
Invest, Educate, Engage, Ask: Strategies for Increasing Individual Giving to LGBTQ Rights in the Global South and East

written by Kris Abrams with Katherine Acey





The Global Philanthropy Project (GPP) was formed in 2008 out of a convening of donors in Bellagio, Italy, hosted by the Arcus Operating Foundation. One of the strategic goals of GPP is to catalyze individual donors, private and public foundations, government funders and corporations to support the human rights of LGBT people globally. The following organizations support its work financially and/or through ongoing engagement with GPP's Coordinating Committee:

- Arcus Operating Foundation
- Astraea Foundation
- The Atlantic Philanthropies
- Dreilinden gGmbH
- HIVOS
- Ford Foundation
- Open Society Foundations
- Wellspring Advisors

In early 2011, GPP engaged Kris Abrams and Katherine Acey to critically review current individual donor outreach efforts to fund international LGBT work and to issue recommendations as to how to strengthen this area of work. This report is the result of that engagement and is submitted by the authors to the GPP Coordinating Committee. The members of the GPP Coordinating Committee are grateful to the authors for their thoughtfulness and commitment.

The opinions and findings in this report reflect views gathered by the authors during individual interviews and reviews of literature and do not necessarily reflect the views of the members of the Global Philanthropy Project.

I. Executive Summary

In some countries in the global South and East, LGBTQ rights activists face shocking levels of legalized violence and oppression; in others, LGBTQ rights movements have achieved phenomenal successes, enshrining rights not yet attained in the U.S. What these activists, organizations and movements have in common is a vision of a world where LGBTQ people have equal rights and opportunities to achieve their full potential, and a very real and dire need for funding to make this vision a reality.

This paper was commissioned by the Global Philanthropy Project (GPP), a consortium of institutional funders dedicated to increasing funding to LGBTQ rights organizations in the global South and East. It seeks to conduct a critical review of current individual donor fundraising efforts for LGBTQ work in the global South and East and to answer the following questions: “Who’s giving, who isn’t giving but has the capacity to do so, and how do we access and engage these people?” This paper is the first to focus on increasing funding for LGBTQ rights in the global South and East via individual donors.

This research began with a review of the existing literature. Because the building blocks of major donor philanthropy are personal connections and relationships, in-depth individual interviews were selected as the primary tool for expanding the knowledge base. The GPP supplied an initial list of prospective interviewees; interviewees were asked for recommendations for other people to interview and the list expanded from there. Interviews were 60 minutes in length and were conducted in June, July and August 2011. Interviewees included staff members responsible for raising money from individual donors for international LGBTQ rights and human rights organizations, major donors who contribute to global LGBTQ rights causes, fundraising staff from public foundations that make grants to international LGBTQ organizations, experts in using social media for social change and philanthropy, and other experts on individual giving. The complete list of interviewees may be found in Appendix A.

No research has been done on individual giving support to LGBTQ groups in the global South and East. *A Global Gaze*, a 2008 report by the Funders for LGBTQ Issues, focused on institutional giving to LGBTQ rights in the global South and East. However, the report includes the finding that more than half of the 163 organizations that participated in the study reported they didn’t receive *any* revenue from individual donors or members for their annual budget. Of the groups that did receive individual support, the median amount was \$2,000.

The vast majority of interview participants expressed excitement and optimism at the prospect of organizing a multi-stakeholder campaign to increase individual giving to global

LGBTQ rights organizations. Interviewees stressed the critical importance of in-depth donor engagement and education, and noted that donor leadership would dramatically increase the effectiveness of such a campaign. Interviewees discussed the effectiveness of Women Moving Millions, Women Donors Network, giving circles, the City Committees of Human Rights Watch, and a challenge Tim Gill laid down at the 2009 OutGiving conference. These donor engagement models are described in detail in the full paper.

The U.S. is ripe for such a campaign, interviewees believe, because of the culture of philanthropy, changing attitudes toward LGBTQ rights, and the presence of major donors who could play a leadership role. Western Europe possesses these same ingredients. Several interviewees argued persuasively that fundraising in the global South and East is important as well, both to support the long-term sustainability and independence of local movements, and to ensure that money isn't left on the table. Interviewees pointed out that the methods of fundraising must be carefully tailored to fit the philanthropic culture of the country.

Interviewees also noted that the timing is right for such a campaign, due to the increased awareness of oppression and violence faced by LGBTQ activists in the global South, increasingly positive attitudes about LGBTQ rights in many countries, and the fact that, with the right capacity and resources, it is possible to increase individual giving even during times of economic recession.

Critically, nearly every interviewee stressed that individual fundraising requires a significant investment of time and money. Individual fundraising requires skilled fundraisers, and a commitment on the part of the organization to invest in fundraising infrastructure and in training staff, board and volunteers. Importantly, while LGBTQ public foundations and organizations may have a vision of how they could engage individual donors to maximize giving if they had adequate resources, most do not have these resources. Time and time again, interviewees stressed that there is no silver bullet. They said that increasing individual giving to global LGBTQ causes will take time and that a campaign needs to be designed strategically and thoughtfully, and involve multiple prongs. Some of these multiple prongs include:

- 1) Investment in individual donor fundraising programs and capacity of organizations and public foundations;
- 2) Public and donor education about LGBTQ rights movements, issues and needs in the global South and East;
- 3) Fundraising in multiple regions. Some interviewees proposed launching a campaign in select cities/regions first, to generate momentum and ensure that donors and

activists can meet regularly to move the campaign forward;

- 4) Fundraising from major donors via a donor engagement and leadership model such as a giving circle, Women Donors Network, the City Committees of Human Rights Watch, or a Women Moving Millions-like campaign;
- 5) Leveraging the power of the internet to raise money from large numbers of micro-donors;
- 6) For all of the above, draw on the experience of those already developing donor bases around the world.

Based on all the interviews, reports and other research, we, the authors of this report, recommend the following next steps:

- 1) Organize and convene leaders from LGBT organizations in the global South and East, public and private foundations supporting this work, and individual donors who could play a leadership role. Interviewees stressed the importance of not reproducing dynamics of power and control by assuming the needs of people in the global South and East. Any potential campaign or effort will need to involve LGBTQ activists from these regions as equal partners from the beginning. Following are recommended primary goals for the convening:
 - i. Determine the vision and values for this campaign. These will then be used to guide and check any methods and actions adopted. This may be obvious, but all too often this step is skipped at the beginning of a new project, organization or coalition, leading to schisms and confusion down the line.
 - ii. Introduce prospective donor-leaders to LGBTQ leaders to begin to develop relationships of trust, mutual respect, and equality.
 - iii. Determine what kind of resources LGBTQ organizations and foundations need in order to boost capacity to support a large-scale individual donor fundraising effort.
 - iv. Facilitate the donor leaders to choose what kind of donor engagement model they want to use.
 - v. Obtain commitments from donors to make a large initial investment and to serve as donor leaders in the campaign.
 - vi. Brainstorm next steps for each prong of the campaign.
- 2) Based on input received at the convening, invest in individual donor fundraising capacity of LGBTQ organizations in the global South and East, and in public LGBTQ foundations supporting this work.

- 3) Research and design effective options and messaging for donating to LGBTQ rights work in the South and East. This work could be done in advance of the convening.
- 4) Research and develop options for large-scale micro-donor internet engagement and fundraising. Allout.org could provide valuable insight and partnership. This work could be done in advance of the convening.
- 5) Research and make recommendations on the geographic strategy for this campaign, answering the questions, what cities/regions should be prioritized and what criteria should be used for prioritizing regions?

Based on the interviews, the need is real; so also is the energy, excitement, commitment, and timing. The time has come to make the investments needed to strengthen and expand individual donor engagement, education, and giving to LGBT rights causes globally.

II. Appreciation

The authors of this report wish to share heartfelt appreciation to the people interviewed for this report. These busy people shared freely of their time and expertise, spoke honestly, critically, and insightfully about their experiences, and expressed great enthusiasm and support for this project. Thank you. We sincerely hope that this paper contributes to supporting LGBT rights around the world.

III. Introduction

Consider just a few of the events in 2011 that are relevant to LGBTQ rights:

- Lawmakers passed legislation legalizing same-sex marriage in New York State.
- The “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” act was repealed in Fall 2011.
- Nepal became the world’s first country to include a third gender, a category for transgender people, in its census.
- In January, David Kato, a founder of the Ugandan LGBTQ rights movement, was murdered. Kato had been campaigning against a piece of legislation that would have introduced the death penalty for homosexuals.

LGBTQ human rights activists around the world share a vision for freedom, safety, and equality. Our struggle is one struggle. But the landscapes in which this struggle is waged are very different around the world. While LGBTQ activists have generated a great deal of momentum and positive victories in the U.S. this year, other countries are even further along. According to The International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association's (ILGA) May 2011 report, 7 nations ban sexual orientation discrimination in their constitutions, 10 nations allow marriage equality, and 20 countries have passed hate crimes legislation based on sexual orientation.

At the other end of the spectrum, oppression is still severe, and levels of violence high. 76 nations impose imprisonment or corporal punishment against LGBTQ people. 5 nations impose the death penalty. And that is just legalized discrimination: LGBTQ people are still murdered with impunity outside the law.

To complicate matters, Western culture and imperialism have had a disproportionate impact on fundamentalist forces in many countries. The anti-sodomy laws in many African countries were written by colonialists who were disturbed by local sexual behavior.¹ David Kato had been campaigning against a piece of legislation that would have introduced the death penalty for LGBTQ people in Uganda at the time of his murder; the legislation was brought just a month after American evangelicals held a conference in the capital condemning homosexuality. The evangelicals preached that gay people were undermining the traditional African family.

Efforts to advance the rights of LGBTQ people internationally have launched and grown with alacrity. *A Global Gaze*, a 2008 report by the Funders for LGBTQ Issues, conducted research on 163 participating LGBTQ organizations in the global South and East. 62% of these organizations were founded between 2000 and 2007. And the Movement Advancement Project points out in its 2008 report, *International LGBT Advocacy Organizations and Programs*, that several major human rights organizations have established LGBT programs or incorporated LGBT concerns into their existing agendas.

However, despite both the inspiring victories and the extreme challenges of striving for LGBTQ rights internationally, despite the disproportionate impact Western influence has had on anti-gay sentiment abroad, and despite the very clear need and potential for change, international activists have very few resources to advance LGBTQ human rights.

¹ Howden, D. (2010, January 11). *The love that still dare not speak its name*. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/africa/the-love-that-still-dare-not-speak-its-name-1863913.html>.

Funding for LGBTQ rights in the global south and east

A Global Gaze found that the majority of the LGBTQ groups working in the global South and East operate on budgets of less than \$50,000 per year, with few to no paid staff members. Of the 163 LGBTQ organizations in the global South and East that participated in the research study, half reported that they didn't receive any funding from foundations, and 81% reported not receiving any government funding. For the groups that do receive grants, 65% of grants awarded in 2007 were for project support; nearly 90% of grants were for a duration of only one year. Furthermore, LGBTQ groups working on international LGBTQ issues but based in the global North received 38% of all funding reported. In fact, while groups in South Africa received the most funding, organizations in the U.S., Sweden and Belgium received the next largest amounts of funding, respectively. Institutional funders reported giving a total of \$23.9 million to global South and East LGBTQ causes – a small amount given the need, but a positive increase from the \$10.5 million reported in 2005.

In comparison, consider the findings from *Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender And Queer Grantmaking By U.S. Foundations*, a 2009 report from Funders for LGBTQ Issues. In 2009, U.S.-based foundations awarded a total of \$93.5 million to LGBTQ organizations. While the report emphasizes that this is a 12% decrease from 2008, for the purposes of this paper, it is relevant to look at the geographic distribution of funds. Just 14% of these funding dollars were awarded to organizations that operate internationally, and half of this international funding went to organizations based in the U.S. Thus, U.S.-based foundations provided some \$80.4 million to national, regional and local LGBT causes in the U.S., and just \$13.1 million to the rest of the world – with about half of this to organizations based in the U.S. that work on a global level.

No comparable research has been done on individual giving support to LGBTQ groups in the global South and East. However, more than half of the 163 organizations that participated in the *A Global Gaze* study reported they didn't receive *any* revenue from individual donors or members for their annual budget. Of the groups that did receive individual support, the median amount was \$2,000.

Based on this data, support for organizations working for LGBTQ rights in the global South and East is extremely low. The majority of funding comes from foundations, and the vast majority of foundation funding is for one year only. Interviewees noted the burden this places on those that work for a small to mid-size non-profit organizations, noting the stressful and unsustainability of this situation, on the individual, organizational, and movement levels.

In 2008, a group of funders and human rights activists convened in Bellagio, Italy to discuss this dire situation and strategize solutions. The majority of the preparatory research for

the convening, as well as the discussion in the meeting, focused on the funding patterns of institutional donors and how to increase funding for international LGBTQ causes via private grantmaking foundations. But participants also noted the importance of maximizing funding from individuals as well. The meeting resulted in a commitment from participants to launch a joint effort to increase global philanthropy to support international LGBTQ rights issues. The resulting consortium of funders, the Global Philanthropy Project (GPP), is supported financially by a number of funders.

Why focus on individual donors?

Institutional funders are attractive because grants can be large and it takes less organizational capacity to write a grant proposal and build relationships with foundation staff, than to engage in the long term relationship-building required for cultivating individual major donors. However, Interviewees noted the following challenges associated with foundations (and note that many of these points have corollaries with government funding as well):

- In the U.S., if a foundation’s mission is to exist in perpetuity, the amount a typical foundation pays out tends to remain at 5% (or slightly more) of the value of its assets over the preceding three to five years.² Thus most foundations decrease giving in times of economic recession – meaning it is unlikely they will increase giving to grantees, or consider adding new causes to funding portfolios.
- Funders have launched several long-term efforts to recruit new foundations to fund international LGBT rights organizations. According to a recent paper circulated by Andrew Park of Wellspring Advisors, the results of these efforts have been slow.³
- Numerous research papers point out that, in contrast to rightwing foundations, liberal foundations tend to provide year-long support for a particular project, rather than multi-year general operating support. This makes it hard for small organizations to create sustainable working conditions and plan boldly for the long term.
- Some reporting requirements and long funding timelines make it difficult for organizations to seize moments of opportunity to build movements, since these opportunities often can’t often be anticipated when the proposal is being written.
- The attitudes of some foundation board members and executives can constitute a conservative force. In the Arcus report focused on increasing funding from foundations for international LGBT causes, *Mobilizing Resources*, half of all respondents to a survey on this issue said that the “lack of institutional support for work on LGBT rights issues (e.g., board, executive management)” created a “very significant” barrier to increasing funding for LGBT rights internationally.

² Park, A. (2011). *Let's get down to brass tacks*. Paper circulated to colleagues, p. 4, and personal communication.

³ Ibid.

Participants said foundation leaders fear controversy and therefore shy away from supporting LGBT human rights work.

- The board of directors and executive management of foundations *usually* hail from the elite strata of society. This means that, while the goal may be to redistribute resources from centers of power and wealth to groups seeking to challenge oppressive systems, the elite still control the way this wealth is redistributed. Unless a foundation is intentional about involving diverse groups in the leadership and decision-making, grantmakers may not be accountable to the communities they serve.

Fundraising from individual donors is rife with its own challenges, but not the same ones. While some individual donors have had to decrease their giving due to the economic recession, others have not, and in some cases, individual donors have been able to increase their giving. Additionally, organizations with strong fundraising infrastructure can focus energy on cultivating new individual donors in these times. The growth of Human Rights Watch and Urgent Action Fund for Women's Human Rights during the recession, both of which have prioritized growing their individual donor bases, attests to this. Andrew Park points out that "Global human rights organizations who have significant individual donor bases are weathering the economic crises better than those that do not," and "international giving portals report that individual giving in 2010 did not decrease to the same extent institutional giving decreased."

Individual donors tend to give money for general operating support, and are often, when asked, open to making multi-year commitments. Individual donors usually don't have rigid reporting requirements, and in fact may be excited by an organization showing initiative to seize the moment. Seizing moments of opportunity or responding to unanticipated crises are critical to building movements. When an organization has engaged its donors with respect and depth, the organization can call on donors in critical moments, share the circumstances on the ground, ask for additional funding, and receive a timely answer.

Generally, individuals can make their own funding choices based on their own politics (though family members of family foundations can struggle with political disagreements).

Lastly, raising money from individual donors can play a critical role in movement-building. Donors, after all, are people capable of taking action. Individual donor fundraising bears many similarities to community organizing in that one must develop authentic and trusting relationships, encourage the individual's leadership, provide educational opportunities for the individual to learn about the issues, and inspire the individual to take action with increasing levels of commitment and risk.

Andrew Park shared his experience as an individual donor fundraiser:

Individual donors became the most stable source of volunteers, board members and community gatekeepers that I had. An individual donor will be more likely than anyone else to sign a petition, write a letter or make a phone call. Individual donors take a financial stake in an organization and as such they are motivated to see that the organization is successful. They require a kind of daily accountability that is not provided by institutions or by government elites... When donors are seen as part of the program, not just as an ATM, such donors add an integrated bench strength beyond staff and board.⁴

Further, given the advent of internet technology, options are now available to reach hundreds of thousands of people and solicit micro-donations – opening up new possibilities for mechanisms of accountability, the sharing of power, and movement-building.

While interviewees stressed the importance of individual donors, they did not suggest that foundation funding should not also be pursued. *Mobilizing Resources* put forth a number of proactive steps that can be taken to increase funding from foundations. This paper emphasizes the strategic and critical value in creating and employing strategies for increasing funding from individuals across a spectrum of income and wealth as well.

Purpose, methodology, and the Global Philanthropy Project

The Global Philanthropy Project (GPP) commissioned this paper, requesting that we conduct a critical review of current individual donor outreach efforts to fund international LGBT work, and to answer the questions, “Who’s giving, who isn’t giving but has the capacity to do so, and how do we access and engage these people?” The ultimate goal is to increase funding for LGBTQ rights in the global South and East. This paper is the first to focus on increasing funding for LGBTQ rights in the global South and East via individual donors.

The GPP is a consortium of funders with a mission to expand global philanthropy to support the human rights of LGBTQ people, especially in the global south and east. The GPP grew out of a convening of funders hosted by the Arcus Foundation in Bellagio, Italy in 2008. A number of funders support the GPP, including the Arcus Foundation, the Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice, Atlantic Philanthropies, the Ford Foundation, Hivos, and the Open Society Foundations.

This research began with a review of existing literature. Because the building blocks of major donor philanthropy are personal connections and relationships, we selected in-depth

⁴ Ibid.

individual interviews as the primary tool for expanding the knowledge base. We felt that individual interviews would best leverage existing relationships, result in the most frank and open exchange of ideas, and possibly also serve a catalytic function for future goals of GPP.

The GPP supplied an initial list of prospective interviewees; interviewees were asked for recommendations for other key people to interview and the list expanded from there. Interviews were 60 minutes in length and were conducted in June, July and August 2011. Interviewees included staff members responsible for raising money from individual donors for global LGBTQ rights and human rights organizations, major donors who contribute to global LGBTQ rights causes, fundraising staff from public foundations that make grants to international LGBTQ organizations, experts in using social media for social change and philanthropy, and other experts on individual giving. For the purposes of this paper, we focused on traditional LGBTQ human rights activism, including activism seeking social, political and economic rights for LGBTQ people via methods such as advocacy, community organizing, consciousness-raising, public education, and direct action. The complete list of interviewees may be found in Appendix A.

About the research team

Kris Abrams authored this paper and served as the project leader. Katherine Acey provided conceptual, strategic, interviewing and editorial support.

Kris Abrams is the Program Officer for Communications and Individual Giving at Urgent Action Fund for Women's Human Rights, an international grantmaking organization based in Boulder, CO. Prior to her work with Urgent Action Fund, Kris served as Senior Producer of the national independent newshour, Democracy Now!, where she helped to expand the radio program with three staff members and twenty affiliate stations to a radio/TV/internet broadcast with twenty staff members and 200 stations.

Kris then moved to Colorado to lead the Boulder-based community radio station KGNU's expansion into Denver, raising over \$1 million from individual donors in seven months. After that she trained, apprenticed and worked for the Peacemaker Institute of Colorado, and moved on to found a multi-racial, multi-issue movement-building organization in Denver called Let Us Rise.

Kris holds undergraduate degrees from Brown University in Neuroscience and Philosophy of Science, and her Master's in Social and Economic History from Oxford University as a Rhodes Scholar. Kris is currently obtaining her second Master's in Counseling Psychology from Prescott College in Arizona, specializing in wilderness therapy and Ecopsychology.

Kris is committed to building movements that cut across traditional divisions, integrate personal and societal transformation, respect and honor nature, and model the world we wish to see at every step. Contact: abrams.kris@gmail.com.

Katherine Acey served as the Executive Director of Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice for twenty-three years, until 2010. She now holds the title of Executive Director Emeritus. Under her stewardship in 1990, Astraea established the nation's first Lesbian Writers Fund, in 1996 created the International Fund for Sexual Minorities and in 2006 launched the U.S. Movement Building Initiative to support people of color LGBTQ organizations to build their power and voice.

From 1982 to 1987, Katherine served as the Associate Director of the North Star Fund in New York City, overseeing its grants programs and participating in donor engagement and fundraising. She has been involved in the Women's Funding Network since its inception, serving as both board member and chair. She is also a founding member and past chair of the Funders for LGBTQ Issues and has served as a board or advisory member to numerous organizations. Current affiliations include: Board Member and Treasurer for both the International Network of Women's Funds and Political Research Associates; and Steering Committee Member for the Public Foundations Project. Until her departure from Astraea she served on the Steering Committee of the Global Philanthropy Project: Expanding Resources for LGBT People.

For her leadership in building a multi-cultural women's funding movement, Katherine was honored twice by the Women's Funding Network. Among her other honors are the Cross Cultural Black Women's Studies Institute for International Women's Leadership Award, the NYC National Organization for Women Susan B. Anthony Award, the Women & Philanthropy LEAD Award, the FEX Vision Award for achievements in social justice, the Lambda Legal Defense and Education Liberty Award and the Women e-news 21 Leaders for the 21st Century Award.

Katherine has traveled extensively in the U.S. and internationally speaking on issues of philanthropy, sexual orientation, race and class. She has participated in numerous women's, LGBTI or philanthropy convenings in Africa, Asia, Latin American, the Middle East and Europe.

She received her B.A. in Sociology from Daemen College and her M.S. in Community Organizing and Planning from Columbia University School Social Work.

IV. The Current Philanthropic Landscape: Context, Trends and Opportunities

What are the major kinds of funding fueling LGBTQ movements and where does it come from?

A 2008 report by the Funders for LGBTQ Issues, *A Global Gaze*, found that in 2007, 40 grantmakers from 18 countries awarded 451 grants to LGBT organizations and projects working in the Global South and East, reaching 79 countries and regions. In total, these grantmakers awarded \$26 million, up from \$10.5 million in 2005. LGBT groups based in the global North and working at the international level received 38% of the funding awarded. Grantmakers in North America and Western Europe provided nearly every funding dollar – 96%.

No comparable research has been done to map individual giving to LGBTQ causes in the global South and East, and a comprehensive study was not possible within the scope of this project. However, as noted above, *A Global Gaze* did report that more than half of the 163 participating organizations didn't receive any revenue from individual donors or members for their annual budget. Of the groups that did receive individual support, the median amount was \$2,000.

Interviewees were asked background questions concerning their organizations' budget size, the percentage that comes from individual donors as opposed to institutional funding, and where in the world these individual donors reside. Findings include the following trends:

- Budgets ranged from 92,000 Euros (Calala) to \$56 million (Human Rights Watch).
- Some organizations do not raise any money from individual donors (UHAI and Council for Global Equality). At the other end of the spectrum, Human Rights Watch raises two-thirds of its budget from individual donors.
- Donors are mostly located in the U.S. and Western Europe, depending on the location of the organization. Almost all of the donors to the U.S.-based International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (IGLHRC) are also based in the U.S. The donors to Mama Cash are located in Western Europe. The donors to Calala are concentrated in Spain. The donors to Filia are German. Human Rights Watch was the only organization interviewed that raises significant amounts of money from a region other than that in which it is headquartered. Approximately two-thirds of HRW's donors are located in the U.S.; the other third are primarily in Western Europe. HRW also receives gifts from Tokyo and Saudi Arabia. A closer examination of HRW's fundraising model is included below.

Based on interview findings, it's possible to conclude that some organizations are raising significant amounts of money for LGBT rights issues in the global South and East, largely from individual donors in the U.S. and Western Europe.

What efforts have already been undertaken to increase individual giving to LGBTQ rights in the global South and East?

Organizations such as IGLHRC, Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice, and Human Rights Watch raise money for their international LGBTQ program work from individual donors. Several interviewees said there has never been a concerted, multi-organization, donor-led effort to raise money for international LGBTQ movements and causes from individual donors. Interviewees saw a great deal of potential in launching such a campaign.

A group of LGBTQ donors launched OutGiving in 1996 to provide an opportunity for donors to network, learn about LGBTQ causes and giving, and interact with LGBTQ rights leaders. The conference, now housed at the Gill Foundation, is held every two years and is geared toward individual donors who give \$25,000 or more annually. According to the recently launched website, OutGiving has “inspired hundreds of donors to give more strategically and more generously to improve the lives of LGBT people across the country and around the world.”

Prior to 2009, the Gill Foundation's National OutGiving conferences had focused on the landscape of LGBTQ equality on the local, state and national levels. However, in 2009, at the height of the global economic recession, the conference held its first panel on international LGBTQ rights and included the Astraea Foundation's International Fund for Sexual Minorities among its collaborative presentations. LGBTQ leaders from Europe and the global South spoke about their work and identified opportunities and obstacles, including the limited resources at their disposal. Tim Gill opened the conference telling donors that the Foundation's endowment was down by 30%, but that it was a time not to pull back; rather, it was a time to be bold. At the end of the international panel, Tim was so inspired that he extended a \$100,000 challenge gift. According to Patricia Evert, who produced the OutGiving conference for years, donors had indicated that they were hesitant to make changes to their giving. However, inspired by the international panelists and Tim's challenge, the Gill Foundation was able to secure the \$100,000 from donors to meet the match.

Some interviewees generally regarded OutGiving as a good start, and that it would make a powerful ally in a major effort to increase giving to LGBTQ rights in the South and East. But they felt that OutGiving would not be the right place to house such an effort. First, the Gill Foundation remains focused on domestic LGBTQ rights causes. Secondly, OutGiving does not currently provide the level of engagement, the sense of community, and individual accountability that such a campaign would require.

One interviewee, who has been a longtime “OutGiver,” clarified that while OutGiving has been phenomenally successful at educating donors about the basics, it is not a traditional donor network in that members don’t engage and meet in between the biannual conferences, participate in donor circles, and so on. “We do not have a functioning gay and lesbian national or international network of individual donors. That’s organizing that should be happening.” The interviewee also felt that because of this vacuum, many donors go to OutGiving once and then don’t return because they need a higher level of engagement.

Interviewees also pointed out that OutGiving’s singular focus on gay rights means that oppressions that intersect with and in LGBTQ communities often go unaddressed. For example, one interviewee shared that lesbians within the Women Donors Network (WDN) had become accustomed to both the respect they received as women in WDN, and to WDN’s focus on social justice. When these same lesbian donors attended OutGiving, they felt that men were not respectful and not focused on social justice, and so they continued to focus their time and energy within WDN.

Another major donor who has participated in OutGiving expressed a wish to live in and co-create a world that is not only accepting of gender expression and sexual orientation, but also one that is economically, environmentally and racially just. The interviewee expressed concern that OutGiving’s mainstream LGBT framework is missing an opportunity to educate donors, across divides, and break down the “siloes” nature of our movements:

This challenge is not just for OutGiving, but for most donor spaces. In donor-centric spaces, you shape conversations to be ones where donors are comfortable. The plus side is that you meet donors where they’re at – it’s a way to expand the pie. The downside is that oppressive power dynamics can be replicated. If you don’t explicitly bring issues of economic, racial and gender justice into the conversation, in a space where people have been well-served by those systems, these issues get left out.

OutGiving has made significant contributions to raising awareness of and expanding funding for domestic LGBTQ rights causes, and some headway in expanding awareness and funding for international LGBTQ rights issues. Several interviewees expressed that OutGiving could be a powerful ally in launching a campaign to increase awareness and funding for international LGBTQ rights work. Interviewees also noted the need for a different kind of model for donor engagement that would increase funding for global LGBTQ rights work.

Timing and historical context

Interviewees generally agreed that the global economic recession has had an impact on individual giving, but not a dire impact, that the economy has recovered somewhat, and that the current economic context would not pose too much of an obstacle to a campaign to increase individual giving for global LGBTQ rights. In fact, Ise Bosch saw the economic climate as an opportunity, because people of wealth are seeing how much their support is needed. Patricia Evert recalled Tim Gill's \$100,000 challenge at OutGiving in 2009, at the height of the recession. She said that when donors gain a better understanding of the need, and appropriate funding vehicles, they will respond. She also cited the results of the OutGiving surveys, in which a substantial percentage of donors said they intend to increase their giving in the coming years. (See below for more info on both of these points.)

Further, interviewees said they believe Westerners are more aware of the oppression and violence faced by LGBTQ activists in the global South and East than ever before, following the murder of David Kato in Uganda.

Some interviewees pointed out that attitudes about LGBTQ rights have transformed to such an extent in the U.S. that more people would be willing to support such a campaign, including straight allies and conservatives. Tim Sweeney, Executive Director of the Gill Foundation, said: "There has been a major shift in public attitude and policy in U.S. Now is the time to step up! There's never been greater opportunity, need, and allies who are reframing how LGBT people fit into their core values, beliefs."

V. How do we access and engage major donors to give to international LGBTQ rights?

Donors aren't piggybanks: the need for donor engagement and leadership

Individual giving experts agree that the key to individual donor fundraising is relationships. Kim Klein is well-known for saying that fundraisers don't raise money, we raise relationships.

How are relationships "raised"? It isn't all that different from community organizing, or from establishing any other kind of meaningful relationship. Donors must be perceived and treated as whole people, not just a means to an end, in this case, funding. Donors give money because they are passionate about an issue, they want to make a difference, and because they are asked by a living and breathing person to whom they are connected.

Additionally, many donors who have sufficient time and passion want to go beyond just doing the due diligence necessary to find and give to effective organizations. They want to engage with the issues, learn, and form meaningful relationships with other donors and/or with activists. In this era, institutions separate us from each other based on race, class, gender, sexual orientation, nationality, and more. Well-meaning donors, like well-meaning activists, want to form meaningful relationships that span these divisions. It is a human yearning, a yearning for connection and wholeness that transcends the dehumanizing cleavages and prejudices in our world. Additionally, many donors have leadership skills that they want to exercise for a good cause. Like any other human being, they desire to make a difference by contributing in ways in which they are competent, not just by giving money.

Tracy Gary shared: "The reason I gave away \$1.2 million is because of the relationships I formed with people through the site visits I did... Giving is accelerated by the partnerships that happen when you take a group of donors and have a shared experience, and you go build relationships, it accelerates the commitment to giving. We haven't figured out how to do that globally, with queer organizations and initiatives."

Just about every interviewee stressed, "There is no silver bullet here": networking, obtaining introductions to people, and building relationships, requires a committed investment of time and money. We heard repeatedly, "It's fundraising 101." Further, some interviewees pointed out that people rarely decide to become philanthropic and suddenly make very large donations out of the blue. Rather, people tend to start small and, as their trust in a particular organization and people grows, give more and more. Fundraising experts Kim Klein and Stephanie Roth said that building a donor base is about engaging people you know at all levels. It's important to start where you are and with whom you

have, and not focus on high net-worth people to whom you don't have access.

Generally speaking, donors prefer to be asked for gifts by other donors. It is a very different experience to be asked for a large gift by a salaried fundraiser, than to be asked by one's peer who is also giving large gifts. In the peer-to-peer relationship, the class tension is not there, at least not in the same way or to the same degree. Ise Bosch of the German women's fund Filia did a survey of Filia donors, asking, "Who would you rather be approached by?" Overwhelmingly, donors responded, "by other donors." The challenge is sometimes to find other donors who are willing to play this role – Ise added that hardly anyone surveyed said they would be willing to make those approaches.

Patricia Evert adds that inspiration is another component of the peer-relationship: "Inspiration is critical. Donors are inspired by other donors who help bring them to the table. Personal stories about why donors give, and how they give help to educate and inspire others."

Interviewees, again referring to fundamental individual donor fundraising practices, said there is no secret to identifying prospective donors: cultivate relationships with donors who already give and ask them to identify and open the door to prospective new donors.

Donors need education and clear, persuasive, strategic messaging

The majority of interviewees also pointed out that a major barrier to giving to global LGBTQ rights work is lack of knowledge. Most donors are unaware of a) the serious challenges global LGBTQ rights movements face; b) the inspiring victories groups have achieved in the global South and East; c) the impact that global LGBTQ philanthropy has already had; and/or d) ways to give to organizations and movements based outside the U.S.

If a donor is already aware of the severity of repression some activists face, she/he may feel overwhelmed and unable to make a difference. Others may be overwhelmed at the scope of the problem – just creating change in the U.S. is so much work – how can we take on the world?

Further, as Mitch Singer, Senior Philanthropic Advisor with Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors, noted:

Often donors come to social change grantmaking with the desire to make lasting impact but without the knowledge of how social change happens. Many donors have spent their careers in business, not in philanthropy. So we need to meet them where they are by introducing them to the best thinkers and teaching them about past successes and failures.

Donor engagement and education takes serious, committed investment of time and money

Nearly every interviewee stressed this point. It flows naturally from the first two points made above, that donors need to be engaged in meaningful ways, and that donors often need and welcome education and information on the issues and organizations. This takes people-time (both paid and volunteer), and investment of money to finance effective education and engagement programs.

The problem, interviewees stressed, is that most public foundations and LGBTQ organizations have not had the resources to invest in this. Karen Zelermyer, President/CEO of Funders for LGBTQ Issues, said that her organization has found in its research that public foundations are not resourced enough to do the necessary relationship-building with the high net-worth individuals that they already know, much less identify and cultivate prospective new donors. “Without having the resources to build skills and develop leadership within some of the foundations, it’s challenging... We haven’t nurtured it, haven’t maximized giving potential in the LGBT community.”

Patricia Evert said of grassroots organizations: “A lot of groups have extremely limited capacity. So they’re unable to connect, ask, find these donors... I’m amazed at the work they do with almost nothing. Some of them are almost all volunteer run.”

Wanja Muguongo, Executive Director of UHAI, the East African Sexual Health and Rights Initiative, affirmed this when she explained why UHAI doesn’t have an individual donor program and why she doesn’t anticipate starting one soon, even though she wants to:

Funding from individual donors takes a lot more time than it does from institutional funders. Right now, in our fourth year, we are just trying to grow the fund and grow programming – this doesn’t allow me to spend time on developing an individual donor program. That’s why it’s a long-term plan.

Interviewees said that any attempt to significantly increase the amount of individual giving to global LGBTQ rights movements will require a major investment of funds. The next section highlights four successful models of donor engagement that interviewees pointed to, to illustrate the need for donor engagement and leadership, donor education, and investing money.

VI. What successful models of donor engagement can we learn from?

In the course of the interviews, many interviewees referred to their personal experiences with donor engagement models and shared their opinions about what worked, and what needs to be improved. These insights are invaluable and should be used to inform the creation of an individual donor fundraising strategy for international LGBTQ rights work.

Donor Engagement Model 1: Donor Circles

When a donor passionately believes in a particular cause and wishes to support it with more money than s/he individually can give, s/he may participate in or start a giving circle. Donors have organized giving in various forms for many years. But a particular kind of circle has gained traction in recent years, particularly within the women's funding movement: the donor circle.

The Global Fund for Women started its first donor circle in the early 1990s and focused on the trafficking of women and girls. Twelve donors were invited to join the group. They traveled as a group around the world to visit anti-trafficking activists, and ended up giving more than \$200,000 over three years. According to Tracy Gary, a U.S.-based donor who was part of the circle, the circle was followed by two gifts of \$500,000 each from these same women. The donors earmarked the funds for anti-trafficking, but within that broad framework, gave the Global Fund staff the freedom to allocate those funds to specific projects. Nicky McIntyre, currently Executive Director of Mama Cash, was part of the Global Fund staff at the time. She says:

Those donors became so engaged and knowledgeable about the issue, about which there was very little knowledge at the time, that they actually held the first ever conference about the topic in the US. They made a documentary film about trafficking that is still an important resource... Many of those women who were part of that circle moved on to define themselves as donor-activists – these are mostly women of inherited wealth. They really began their journey into being donor-activists and getting other donors involved, particularly in social change philanthropy.⁵

Most circle members remained major donors to the Global Fund for Women for years afterwards, most became major donors to other organizations, and many wrote the Global Fund for Women into their will. Nicky McIntyre added, "These became almost like ambassadors who could go and talk confidently about the work of the organization because

⁵ Ribeiro, C. (2009, December 8). *Circles, a new angle*. *Civil Society Fundraising*. Retrieved from <http://ejewishphilanthropy.com/circles-a-new-angle/>

they were brought right into it.”⁶ Additionally, some donors and staff of the Global Fund for Women went on to found Urgent Action Fund for Women’s Human Rights, which has given millions of dollars in grants since its founding, indicating that donor circles not only increase funding for the immediate cause, but result in contributions far greater than could ever have been envisioned at the beginning.

Donor circles are not just about raising money: they also build community and educate donors. The model treats donors not as piggybanks, but as whole people who wish to learn and connect with others. Nicky McIntyre suggests this model may appeal more to women than men:

We know that women donors are more likely to want to seek that sense of community than male donors. They think about their philanthropy in a different way. They tend to have a closer feeling about an organization, more of an instinctual feeling about what’s going on. So it’s less about reading reports and more about ‘what’s my gut telling me about what this organization is doing?’⁷

Because this model also requires a great deal of time, it can limit participants to people of inherited wealth who do not work. To engage donors in a newer donor circle who have less time, the Global Fund for Women has set up 90-minute conference call briefings for donors. Donor circles, therefore, present a number of strengths: they provide a vehicle for intensive donor engagement and relationship building. They provide a way for donors to be involved without taking the even bigger step of joining a board of directors and shouldering fiscal responsibility for an organization. They create relationships *between* donors, and create a system of accountability between donors for their giving. They involve donors in, and educate donors about, the issues: donors get to tour organizations, meet activists, and learn in-depth about the programmatic issue being addressed. However, they require a great deal of staff time to organize and facilitate the donor engagement, which in turn takes money.

The donor circle model may need to be modified in order to work in cultures outside of the United States (see the sections below on geographic considerations). The model may also need to be modified if the donor circle seeks to raise money for a consortium or coalition rather than a single organization. For example, some organizations reserve seats on their Board of Directors for grassroots leaders. This ensures that grassroots leaders have input into how the organization spends its money, thus creating a system of philanthropic movement accountability. The organizers of a donor circle focused on supporting more than one organization would need to create a different system of accountability to the movement it serves.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

Donor Engagement Models 2 and 3: Women Donors Network and Women Moving Millions

The Women Donors Network is a U.S.-based national network of women philanthropists, which seeks to build “trusting relationships in a network of women with personal or familial wealth who are committed to building the progressive movement through the power of philanthropy, women’s leadership, and collective and individual action.”

There are about 150 women in the network; to join, members must give \$25,000 or more annually. The network launches circles to address particular issues; for example, after Hurricane Katrina, WDN launched the Gulf Action Circle and raised more than \$2 million from WDN members. WDN also produces trips to educate donors and raise awareness on particular issues. A group of donors recently traveled to Israel and Gaza to learn about the conflict and military occupation of Palestine. WDN estimates that it leverages more than \$100 million a year.⁸

WDN is openly committed to a progressive agenda. WDN “envisions sustainable and caring communities worldwide that are built on respect for diversity, mutual understanding, biodiversity, and the equitable distribution of wealth and power. We work to build a progressive movement that ensures substantial and enduring change of prevailing systems of inequality, exclusion, and oppression. WDN embraces the core progressive ideals of peace; human rights; feminism; and social, political, economic, and environmental justice.”⁹ Tracy Gary, one of the original members of WDN, said that one of the most powerful aspects of the WDN model is the mutual accountability it affords. She said members shared their grants list and helped each other to think through whether the money they gave was helping them to meet their strategic goals.

Women Moving Millions (WMM) is another donor-led philanthropic initiative designed to inspire individual gifts of a million dollars or more to women’s foundations and projects that support women and girls. The initiative was launched in partnership with the Women’s Funding Network, a network of women’s foundations. In May 2009, WMM announced that more than \$182 million had been raised through partnerships between 102 donors and 41 women’s funds.

Interviewees familiar with WMM felt that it has made people think bigger, and that the donors who led this initiative, Helen and Swanee Hunt, achieved a great deal when they successfully encouraged wealthy women to commit money to women and girls. Their role as donor-leaders was critical, both in encouraging other donors to get involved, and in funding the campaign itself. According to one interviewee, these two donors put \$6 million

⁸ “Women Donors Network: Community, Collaboration and Connection, p. 5, retrieved from <http://womendonors.org/document/download/61>.

⁹ Retrieved from http://womendonors.org/section/view/what_we_do

on the table. They had the idea, and they put their money behind it to help finance and launch the campaign.

One interviewee pointed out that, since WMM is comprised of women who give \$1 million or more, it is a very insular group. The interviewee also mentioned that there is a wide range of political beliefs among the donors, and that the money therefore goes to a range of causes, from progressive to liberal to conservative methods of supporting women and girls. WMM is therefore a donor engagement model through which an enormous sum of money was raised, partially by building a very large tent.

The role of lesbians in WDN and WMM is complicated. One lesbian member of WMM said she knows of other lesbians who are closeted. Another interviewee noted that the “women’s funding movement has been challenged to be more inclusive of lesbian and trans issues; these issues overall remain pretty invisible... It’s not a welcoming, open door.” This interviewee saw this project as an opportunity. “It is time to create a donor engagement structure to identify queer high net-worth donors and engage them on international LGBT giving.”

Karen Zelermyer pointed out that some preliminary work would need to be done before the LGBTQ movement could adopt a model such as WMM, because the LGBTQ movement isn’t in the same place as the women’s movement was when WMM was launched. She believes public LGBTQ foundations don’t currently have the resources to build the capacity necessary to partner with donors in a WMM-style campaign. “These are the two essential ingredients,” she said, “having resources and investment to build capacity of existing organizations – whether public foundations or organizations – and having high net-worth individuals who are willing to step forward, model, and lead.” Zelermyer suggested that the LGBTQ movement may already have such leaders who could step up and play this role. But the work, she noted, will be slow because capacity-building must happen first.

WDN and WMM, both donor engagement models in the women’s funding movement, have strengths and weaknesses. As with giving circles, WDN and WMM engage donors, create opportunities for donors to build relationships and to lead. Both are led by donors. Donors encourage each other in both models to give to women’s causes, creating a peer-to-peer system of accountability regarding how they direct their funds. WDN involves participants intimately in donor education and engagement programs. WDN has clearly articulated a progressive vision and values, a vision which includes dismantling the systems that create poverty and the large accumulations of wealth that make philanthropy possible in the first place. WMM has kept its goals more broad, which allows it to engage more philanthropists and bring in more money, but also means that the money raised may not necessarily fund projects seeking to transform those economic systems. Finally, WMM thinks big, and the results are subsequently big.

Donor Engagement Model 4: Human Rights Watch

Human Rights Watch (HRW) campaigns for human rights all over the world, and has an LGBT Rights program. The organization has a budget of \$56 million – dramatically increased from around \$8 million just fifteen years ago. Then, most of HRW’s budget came from foundations. Now, about two-thirds of the annual budget is raised from individual donors, one-third from foundations. HRW accepts no government money, and accepts very few corporate gifts. Since this is the most successful model of individual fundraising for international human rights that we know of, and because HRW has an LGBT program, it is worth examining in more detail. The information presented here came from interviews and email correspondence with Michele Alexander, HRW’s Development and Outreach Director, and Elizabeth Seuling, who directs HRW’s foundation fundraising. Michele Alexander became HRW’s Development and Outreach Director in 1996: she directed the multiplication of HRW’s revenues by seven times.

The focus of HRW’s individual giving program is major donors: 800 donors make up 90% of the giving, and gifts of \$100,000 and above make up 70% of HRW’s revenue. HRW has 30,000 donors in total. HRW devotes different amounts of time and engages in different cultivation strategies depending on the donor’s or prospective donor’s potential capacity. A donor who gives \$10,000 but has capacity to give significantly more may be invited to meet with the Executive Director or to participate in a donor trip, for example. Likewise, a donor giving a gift of \$100,000 or more may be invited to do the same, the objective being to keep them deeply engaged with the organization so they will continue to give at that level over the long term.

Approximately two-thirds of the money HRW raises from individuals comes from donors in the U.S. The other third comes primarily from donors in Western Europe; for the last 6 or 7 years, HRW has had \$100,000 donors in the region.

Michele and Elizabeth don’t believe that individual donor fundraising in Western Europe is significantly different from fundraising in the United States, except that “asks” may be a little less direct. Beyond Europe, Canada, Japan and Saudi Arabia are home to a few significant HRW donors; HRW plans to begin engaging donors more proactively in Asia and the Middle East in the future.

How does HRW do it? The development and outreach department organizes volunteer “City Committees,” usually comprised of 12-15 people each, in various cities around the world. These committees do not have fiduciary responsibility for the budget, like board members do, but in other respects do function as small boards. They raise money, network

in their city, produce outreach events such as panel discussions and seminar series, create partnerships with universities or law firms or other prospective allies, and so on. They meet once per month, conceive of the program in that city for the year, plan it, and execute it.

Members of the City Committees are people who are influential in their communities, affluent (they give at least \$5,000 or \$10,000 each and usually more), highly educated, well travelled. The City Committees are each staffed by a HRW City Director. In cities where HRW has smaller offices, City Directors function largely as Executive Directors. City Directors train the City Committee members as needed. It can be challenging to find the right person to fill this role, as they need a broad skill set. When a City Committee member identifies a prospective new major donor, the member does not have to be the one to ask for money. He or she opens the door for HRW staff to go in and cultivate the relationship.

Michele directed the growth of this fundraising model one or two cities at a time, achieving success in each city before moving on to launch the next one. HRW now has such committees in dozens of cities in the U.S. and around the world.

Michele says she understands that sometimes program staff and leadership at other organizations do not support their own development department. This is not the case at HRW. She says her department “has enjoyed incredible support from its program colleagues, the executive staff, and the board of directors.” She has never had a hard time getting HRW to allocate the money necessary to staff her Development and Outreach department. The board and E.D. understand that programming cannot expand until development is able to raise more money. The fundraising budget for 2011 is \$12 million – 21% of the annual budget, though Michele pointed out that this includes outreach, production of the Annual Report, and other expenses that federal tax laws do not specify as fundraising; she strives to keep the actual fundraising expenses to 18%.

The City Committees serve as training grounds for HRW’s board of directors – 40% of HRW’s board came through their ranks. Generally, HRW’s board nominating committee looks for board members in one of three categories:

- 1) People who are substantive experts in human rights
- 2) Major funders – people who will make investment gifts in the organization, from say \$50,000 to \$1 million
- 3) People who may not have “significant capacity” – perhaps they make a gift of \$5,000 – but they have extensive networks that they use on behalf of HRW, whether those networks are with wealthy philanthropists, the business community, the media world, policy-makers, politicians and governments.

A few things are worth noting about this model. HRW, like Women Moving Millions, was not afraid to think big. HRW established successful networks one city at a time, and created the space for donors to take leadership roles and engage with each other, activists, and the mission of the organization. In this way, a community of engagement, and momentum, is established in a given city. This is very different from a strategy in which a Development Director identifies one or two major donors in each city and tries to engage these people individually. In effect, these City Committees are functioning as a model of peer-to-peer donor engagement, though the focus isn't directly on fundraising. The City Committees also play a valuable educational role, by bringing HRW experts to give talks and present at discussion panels at public events. HRW's leadership sees the importance of investing in fundraising and outreach. HRW exclusively recruits people who bring fundraising, networking, or substantive expertise in human rights for these committees. Some progressive activists might feel that this approach clashes with their values of inclusion and valuing every voice. Progressive groups seeking to replicate this model would need to grapple with this issue.

Leveraging technology to engage microdonors

Many interviewees stressed that it is important to leverage the new fundraising opportunities made possible by new technologies. Patricia Evert shared her perspective:

We didn't have these technologies 20 years ago. I've been working with LGBT communities for years, in the 80s and 90s, with AIDS communities in New York. I've been reflecting on huge events we would do to raise money and take action. We did grassroots organizing – phone-banking, slapping posters up – we didn't even have the internet. It's breathtaking to see what technology can do – hopefully to create substantive change and build movements. So how can you do the hands-on individual cultivation that is needed, and also in tandem, say, 'wow, we've got these incredible technologies, who are the organizations that can best employ those technologies to create change?' Let's take advantage of what we have now, that we didn't before. That said, social media is not a silver bullet, one must know how to best use those vehicles to engage people and get them to give.

Interviewees were in agreement that internet fundraising should form one component of a multi-pronged campaign to raise money.

Avaaz.org, a movement-building, action-oriented, internet organizing website, describes itself as “a global web movement to bring people-powered politics to decision-making everywhere.” Avaaz organizes people by providing savvy, well-polished updates on people's struggles and opportunities for people to take action. Avaaz reports on its website, for example, that it organized members to send 1 million messages to U.N. Security Council

members calling for a no-fly zone over Libya to protect the opposition forces. The UN Ambassador from the US, who did not support the motion until the last minute, publicly thanked Avaaz for the messages. In Italy, when Silvio Berlusconi tried to push through a bill that would have censored his critics on independent TV shows, Italian Avaaz members organized a 70,000-strong petition and thousands of phone calls to parliament. The legislation failed.¹⁰ Avaaz has also supported indigenous people from the Amazon to block the construction of a dam, generated a million signatures calling for a ban on bee-killing pesticides in Europe, and more.

Avaaz boasts nearly 10 million members in 193 countries. Andre Banks, who works for Purpose (www.purpose.com), a company that was co-founded by Jeremy Heimans, the same person who co-founded Avaaz, said that Avaaz got started with major investments from foundations. Only after Avaaz won the trust of its members did it begin to raise money from them to sustain itself; two newspaper articles report that since 2009, 100% of Avaaz's budget came from member donations, and the organization does not accept donations of more than \$5,000 each.^{11, 12} Thus, Avaaz is using well-worn principles of major donor fundraising – the importance of building relationships and trust – to leverage the power of the internet. While in traditional individual donor fundraising, the majority of the budget comes from just a few large gifts, Avaaz is raising a large budget through thousands of “micro-donors.”

Purpose.com has just launched another internet organizing website, AllOut.org. Unlike Avaaz, All Out is focused specifically on international LGBT rights: “All Out is a new campaigning organization adding global people power to the historic fight for LGBT equality.” For example, over 500,000 people signed All Out's petition to stop Uganda's anti-homosexuality bill. The Ugandan Parliament adjourned without passing the legislation.

Andre Banks says All Out is modeled on Avaaz: it was launched with major investments from institutions and high net-worth individuals, is in the process of campaigning, recruiting members and winning their trust, and in 2012 will begin fundraising from its members to sustain itself. All Out has a budget this year of just over \$2 million.

It is encouraging to consider what All Out can accomplish for global LGBTQ rights as it grows. However, Banks clarified that Avaaz and All Out are not conceived as grantmaking organizations, but rather as organizations that identify strategic moments of opportunity where they can add value by quickly funneling resources for campaign expenditures a group wouldn't be able to afford otherwise. For example, “We might not pay for a Malaysian group's operating expenses, but when there's a huge media moment, and we see that we

¹⁰ Info on these and other Avaaz campaigns is available here: <http://www.avaaz.org/en/highlights.php?aboutus>

¹¹ Bentley, S. (9 February, 2011). *Can Avaaz save the world in a click?* *Times of London*. Retrieved from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/48808533/The-Times-profile-of-Avaaz-and-Ricken-Patel-Feb-9-2011>.

¹² Kingsley, P. (21 July 2011). *From the web to the streets*. *Guardian of London*. Retrieved from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/60655424/From-the-Web-to-the-Streets-The-Guardian-s-Patrick-Kingsley-on-the-power-of-clicktivism>

need to run a TV ad for the next three nights, we'll write the check. We don't write blank checks to organizations." Therefore, All Out is not a fundraising portal through which microdonors can give directly to LGBTQ rights organizations in the global South and East. Allout could be a partner and/or advisor to such a portal.

Some interviewees mentioned Kickstarter.com, which allows an individual or group to create a page outlining a project proposal, identify the funds needed to launch the project, and then spread the word about the project to his/her own networks. People can then donate via the site to the project; a donor's account is not charged until the project meets its funding goal. While Kickstarter is focused on creative projects, such as music and art, the implications for activism are clear.

Patricia Evert mentioned Donorschoose.org as another site that has interesting implications for this project. Public school teachers post classroom project requests; similar to Kickstarter, donors are not charged until the project meets its goal. However, rather than automatically depositing the funds into the teacher's account, Donorschoose is a charity that purchases the materials and then delivers them to the school. Donors receive photos of the project taking place, a thank-you letter from the teacher, and a cost report showing how each dollar was spent. Donors who give over \$100 also receive hand-written thank you letters from the students.

Progressive non-profit organizations have long struggled to figure out how to engage donors who cannot afford to give major gifts. Micro and mid-level donors often give a greater percentage of their income compared to major donors. But non-profits simply cannot invest the same amount of time for a \$100 or \$1,000 gift as for a \$100,000 gift. Effective internet and social media strategies provide an option for engaging these donors.

Lastly, interviewees pointed out that technology can even be used to engage major donors at a deep level. Tim Sweeney, Executive Director of the Gill Foundation, said that donors at OutGiving are deeply moved by short speeches and interviews of the many inspiring LGBT activists from the global South and East. When donors don't have the time to make site visits, organizers can produce short videos, or video conference calls with donors, and this strategy can be used with donors who give at all levels. It requires time and investment to do it, but one video can be used to engage an unlimited number of donors.

VII. Where are there opportunities to build new and expand existing donor bases?

The United States

Interviewees consistently perceived the U.S. as the country with the greatest potential for increasing individual giving to international LGBTQ rights issues. They cited three reasons for this:

- a) The U.S. has a strong culture of philanthropy;
- b) There has never been a major donor-led campaign to expand giving to international LGBTQ causes, so the country is relatively “untapped”;
- c) There are major donors who are already giving to this cause and can serve as a model and take leadership roles.

Given that a large portion of the money given to global LGBTQ causes already comes from the U.S., interviewees considered whether it would be better to reach out to new countries and find new sources of money. Interviewees consistently noted that the donor bases in the U.S. and Western Europe are largely untapped: many prospective donors to international LGBTQ causes have never been asked to give.

The culture of philanthropy in the U.S. is well-known; about 7 out of 10 people give money to causes. Is it true that the U.S. has a relatively untapped ‘market’ of major donors for global LGBT rights? In advance of the 2011 OutGiving conference, the major donor networking conference convened by the Gill Foundation every other year, OutGiving staff polled their participants. Consider the following findings:

- “OutGivers” give more than \$131 million annually.
- 63% of OutGivers said their giving level is likely to stay about the same, whereas *25% of participants said their giving is likely to increase by 20 to 50% in the next three years.*
- About half of OutGivers give more than half of their money to LGBT causes, and *38% of all participants said they are likely to increase the amount of money they give to LGBT causes.*
- Just 4% of all OutGivers’ giving goes to international LGBT organizations. 53% of their giving goes to national organizations, 31% to local, 12% to state.
- *However, 24% of OutGivers said they were either very likely or somewhat likely to begin giving internationally in the next three years.*

It appears that many of these donors are poised to be engaged on the issue of global LGBTQ rights. Patricia Evert suggested that if this research does indeed lead to some kind of collaborative campaign to increase individual giving to global LGBTQ rights, the Gill Foundation could be approached to explore the opportunities for sharing the information with the OutGiving donor network.

Interviewees also consistently stated that donor leadership is a key ingredient to the success of large-scale efforts to raise money. Citing the impressive success of Women Moving Millions, and the critical leadership role that high net-worth donors played in that success, several interviewees pointed out that there are a few high net-worth individuals who could take a leadership role.

Western Europe

For these same three reasons, many interviewees said that countries in Western Europe have great potential as well. Western Europe also has a relatively strong culture of philanthropy, there has never been a campaign of this kind waged before, and there are some donors who could play leadership roles.

However, while the Human Rights Watch fundraising team said that major donor fundraising looks pretty much the same in Western Europe as it does in the U.S., Nicky McIntyre, the Executive Director of Mama Cash, has a different view. She said major gift fundraising in Europe is like a “different planet.” She believes donors have less experience and donor engagement and education is required. As an example, Nicky shared that Mama Cash recently partnered with Hivos, an institutional funder, to launch an LGBT donor circle to encourage donors to give more. The donor circle raised 40,000 Euros, with half of that coming from a single donor. Nicky believes that part of the reason why the circle raised so little money is cultural: the women donors she works with tend to shy away from talking about money, and the donor circle felt exclusionary to them, counter to their strong value of equality. They perceived the donor circle as elitist. Nicky also pointed out that people live more simply and spend less in the Netherlands, and that the income gap between the highest paid and lowest paid is much smaller than in the U.S. She did, however, feel that it is possible to overcome these barriers with more resources for donor education.

These differing experiences of Mama Cash and HRW may be due to the fact that HRW and Mama Cash have different fundraising methods and models, and HRW might appeal to a broader audience. It also points to the crucial importance of adopting a donor engagement model that works within the particular culture of the region. All of this would need to be explored further.

Amanda Gigler, Executive Director of Calala, a women’s fund based in Spain that promotes the rights and leadership of women in Latin America and the Caribbean, provides a

fascinating look at how different fundraising cultures can be. She said that there is not a strong culture of giving in Spain, which she believes is common in Southern European countries with a strong history of fascism. There are strong, state-supported institutions, and people look to the government for solutions. When people do give, they tend to give to international causes. For example, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Spanish activists travelled to El Salvador and Nicaragua as part of anti-fascist international brigades. They were able to raise money to fund the effort. Calala is now seeking to stimulate people's memories of that time and that culture of giving, as it builds its major donor program.

Despite this challenging culture of philanthropy, Calala is slowly but surely building a base of support among individuals. While Calala has a small budget (its entire 2010 grantmaking budget was \$15,000), individual gifts comprised 30% of the budget. Amanda estimates they have a base of 50-60 donors, including around 5-8 major donors, who give over 1,000 Euros per year. The rest give in the range of 20-300 Euros/year.

Ise Bosch, a board member of Filia, a women's Fund based in Germany and a major donor to LGBTQ issues, shared that almost all of Filia's donors are German, and range from "medium to high net-worth" in wealth. She believes that the German gay male population has been untapped and has potential for this campaign. Germany has the additional advantage as serving as Ise's home, if Ise is willing and able to play a leadership role in a campaign of this nature.

The Human Rights Watch interviewees identified The Netherlands as having great potential as a starting place in Europe, because there is a large constituency for LGBTQ issues there.

The Global South and East

While some interviewees warned of the obstacles to fundraising outside of the U.S. and Western Europe due to the varied cultures of philanthropy, others challenged those views and said that ignoring the global South and East would be both an ethical and tactical mistake. Wanja Muguongo, Executive Director of UHAI, the East African Sexual Health and Rights Initiative, said that one of her long-term goals is to launch an individual giving program that focuses its energy on East Africans and the diaspora. It concerns her that UHAI is entirely dependent on Western foundations and government funding. She wants to see East Africans support their own people.

For sustained, long-term support, you need people who completely understand where you're coming from. It's best for the people who own the issue, to fund it. It makes you less dependent. It's our land, our country, our rights.

She added:

We don't have a problem with giving. The problem is getting people to see that the way we spend their money aligns with their interests and strategic goals. People want to give to something they can see, something that resonates with them. Queer people in Africa do understand that giving to the queer movement in Africa is important.

Wanja is under no illusion about the amount of time, effort and capacity needed to launch such a project. She agreed with other interviewees in her assessment that it takes more time and capacity to raise money from individual donors than from foundations, and she has a very small staff. For these reasons she doesn't foresee launching an individual donor program any time soon.

Fundraising experts and trainers Kim Klein and Stephanie Roth pointed out that *in every country where philanthropy has been studied, the majority of people in those countries give away money*. Some countries demonstrate more generosity than the U.S. Kim added:

Asking gets you more money than not asking and, as Sushma Rahman [President of Southern California Grantmakers] always points out, culture is constantly changing so we can't allow people to hide behind their culture when they don't want to ask for money. Furthermore, when people have to consider issues of money, including philanthropy, and charity, they will have to eventually consider and confront issues of class, race, and culture. So many cultures are also products of imperialism and colonialism that people will have to consider those as well. In fact, smart organizers use fundraising as a way of introducing these topics, and vice versa—social justice organizations who truly want to belong to and be representative of their communities will raise their operating income from their communities.

Kim and Stephanie shared that they have been invited to provide individual donor fundraising trainings to NGOs in the global South and East, indicating that there is an interest in individual donor fundraising in these regions. In South Korea, they have worked with staff, board and volunteers from a variety of NGOs. They also trained a number of human rights foundations based in the Global South that convened in Brazil, most of which were launched and sustained with private foundation funds. Rather than assuming that what works in the U.S. will work everywhere, they are sensitive to the culture of giving that exists in the country, and they engage with participants in a conversation about that at the very beginning. "You can't take a cookie cutter approach," they said. "You have to figure out what makes sense in a particular region."

Underscoring Wanja's concerns about capacity, Stephanie and Kim also reported that, while some of these funds were eager to engage in individual fundraising, others were daunted by the time and resources required to build a substantial donor base.

Emilienne de León, Executive Director of the International Network of Women's Funds (INWF) and former Executive Director of Semillas, the Women's Fund in Mexico, said that Semillas has been "very successful in the past five years in creating a new culture of giving among women in a non-traditional philanthropic country as Mexico." She added, "There are other cases like Tewa or Nirnaya in Asia where the donations are very small from individuals, but still bring a lot of acknowledgement of the fund in its own country." Other women's funds in the global South and East are evolving individual donor programs at the micro and major donor level. (INWF is primarily funded by foundations and member fund dues but does hope to initiate an individual donor program in the near future.)

The success of Human Rights Watch is also notable: HRW receives major gifts from Tokyo and Saudi Arabia, has established City Committees in Tokyo and Beirut, and is planning on organizing more city committees in Asia and the Middle East in the years to come. Jason Franklin, the Executive Director of Bolder Giving, a non-profit devoted to working with individuals from all economic backgrounds to give at their full potential, recently began networking with high net worth individuals from emerging market countries, and found that they expressed intense interest in philanthropy and learning from American experiences.

Based on the interviews and desk research conducted for this paper, the following conclusions should be considered: 1) It is clear that there are opportunities to increase individual giving to LGBTQ efforts 2) It is apparent that including the global South and East in any comprehensive effort to increase individual giving to global LGBTQ rights is imperative, in order for those movements to be sustainable in the long term and to achieve autonomy. Launching an international fundraising effort that did *not* involve building donor bases and capacities in the countries where work is taking place, would reproduce power structures and systems of dependency. 3) It is clear that an effort to increase individual giving to international LGBTQ efforts will take time and resources.

When asked what her dream strategy for increasing individual giving to global LGBTQ rights causes would be, Wanja called for doing fundraising in the West *and* the global South and East. Her vision includes: 1) providing funding and training for local organizations to boost their individual donor fundraising capacity, and 2) raising money from major donors in the U.S. and Europe in a coordinated campaign to benefit international LGBTQ rights organizations. "Funders," she said, "occupy spaces that it would take UHAI a long time to reach. They can get people to give. So why not do both? Why not boost capacity of organizations in the global south, and raise money from people that organizations in the South might not be able to access?"

LGBTQ allies

Several interviewees had a great deal to say about the importance of not limiting efforts to increase individual giving to international LGBTQ efforts only to donors who identify as LGBTQ. The interviewees who had a great deal of experience fundraising for women's funds said that progressive straight women, while initially not interested in LGBTQ issues, can successfully be approached from a feminist angle by addressing discrimination and violence. Ise Bosch said that creating opportunities for face-to-face contact between feminist straight donors and lesbian activists was especially helpful in bridging the divide.

Jason Franklin of Bolder Giving and Tim Sweeney, Executive Director of the Gill Foundation, also stressed the potential of straight allies, based on shifting public attitudes towards LGBTQ rights. Jason pointed out that because many straight people from younger generations didn't grow up with the same homophobic attitudes as their parents, LGBTQ donors and activists should think about how to reach out to their straight friends.

Tim Sweeney said that there has been a major shift in public attitudes toward LGBTQ people in the U.S., and therefore now is the time to step up: "There's never been a greater opportunity – and allies are reframing how LGBT people fit into their core values and beliefs." He pointed out that LGBTQ people are stepping out of a view rooted in internalized oppression and realizing that we are a positive resource for society, and that we can in fact reach out to straight people. He believes that part of the way to do this is to get out of a narrow rights-based framework:

Lift up our dreams and vision for the world: it is about people fulfilling their human potential. This is stuff a lot of people can hear – pursuing a career path, having a family, having a spiritual path – so it's not all about victimization, discrimination. Rather than deficit-speak, it's aspirational.

Tim referenced the recent marriage victory in New York: wealthy conservatives wrote large checks to support the lobbying effort. He pointed out that conservatives are reframing what LGBTQ issues mean in their life. They have sons, or daughters, or colleagues:

Those conservatives owned it... They see us as just like them... we tried not to be afraid of going there – those openings are there. Talk to people, don't make assumptions. 70% of people have LGBT people in their lives – let's use those people to promote the conversation.

Mid-level and microdonors

Many interviewees warned against focusing all of our energy on the few extremely high net-worth individuals who can give 7, 8, 9 figure gifts to the movement in their lifetimes. This is the myth of the magic bullet, and stems from a misconception of how major donor fundraising works. Fundraising expert Kim Klein warned against overlooking donors who give smaller amounts, because it is through cultivation and engagement with them that you build a broad donor base. It is also through that cultivation that the few people who are able to give much bigger gifts will start doing so.

Micro-giving via the internet represents a major opportunity for significantly increasing individual giving to international LGBTQ causes, while building a movement at the same time. A mechanism needs to be created to seize this opportunity. Patricia Evert said, “There’s a lot of emphasis put on individual major donors who can rise to the occasion, but that’s a limited pool of people! There are hundreds of thousands who could be educated around the globe to give at lower levels. That aggregates to significant dollars.” And, she pointed out, “they can be called on to take action and exist in greater numbers. We need not only wealthy people, but we need micro donors too if we want a movement.”

VIII. Matching Strategy with Vision and Values

Non-violent movements advance rights, overthrow oppressive systems, and build peace. But movements also fall prey to the same divide-and-conquer tactics that create those oppressive systems and catalyze violence in the first place.

Throughout this project, interviewees addressed the issue of vision and values. For example, some interviewees mentioned that they believe the women's funding movement has not been as inclusive of lesbians as it could be; that Women Donors Network has a progressive vision and set of values; that Women Moving Millions did not articulate support for one set of political values over another, which thereby allowed people with a wide range of political beliefs to participate; and that OutGiving has not included issues of economic justice in its donor education.

This is a normal part of movement-building. At the beginning of a movement, or at the beginning of a new phase in the life of a movement, participants define the boundaries of the "we." Who is included and who is not? Beth Zemksy writes in *Building Organizations in a Movement Moment*:

New social movements promote a shared collective identity that transforms the personal into the political and links people through group values, attitudes, commitments, symbols, and norms for behavior. Collective identity is more than the addition of individual personal identities. It is the shared definition of a group that derives from people's common interests, experiences, and solidarity with each other. The emotional connection to a collective identity enables people to see themselves as part of a broader "we" and to engage in activities that are not bounded by a narrow definition of "self-interest."¹³

Tim Sweeney, President and CEO of the Gill Foundation, pointed to the fact that conservatives invested large amounts of money in lobbying to support the recent New York marriage legislation to argue that we should include conservative allies in the "we" when we raise money for global LGBT rights:

We have allies out there, we have people who are reframing what LGBT means in their lives. Whether it's a son or daughter, or a colleague... those conservative people owned it. They put LGBT couples and families on moral parity with other couples and families. They see us as just like them... Those openings are there.

¹³ Zemsky, B. & Mann, D. (Spring-Summer 2008). *Building organizations in a movement moment*. *Social Policy*, p. 12. Retrieved from <http://www.strategicpractice.org/paper/building-organizations-movement-moment>.

On the other hand, one interviewee proposed that the “we” should include movements for economic justice:

I want to live in and hope to help co-create a world that's not just accepting of gender expression and sexual orientation, but also one that is economically, environmentally, and racially just. We silo our movements. Especially with LGBT issues... I've been troubled. In the U.S., in order to get successes in gay marriage, don't ask don't tell etc., we appeal to more conservative white gay and lesbian donors, we don't challenge multiple layers of oppression... We need to ask ourselves, what does success look like? What is our end goal? Maybe dollars do get left on the table. The trade-offs are real. What is the purpose of organizing – to get the maximum amount of dollars moving? Or to get the dollars that best match the goals that we have?

If this piece of research leads to action – if a group of funders decide to invest resources to launch a major effort to increase individual giving to global LGBTQ rights – questions of vision, values, and who the “we” is must be addressed, because the answers should determine the fundraising models adopted. For example, is the goal to raise money from conservative donors who have embraced LGBTQ rights but do not want to transform economic systems of oppression? Should a donor engagement model include education about economic, racial, and imperialist systems of oppression, which might turn off some conservative donors, but could build bridges to other social change movements?

IX. Summary and Recommendations

The vast majority of interview participants expressed excitement and optimism at the prospect of organizing a multi-stakeholder campaign to increase individual giving to global LGBTQ rights organizations. Interviewees stressed the critical importance of in-depth donor engagement and education, and noted that donor leadership would dramatically increase the effectiveness of such a campaign, pointing to the effectiveness of Women Moving Millions, Women Donors Network, giving circles, the City Committees of Human Rights Watch, and Tim Gill's challenge gift at the 2009 OutGiving conference.

The U.S. is ripe for such a campaign, interviewees believe, because of the culture of philanthropy, changing attitudes toward LGBTQ rights, and the presence of major donors who could play a leadership role. Western Europe possesses these same ingredients. Several interviewees argued persuasively that fundraising in the global South and East is important as well, both to support the long-term sustainability and independence of local movements, and to ensure that money isn't left on the table. Interviewees pointed out that the methods of fundraising must be carefully tailored to fit the philanthropic culture of the country.

Interviewees also noted that the timing is right for such a campaign, due to the increased awareness of oppression and violence faced by LGBTQ activists in the global South, increasingly positive attitudes about LGBTQ rights in many countries, and the fact that, with the right capacity and resources, it is possible to increase individual giving even during times of economic recession.

Critically, nearly every interviewee stressed that individual fundraising requires a significant investment of time and money. Individual fundraising requires skilled fundraisers, and a commitment on the part of the organization to invest in fundraising infrastructure and in training staff, board and volunteers. Importantly, while LGBT public foundations and organizations may have a vision of how they could engage individual donors to maximize giving if they had adequate resources, most do not have these resources. Time and time again, interviewees stressed that there is no silver bullet. They said that increasing individual giving to global LGBTQ causes will take time and that a campaign needs to be designed strategically and thoughtfully, and involve multiple prongs. Some of these multiple prongs include:

- 1) Investment in individual donor fundraising programs and capacity of organizations and public foundations;
- 2) Public and donor education about LGBTQ rights movements, issues and needs in the global South and East;

- 3) Fundraising in multiple regions. Some interviewees proposed launching a campaign in select cities/regions first, to generate momentum and ensure that donors and activists can meet regularly to move the campaign forward;
- 4) Fundraising from major donors via a donor engagement and leadership model such as a giving circle, Women Donors Network, the City Committees of Human Rights Watch, or a Women Moving Millions-like campaign;
- 5) Leveraging the power of the internet to raise money from large numbers of micro-donors;
- 6) For all of the above, draw on the experience of those already developing donor bases around the world.

Based on input from interviewees and the desk research , we recommend the following next steps:

- 1) Organize and convene leaders from LGBTQ organizations in the global South and East, public and private foundations supporting this work, and individual donors who could play a leadership role. Interviewees stressed the importance of not reproducing dynamics of power and control by assuming the needs of people in the global South and East. Any potential campaign or effort will need to involve LGBTQ activists from these regions as equal partners from the beginning. Based on the research and interviews, we recommend the following primary goals for the convening:
 - i. Determine the vision and values for this campaign. These will then be used to guide and check any methods and actions adopted. This may seem obvious, but all too often this step is skipped at the beginning of a new project, organization or coalition, leading to schisms and confusion down the line.
 - ii. Introduce prospective donor-leaders to LGBTQ leaders to begin to develop relationships of trust, mutual respect, and equality.
 - iii. Determine what kind of resources LGBTQ organizations and foundations need in order to boost capacity to support a large-scale individual donor fundraising effort.
 - iv. Facilitate the donor leaders to choose the kind of donor engagement model that will be most effective, that creates a partnership with activists, organizations, donors, and public foundations, and that exemplifies the vision and values adopted for the campaign.
 - v. Obtain commitments from donors to make a large initial investment and to serve as donor leaders in the campaign.
 - vi. Brainstorm next steps for each prong of the campaign.

- 2) Based on input received at the convening, invest in individual donor fundraising capacity of LGBTQ organizations in the global South and East, and in public LGBTQ foundations supporting this work.
- 3) Research and design effective options and messaging for donating to LGBTQ rights work in the South and East. This work could be done in advance of the convening.
- 4) Research and develop options for large-scale micro-donor internet engagement and fundraising. Allout.org could provide valuable insight and partnership. This work could be done in advance of the convening.
- 5) Research and make recommendations on the geographic strategy for this campaign, answering the questions, what cities/regions shall we start with, what criteria should be used for prioritizing regions, and how shall we engage people in those regions to begin the work?

Based on the interviews, the need is real; so also is the energy, excitement, commitment, and timing. The time has come to make the investments needed to strengthen and expand individual donor engagement, education, and giving to LGBT rights causes globally.

Appendix: List of Interviewees and Organizations

- I. **Organizations** that campaign for global LGBTQ rights
 - a. Andre Banks, co-founder of Allout.org
 - b. Michele Alexander, Development and Outreach Director, Human Rights Watch (HRW)
 - c. Julie Dorf, Senior Advisor, Council for Global Equality; founding Executive Director of International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (IGLHRC)
 - d. Cary Alan Johnson, Executive Director of International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (IGLHRC)
 - e. Elizabeth Seuling, Director, Foundation Relations, Human Rights Watch (HRW)

- II. **Public foundations** that fund global LGBT movements
 - a. Ise Bosch (see below)
 - b. Amanda Gigler, Executive Director, Calala Fund
 - c. Nicky McIntyre, Executive Director of Mama Cash; former Vice President of Resource Development at Global Fund for Women
 - d. Wanja Muguongo, Executive Director, UHAI - East Africa Sexual Health and Rights Initiative

- III. **Donors** who fund LGBT rights:
 - a. Ise Bosch, executive board member of filia.die frauenstiftung, Germany; founder and CEO of Dreilinden gGmbH
 - b. Jason Franklin, Executive Director of Bolder Giving
 - c. Tracy Gary, donor activist, philanthropic advisor with Inspired Legacies, and author of *Inspired Philanthropy: Creating a Giving and Legacy Plan*
 - d. Dorothy Sander, co-chair of IGLHRC Board of Directors
 - e. Tim Sweeney, Executive Director of the Gill Foundation, for Tim Gill

- IV. **Other people** with expertise in the field of philanthropy and raising money for LGBT rights:
 - a. Patricia Evert, strategic fundraising and event consultant, and former Vice President of Donor Resources at the Gill Foundation, where she produced the OutGiving conference
 - b. Kim Klein, author of *Fundraising for Social Change*, and Principal at Klein and Roth Consulting
 - c. Emilienne de León, Executive Director of the International Network of Women's Funds and former Executive Director of Semillas
 - d. Stephanie Roth, Principal at Klein & Roth Consulting, and author of *The Accidental Fundraiser: A Step-by-Step Guide to Raising Money for Your Cause*
 - e. Mitch Singer, Senior Philanthropic Advisor, Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors
 - f. Karen Zelermyer, President/CEO of Funders for LGBTQ Issues