	Each financial transaction

In addition to using the filter above, the following are the configurations in Excel to obtain the needed data:

- “Transaction_date_iso_dates”. Single select 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021. This will allow users to filter for each year the actual disbursement made.
- “Transaction_value_usd”. This is the column used to obtain the disbursement amounts

IATI Datastore Report by Transaction Search Query Results

Data currently available within the IATI Datastore corresponds mainly to 2018, 2019, and 2020. Among the projects funded by private sector outflows in Kenya in 2018, 37% targeted gender equality; in 2019, 50.8% targeted gender equality; and in 2020, 62% targeted gender equality.

In Nepal, 31.6% of philanthropic funding during 2018-2019 targeted gender equality, and for the same period in Guatemala 42.4% of philanthropic funding targeted gender equality.

For the three target countries, the query on private sector disbursement for 2018-2021 in the IATI Datastore, 100% of the disbursements reported correspond to the BMGF. The BMGF is the only philanthropic organization that has reported to IATI for activities implemented in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala to IATI marking their funding as “private sector outflows” in the “collaboration type” field.

⁴⁶ IATI Datastore query in CSV is available [here](#).

Table 20. IATI Datastore search results to identify private sector disbursements targeting gender equality⁴⁷

Year	IATI Datastore Results: queried March 30, 2021	Kenya	Nepal	Guatemala
2018	Total private sector outflow disbursements	\$252,847,174	\$10,493,255	\$5,981,342
	Private sector outflow disbursements marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	\$93,663,529	\$4,363,468	\$1,812,999
	% of private sector outflow disbursements marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	37%	41.6%	30.3%
2019	Total private sector outflow disbursements	\$273,538,475	\$29,461,826	\$1,279,004
	Private sector outflow disbursements marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	\$106,536,623	\$6,242,240	\$719,365
	% of private sector outflow disbursements marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	38.9%	21.2%	56.2%
2020	Total private sector outflow disbursements	\$217,936,592	\$13,951,337	\$950,000
	Private sector outflow disbursements marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	\$110,809,674	\$6,544,511	\$950,000
	% of private sector outflow disbursements marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	50.8%	46.9%	100%
2021	Total private sector outflow disbursements	\$41,748,485	\$629,148	\$0
	Private sector outflow disbursements marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	\$25,899,285	\$105,891	\$0
	% of private sector outflow disbursements marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	62%	16.8%	0%
Total 2018-21	Total private sector outflow disbursements	\$612,675,622	\$54,535,566	\$8,210,346
	Private sector outflow disbursements marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	\$336,909,111	\$17,256,110	\$3,482,364
	% of private sector outflow disbursements marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	55.0%	31.6%	42.4%

⁴⁷ Excel version of IATI Datastore results table available [here](#).

IATI Datastore Report by Unique Activity Query

Table 21. Filters and configurations applied to IATI Datastore to identify number of activities funded by the private sector and targeting gender equality⁴⁸

IATI Datastore Search Filters for Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala		
Core filters	Recipient country	Multiselect Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala.
Core filters	Filter by date	Single select yes
Core filters	Activity/budget start date	January 1st, 2018
Additional filters	Policy marker	Gender
Additional filters	Collaboration type	Single select private sector outflows
Output format	Row format	Each unique activity
Output format	Column elements to include	Multiselect Activity Dates, Reporting Organization, Title, Descriptions, Participating Organization, Recipient Countries, Sectors.

In addition to using the filter above, the following configurations were done in Excel to obtain the needed data:

- “Activity_date_start_actual”. Filter by 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021. This will allow users to filter for the number of activities that started during the selected year. IATI Datastore report by activity search query results

From 2018 to 2021, Kenya received over \$336 million from private donors that targeted gender equality. For that same period, Nepal received 5% of the amount received by Kenya and Guatemala received 1%. This difference can be explained by the fact that the BMGF is the only private foundation that currently reports data to IATI for the three target countries marking their funding as “private sector outflows” in the “collaboration type” field and that Kenya is the only focus country (out of our three focus countries) for which this foundation reports.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ IATI Datastore search results available [here](#).

⁴⁹ More information on focus countries for the BMGF: <http://www.gatesfoundation.org/our-work/places/africa>

Table 22. IATI Datastore search results to identify activities funded by private sector outflows targeting gender equality⁵⁰

Year	IATI Datastore Results: queried March 30, 2021	Kenya	Nepal	Guatemala
2018	Private sector outflow count of activities	62	11	6
	Private sector outflow count of activities marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	60	8	5
	% of activities count to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	96.8%	72.7%	83.33%
2019	Private sector outflow count of activities	57	13	3
	Private sector outflow count of activities marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	56	12	2
	% of activities count to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	98.2%	92.3%	66.7%
2020	Private sector outflow count of activities	1	0	1
	Private sector outflow count of activities marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	0	0	0
	% of activities count to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	0%	0%	0%
2021	Private sector outflow count of activities	0	0	0
	Private sector outflow count of activities marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	0	0	0
	% of activities count to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	0%	0%	0%
All	Private sector outflow count of activities	120	24	10
	Private sector outflow count of activities marked to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	116	20	7
	% of activities count to target gender equality (values 1 or 2)	96.7%	83.3%	70%

IATI Datastore Challenges

- For the report by transaction, it is important for users to not select any data fields when configuring the output format as it removes existing columns from the default CSV file and does not add any additional columns to the file. This might be a bug or is otherwise a counterintuitive design.
- To visualize philanthropic funding there are two possible ways to query the IATI Datastore: by displaying only data reported by foundations or to filter by “private sector outflows” using the “collaboration type” field. The results of this report correspond to filtering results by “private sector outflows”. Using the option of displaying only data reported by foundations resulted in some quality issues: data without donor names appear and funders that are not foundations appear (e.g., the government of the

⁵⁰ Excel version of IATI Datastore results table available [here](#).

Netherlands). Yet it does include data for additional foundations that are not included when filtering by “private sector outflows” in the “collaboration type” field such as Comic Relief, which is a foundation based in the UK. One reason for these differences in query results is due to the fact that the field “collaboration type” is not being used broadly.

- When downloading the data, if the user is not careful, they can download only a sample of 50 rows instead of the full dataset as this is the default setting.
- In the preview page of the results page, it is not possible to see a preview of all columns included in the file.
- For the report by transaction, it is not possible to know the percentage of the disbursement that is allocated to each of the target countries when it corresponds to an activity that targets multiple countries.
- It is safe to say that a majority of philanthropic foundations are not using IATI to publish their data. For the target countries, only the BMGF had published data for 2018-2021 marking their funding as “private sector outflows” in the “collaboration type” field.
- Within the organization name data column, some of the names include a comma such as APICS, Inc. The use of a comma for an organization name makes it difficult to analyze the data as commas are used to separate different organizations within the same cell.

Discussion of Research Questions

This section addresses the research questions using the analysis from the previous sections of this report. In addition to discussion of the core questions, this section also outlines the main limitations and weaknesses present in the surveyed data sources, including how these restraints impact the quality of philanthropic and gender equality financing data available to the public.

1. To what extent is philanthropic funding marked with a gender equality policy marker in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala?

The marking of philanthropic funding activities targeting gender equality uses two types of markers: SDG 5 and the OECD DAC gender equality policy marker. It is not possible to assess how many of the foundations publishing data are not tagging enough activities using the marker. The first steps towards effectively tracking gender equality funding by foundations is to increase the number of foundations publishing their data to IATI and the OECD CRS. The second step would be to increase the quality of data published to the OECD CRS and IATI to more effectively tag activities with the gender equality policy marker.

Table 23. Summary of gender marker usage

Data source	Can users filter information by gender marker? (Y/N)	What type of gender marker is in use?
SDGfunders	Y	SDG 5: Gender Equality
360Giving	N	N/A
Financial Tracking System	N	Gender with Age Marker (GAM)
IATI d-portal	Y	OECD DAC gender equality policy marker
IATI Datastore Query Builder	Y	OECD DAC gender equality policy marker
OECD CRS	Y	OECD DAC gender equality policy marker

2. What organizations are mainly receiving philanthropic funding for gender-related projects in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala?

Philanthropic funding targeting gender equality is implemented most often by research organizations, universities, national NGOs, and international NGOs. Philanthropic organizations are not significant funders of humanitarian activities, but when they fund humanitarian activities it is through the UN.

Table 24. Summary of common implementing organizations for philanthropic funded activities

Data source	Common delivery/implementation organizations
SDGfunders	International NGOs, national NGOs, other foundations and funds
360Giving	Universities, international NGOs, national NGOs
Financial Tracking System	UN agencies
IATI d-portal	Universities, international NGOs, UN agencies
IATI Query Builder	Universities, international NGOs, UN agencies
OECD CRS	National NGOs, international NGOs, universities, UN agencies

3. What sectors & sub-sectors/thematic areas does gender-related philanthropic funding mainly target in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala?

Activities funded by philanthropic organizations typically fall under health, education, and governance sectors. Health is the sector with the biggest overlap with gender equality. It is also the sector with the most investment from philanthropic foundations worldwide.

Table 25. Summary of common sectors for philanthropic funding

Data source	Common sectors for philanthropic assistance
SDGfunders	SDG 3: Good Health and Well-being; SDG 4: Quality Education; and SDG 10: Reduced Inequality
360Giving	No data available
Financial Tracking System	Zero funding targeted gender equality
IATI d-portal	Health, Reproductive Health, Governance, and Agriculture
IATI Query Builder	Health, Reproductive Health, Governance, and Agriculture
OECD CRS	Population Policies/Programmes & Reproductive Health, Agriculture, Banking & Financial Services and Government & Civil Society-general

4. To what extent can we track which philanthropic commitments have already been disbursed in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala?

Information on disbursements of philanthropic commitments is not available on all platforms, and where the field is available it is not always used, or when it is used it is sometimes used by copying the commitment into the disbursements field.

Table 26. Summary of disbursement availability and completeness of fields across data sources

Data source	Is there disbursement information? (Y/N)
SDGFunders	N
360Giving	N
Financial Tracking System	Y ⁵¹
IATI d-portal	Y
IATI Query Builder	Y
OECD CRS	Y

5. On a geographical scale, how disaggregated are philanthropic funding flows that we can track for Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala?

Data are typically available across all data sources at a country level. IATI has fields for subnational or local level data, but these fields are rarely filled. OECD CRS has subnational (state/county, and sometimes town) data. For activities that target multiple countries, it is not possible to track the percentage allocated to each country with regards to disbursements.

Table 27. Summary of geographical scale of disbursements

Data source	Global	Regional	National (Country)	Subnational (state/county/town)
SDGfunders	X	X	X	
360Giving	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Financial Tracking System	X	X	X	
IATI d-portal		X	X	X
IATI Query Builder		X	X	X
OECD CRS	X	X	X	X

⁵¹ *Assuming that paid contribution is the same as a disbursement.

6. To what extent can we track the results/impact of gender-related philanthropic funding in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala?

Results Data

Results data are hard to find across the funding sources surveyed. Occasionally in FTS publishers include some level of output or outcome information in the description field, but it was not comprehensive or reliable. IATI has fields for results, which are rarely used.

Table 28. Summary of available results data by data source

Data source	Results data available? (Y/N)	Type
SDGFunders	N	N/A
360Giving	N	N/A
Financial Tracking System	Y	It is occasionally included in the description field
IATI d-portal	Y	It is possible to add but is not well used
IATI Query Builder	N	N/A
OECD CRS	N	N/A

Reporting Timeliness

Timeliness of data also varies, but data are often available after a year or more. The IATI Query Builder and d-portal both include a field that auto-generates the last updated date and time for each dataset. Queries showed that most activities had been updated within the last two months.

OECD CRS by contrast only has data through 2019 due to the fact that it goes through a lengthy data validation process. Yearly datasets are usually updated every quarter.

What are (current/expected) barriers to more transparent gender-related philanthropic funding in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala?

One clear weakness is the limited publication of philanthropic data. SDGFunders, which has the most comprehensive data source, even if limited to American foundations, stopped publishing data in 2017. The OECD CRS database collects data for 38 foundations, and the information is published over a year after the end of the calendar year. Finally, IATI is only used by one foundation in the target countries of this report and marking their funding as “private sector outflows”: the BMGF.

Conclusion

Data on philanthropic funding flows are currently scattered across different data repositories and each repository uses different methodologies to collect data and to identify projects that target gender equality. They also define philanthropic funding differently between data sources. There are useful datasets available, sometimes buried within the individual data sources. The problem remains that only a subset of all philanthropic funding is currently being reported to the main two data sources: the IATI Datasore and OECD CRS. For the data that are available, they are labor intensive to access, and they do not necessarily paint a complete picture of philanthropic funding as a whole, nor of the activities that target gender equality specifically.

Below we analyze the key challenges to understanding philanthropic funding for gender equality.

Philanthropic Financing is Not a Term that is Shared Across Platforms

The objective of this research was to analyze philanthropic financing across three countries. Each platform that was consulted for this research had a different name for referring to philanthropic financing and a different way of understanding it. For example, the OECD refers to philanthropic funding as Private Philanthropy for Development, which includes all donors that have been identified as private donors.

The IATI Standard does not have a clear definition for philanthropic financing. It allows for the tagging of financial flows as private sector outflows, but the definition of private sector outflows is not clear. In the documentation for the IATI Standard there is no description for this value.⁵² For humanitarian data collected through OCHA Financial Tracking System, philanthropic financing is classified according to the funding organization type, which is as private organizations/foundations. It is not clear which private organizations, outside of foundations, are taken into consideration for OCHA. SDGFunders refers to philanthropic financing as philanthropic investments, and includes all foundations as philanthropic organizations. Finally, UK-based 360Giving, does not define philanthropic financing even though it collects data from multiple foundations within the UK.

As philanthropic financing continues to increase in importance, there is a need to define what philanthropic financing is and to have a common vocabulary to refer to it.

Gender Equality Tracking Challenges

The first challenge in tracking gender equality funding by philanthropic organizations is that some platforms, such as 360Giving or the current implementation of the FTS, do not have any

⁵² More information on collaboration type: <https://iatistandard.org/en/iati-standard/203/codelists/collaborationtype/>

gender marker to track funding towards gender equality. The second challenge is that even when data sources have a way to mark projects as targeting gender equality, publishers do not always provide the data for this field.

Finally, there is a need to standardize how to tag projects and funding going towards gender equality. There are currently two markers commonly used for philanthropic funding: marking projects as working towards SDG goal 5: Gender equality (currently used by SDGfunders), or using the OECD DAC gender equality policy marker (currently used by the OECD CRS, the IATI Standard, and used by the FTS in humanitarian response plans but not in the database for queries). As the IATI Standard and OECD CRS use the OECD DAC gender equality policy marker, which can be directly linked to SDG 5, it would be useful if philanthropic organizations use the OECD DAC gender equality policy marker to publish their data across platforms.

Cross-Country Programs and Projects are Difficult to Track

Philanthropic data struggle with the same themes that impact broader official development assistance. Programs are often cross-country, and it is difficult to pinpoint how much money is going to each country. IATI enables reporters to divide planned disbursements among different countries, but transactional data are not associated with a single country for multi-country programs. This makes it more difficult for users to track philanthropic financing by multiplying the number of queries that need to be run in order to attempt to accurately answer the basic question: “how much philanthropic funding is a country receiving within a set time period?”

Philanthropic Funding Data are Fragmented

For the two biggest repositories of information on philanthropy funding for development, IATI and the OECD CRS, reporting is voluntary. Foundations are not required to publish their data in the IATI Standard, and from the foundations funding activities in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala, only the BMGF is publishing data in the IATI Standard and marking their funding as "private sector outflows". OECD CRS contains a large number of foundations, with 38 reporting to the database, but this still leaves out a number of foundations that do not voluntarily report their activities. In the case of Guatemala for example, according to SDGfunders the biggest private donor for gender equality is the Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation. According to the results found via 360Giving's GrantNav, the biggest UK-based philanthropic funder for gender equality in Guatemala is the Wellcome Trust. Neither foundation publishes their data in the IATI Standard. The Wellcome Trust reports its Guatemala activities to the OECD CRS, while the Buffet Foundation does not.

Limited Publishing of Philanthropic Financial Flows

For the target countries of this report, there were no data from local philanthropic organizations within Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala. It is not possible to understand the role these organizations play in national development.

Internationally, there is only a subset of organizations that are publishing their data to the IATI Registry and the OECD CRS database.

Recommendations

This report has reviewed the targeting of gender equality in philanthropic funding in Kenya, Nepal, and Guatemala, using the lens of gender equality markers (OECD DAC gender equality marker, GAM, and SDG 5) to help track activities. There are limited data available about foundation funding in the existing platforms that focus on international development, and when data are available there is a need for a better definition and tagging on philanthropic funding.

General Recommendations

- **Streamline naming.** Data sources should refer to philanthropic funding with the same vocabulary. The official terms from the OECD could be replicated in the IATI Standard: Private Philanthropy for Development to refer to the funding of philanthropic activities by private donors.
- **Streamlining gender markers.** Currently there are three markers for gender in the data sources tracking philanthropic funding: SDG 5: Gender equality, GAM, and the OECD DAC gender equality policy marker. Even though each of these markers serves a different purpose, all data sources could consider using the OECD marker – in addition to their current gender markers – to promote interoperability across the various data sources.
- **Promote transparency among national and international philanthropic organizations.** The biggest active repository of philanthropic funding information is the OECD CRS, which publishes data for 38 foundations worldwide. More foundations could be included in the list of private donors reporting to the CRS. In regards to IATI, there are less than five foundations working in the target countries of this report, who have published their activities in the IATI Standard.

Recommendations by Data Source

SDGfunders

SDGfunders is a comprehensive database for 2010 to 2017 American philanthropic funding. The methodology used by Candid to collect philanthropic funding could be replicated to collect data for current programs as American foundations are important philanthropic funders. The user interface is intuitive and easy to use but data should be downloadable in CSV format to enable users to perform their own analysis. To analyze SDGfunders data, users have to manually copy the information presented in the dashboard to their computer as there is no data download feature.

360Giving

The 360Giving Data Standard and GrantNav could be improved to increase transparency in the private funding of activities targeting gender equality by:

- Adding a gender equality policy marker to their standard. 360Giving is currently working on adding an extension to identify projects that are supporting women and girls. This would partially enable users to understand which activities are targeting gender equality. 360Giving could take into consideration using the OECD DAC gender equality policy marker for its extension as it is already commonly used.
- Adding locations outside of the UK to the location field. Even though the 360Giving Data Standard was developed to help UK-based charity organizations publish open and standardized data, 360Giving could consider including locations outside of the UK in their location filter as this report identified that charity organizations are publishing grants data for activities implemented outside the UK using the 360Giving Data Standard.
- Adding a quick filter in the GrantNav interface to allow users to identify philanthropic funding. Currently, in the organization type filter there is a category “grantmaking organizations.” This category includes private funding as well as other organization types – for example, the National Emergencies Trust, which receives public funding.

OCHA's FTS

To improve the tracking of humanitarian activities that target gender equality, the Gender with Age Marker (GAM) in FTS should become a mandatory field for reporting to UN OCHA, even for countries that do not have a humanitarian response plan, like Kenya, Nepal and Guatemala. Additionally, users should be able to filter activities to identify whether they target gender equality or not. To enable users to do their own analysis, the GAM should be accessible as a column in data available for download. Moreover, to facilitate interoperability, UN OCHA could consider adopting the OECD DAC gender equality policy marker.

CRS Database from the OECD's Statistics

The CRS database can be queried by downloading the database per year to the computer or by using the Private Philanthropy for Development (CRS) dashboard.

Analyzing the CRS database by downloading it to the computer requires users to have intermediate Excel skills. To promote the use of the CRS for analyzing philanthropic funding of gender equality, the OECD could create a video explaining how to query the database to analyze philanthropic funding. The video *How To Track Gender Financing with the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS)* created by Publish What You Fund can be used as an example.⁵³ Additionally, for the sector field it would be beneficial for analysis to not include sector codes in

⁵³ Video available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5fB42NJJpZw>

the same field as the sector names. For example, the “I.1.b. Basic Education” sector could be replaced by “Basic Education.”

The private philanthropy for development (CRS) dashboard allows users to access data on philanthropic development funding through an easy-to-use interface. To enable users to understand how philanthropic organizations are funding activities that target gender equality, a filter to query by the gender equality policy marker should be enabled in this interface.

The OECD could aim to include additional foundations to the 38 foundations that currently publish their data through the OECD.

IATI's d-portal

The main recommendations for IATI's d-portal are the improvement of their user interface and the improvement of definition fields that are used throughout the website:

- Provide a clear description of the fields that are queried in the filter. This would be particularly useful for the date filter. An example of how to provide descriptions for each filter field is the “i” used by the OECD CRS interface. This could replace the current glossary page.
- If more than one field is used in the date filter field (planned start date and actual start date) for queries, this information should appear as a column in the row data that is accessible for download. This would enable users to do analysis by year using the CSV download.
- Add a column to display the gender equality policy marker and a column for sector in the CSV available for download.
- Replace the status code in the CSV download with the status name or add the status name as an additional column.
- Add the definition of private sector outflows to IATI's documentation.
- Show each transaction type as separate columns rather than aggregating them.

Figure 1. Sample of OECD CRS fields



Flows based on individual projects (CRS)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Aid activities targeting Global Environmental Objectives	i
<input type="checkbox"/>	Aid projects targeting gender equality and womens empowerment (CRS)	i
<input type="checkbox"/>	Creditor Reporting System (CRS)	i
<input type="checkbox"/>	CRS Grant Equivalent	i
<input type="checkbox"/>	Members' total use of the multilateral system	i
<input type="checkbox"/>	Private Philanthropy for Development (CRS)	i

IATI's Datastore

Philanthropic organizations are not using the IATI Standard to publish data on the activities they are funding. To be able to use data published in the IATI Datastore as a reliable source of philanthropic funding for development and for gender equality, the IATI Secretariat could promote the publication of data using the IATI Standard by philanthropic organizations and promote the use of the “collaboration type” field.

In parallel, improvements can be made to the IATI Datastore interface to provide a more intuitive user experience:

- For reports that have an output format by transaction, if users select additional data fields, it removes existing columns from the default CSV file and does not add any additional columns to the file. This appears to be a bug. By removing existing columns from the CSV file, this bug makes the CSV hard for users to read. By not enabling users to add additional data to the CSV file, like sectors, it limits the types of analysis users can do with the transactional data. The “collaboration type” field should be mandatory for publishers. For example, Comic Relief, which is a UK-based foundation, does not tag their funding as “private sector outflows” in the “collaboration type”, which means their funding is not included in the query results of this report.
- Make the option of downloading a sample of the query results or the full dataset more visible.
- Improve the interface to preview query results, as currently only three columns are visible.
- Encourage organizations to exclude commas from their organization names. Using commas makes it difficult to convert to columns function in Excel for data cells that have more than one organization in them. For example The Albert B. Sabin Vaccine Institute, Inc. could drop “, Inc.” or the comma before “, Inc.”

Annex – Raw Data

Overall results data for each data source can be accessed [here](#).

1. [SDGfunders](#)
2. [360Giving](#)
3. [OCHA FTS](#)
4. [OECD CRS](#)
5. [IATI d-portal](#)
6. [IATI Datastore](#)

Making international development data easier to gather, use, and understand.



For information or inquiries, please contact us at info@developmentgateway.org

Development Gateway, Inc.
1100 13th St NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005 USA
+1 202 572 9200



@DGateway
developmentgateway.org
