



SDG
Philanthropy
Platform



The World Humanitarian Summit: A Pivot Point in Philanthropy's Contribution to Addressing Humanitarian Crises

By Regine A. Webster and William Paton

A PIVOT POINT IN PHILANTHROPY’S CONTRIBUTION TO ADDRESSING HUMANITARIAN CRISES

By Regine A. Webster and William Paton

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper calls on the philanthropic community to take advantage of the opportunity offered by the first World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in Istanbul in May 2016 to make important changes in the way it contributes its share of the global response to humanitarian crises.

In Section 1, the paper looks at the challenges shared by all who contribute, including the philanthropy sector. Section 2 discusses philanthropy’s current contributions and potential, including some of its shortcomings. Section 3 examines how the Summit is setting the stage for change—change for which philanthropy can be a greater part. Section 4 concludes the paper with a set of actionable recommendations for how philanthropy’s contribution to humanitarian crises can be greatly improved.

The stakes are high

One of the overarching goals of the WHS Summit is to redefine how the global community delivers for the world’s most vulnerable people. The Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit lays out five core responsibilities that are being used to drive the Summit’s discussions:

- Political leadership to prevent and end conflicts
- Upholding the norms that safeguard humanity
- Leaving no one behind
- Changing people’s lives—from delivering aid to ending need
- Investing in humanity

The stakes leading up to and following the Summit have never been higher. Humanitarian needs around the world have risen dramatically in just the last decade, due to both increased conflict and increased disasters provoked by natural hazards, with the former receiving about 80 percent of humanitarian resources and the latter 20 percent.

The causes for ongoing conflicts are complex and debatable but the trend is not, including bleak prospects for more displacement crises. According to WHS projections: “Around the world more than 60 million people have fled their homes due to conflicts and violence, the highest number since World War II. However, many current approaches to large-scale movements of displaced populations—internally displaced persons, refugees and asylum seekers—have proven inadequate and unsustainable. They also ignore the need for better sharing of our collective responsibility for such populations.”¹

¹ World Humanitarian Summit secretariat, Restoring Humanity: Synthesis of the Consultation Process for the World Humanitarian Summit (New York, United Nations, 2015)



This report was commissioned and funded by the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation.

Additionally, natural disasters are steadily rising. In the last 2 decades, an average of 218 million people each year were affected by natural disasters. The UN estimates in their Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 that global average annual losses in the built environment associated with tropical cyclones (wind and storm surge), earthquakes, tsunamis and floods now average \$314 billion per year, and will increase to \$415 billion by 2030.²

For any type of emergency, the causes of increased risk include failure of national governance, failure of global governance, lack of funding to mitigate risk, and the risk of multiple shocks caused by such events as financial crises, spiking food prices and violent extremism. There are also groups of people who face specific risks because of who they are – including women, children, and the elderly. For example, disasters kill more women than men, and hit women’s livelihoods hardest. Sixty percent of all maternal deaths take place in humanitarian settings and all forms of gender-based violence against women and girls spike during disasters and conflict.³

Philanthropy’s contribution and potential

Philanthropy brings resources to both prevent and respond to humanitarian crises, mostly for immediate relief after sudden natural disasters. This contribution sits within a far larger ecosystem of the United Nations (UN), governments, civil society organizations, and businesses addressing natural, man-made, and complex humanitarian emergencies alike. At the same time, and looked at from the perspective of the comparatively well-coordinated mainstream of humanitarian and development assistance, philanthropic giving is piecemeal, fragmented and sometimes chaotic.

At least \$27.6 billion of funding was directed toward humanitarian crises efforts in 2013, as both official development assistance by governments and through multilaterals, corporations, individuals, and foundations.⁴ Disaster-related grants awarded by the top 1,000 U.S. private foundations totaled \$116.9 million in that year, and of this the majority went for domestic needs - thus less than \$50 million was spent on international humanitarian needs.⁵

Some companies and corporate foundations are increasingly supporting the response to complex humanitarian emergencies in more sophisticated ways, including in the Middle East and most recently in Syria and its neighbors. Some foundations have also explicitly or implicitly developed portfolios that address the causes of humanitarian crises. These are encouraging steps and point to a desire to fund in a more systematic way.

The Summit—setting the stage for a new dialogue

Arguably the most important contribution of the Summit is how it can help shift the conversation from one singularly focused on how philanthropy responds to disasters to one about how philanthropy can invest in efforts designed to prevent, according to the WHS, “recurrent and predictable disasters always becoming events associated with huge suffering.”

The conveners of the World Humanitarian Summit are breaking with past thinking that speaks about a relief to development continuum, and moving the discussion to one focused on thinking about human well-being, development, and security.

At the same time, a growing body of research suggests that the best way for foundations to be more strategic regarding natural disasters would be to focus on reducing the risk of disasters or other emergencies happening in the first place. In many contexts, relatively small amounts of money sometimes make the biggest difference.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The paper offers recommendations for actions that cover structural, policy, and practice changes, along with ideas for innovating on how philanthropy approaches disaster giving.

1. Be brave and be present
2. Support aid coordination
3. Support the Sustainable Development Goals
4. Assist the creation of additional joint appeals processes in the United States and across Europe
5. Ally with and support local organizations
6. Make an intellectual investment
7. Follow the maps already drawn by others
8. Move from charity to effective philanthropy
9. Research global funding flows, including philanthropic funding
10. Leverage the private sector

INTRODUCTION

This paper calls on the philanthropic community to take full advantage of the occasion of the first World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in May 2016 to adapt and improve how it contributes its share of the global response to humanitarian crises—with respect to both natural and man-made disasters and to conflicts. While the target audience for this paper is the philanthropic community and its closest partners, we hope it will also be of interest to other stakeholders committed to this important issue.

The philanthropic community has increasingly accepted “disasters” as an all-encompassing term that includes complex humanitarian emergencies, and most of the data that is collected, in coordination with the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), is based on that definition. In contrast, most humanitarian organizations see disasters as emergencies provoked by natural hazards or biological or chemical hazards. This paper aims to use language that is clear for multiple audiences.⁶

Antoine Gérard, the man charged with ensuring the 2016 Summit delivers real results, summarized his wishes for the gathering, saying he hopes it “will set in stone a number of key engagements that show humanity matters; we need to encourage political actors to reaffirm their adherence to humanitarian principles, reaffirm that protection of individuals is absolutely key, and reaffirm that we can deliver dignified humanitarian action...We can’t ignore the fact that the people affected by disasters...have asked us to do much better.”⁷ Among these hopes for the Summit is also the aspiration that private actors, encompassing broad civil society, business and philanthropy, will play a bigger and better role vis-à-vis the humanitarian imperative.

⁶ In 2014, organizations working on philanthropy’s role in humanitarian crises worked with UN OCHA to move beyond the one category available for collecting information on disaster-related funding—“disasters”—to a more nuanced set of categories to describe the “strategies” that philanthropy was using related to disaster funding (State of Disaster Philanthropy 2015: Data to Drive Decisions.) This was done to utilize language that creates and builds partnerships. Four “strategy” categories were adopted: 1) resilience, risk reduction, and mitigation; 2) preparedness; 3) response and relief; and 4) reconstruction and recovery. This step has allowed better tracking and analysis of the funds that philanthropy was providing in each of these areas, making it possible to have strategic conversations with foundations about how to think about funding disasters and humanitarian crises. In this taxonomy, disaster is the umbrella category, with natural disasters, man-made accidents, and complex humanitarian emergencies being the three major sub-categories. Natural Disasters were further categorized into: geophysical, meteorological, hydrological, climatological, and biological (http://disasterphilanthropy.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/SODP_2014.pdf).

⁷ Interview with The Guardian, 12 January 2016. <http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2016/jan/12/people-disaster-response-aid-world-humanitarian-summit-antoine-gerard>.

² Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction

³ *Action to Achieve Gender Equality High-Level Leaders’ Roundtable: Core Responsibilities Two and Three of the Agenda for Humanity*.

⁴ Foundation Center and The Center for Disaster Philanthropy. *Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy: Data to Drive Decisions 2015* (New York, 2015)

⁵ Foundation Center and The Center for Disaster Philanthropy. *Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy: Data to Drive Decisions 2015* (New York, 2015)

This paper has four sections. It begins with a look at the challenge shared by all who contribute, including philanthropy. Second, it describes philanthropy’s current contributions and potential, including shortcomings in current approaches. Third, it examines how the Summit sets the stage for change—change of which philanthropy can be a greater part. And fourth, it concludes with a set of actionable recommendations for how philanthropy’s contribution to humanitarian crises can be greatly improved.

The stakes are high

One of the overarching goals of the WHS is to “redefine how the global community delivers for the world’s most vulnerable people.”⁸ The Report of the Secretary-General for the WHS⁹ set out five core responsibilities that are being used to drive the Summit’s discussion:

- Political leadership to prevent and end conflicts
- Upholding the norms that safeguard humanity
- Leaving no one behind
- Changing people’s lives—from delivering aid to ending need
- Investing in humanity

The WHS organizers emphasized the need for action in how they crafted the Summit goals:

1. Reaffirm our commitment to humanity and humanitarian principles.
2. Initiate actions and commitments which enable countries and communities to prepare for and respond to crises and be more resilient to shocks.
3. Share best practices which help save lives around the world, placing affected people at the center of humanitarian action and alleviating suffering.

These responsibilities and goals reflect the seemingly inexorable growth in humanitarian need that financing alone simply cannot address. In fact, the path forward must be about the ‘how’ even more than it is about the ‘how much’.

Humanitarian needs around the world have risen dramatically in just the last decade, due to both increased conflict and increased natural disasters, with the former receiving about 80 percent of humanitarian resources and the latter 20 percent. Intertwined causes and effects have created an ever more complex patchwork of issues, crises and humanitarian needs that have overwhelmed increases in aid financing.¹⁰ We see staggering levels of poverty, growing inequality, huge gaps in respect for human rights, and frequent political paralysis in the face of even the direst circumstances. We also face the growing effects of climate change, competition for degrading natural resources, an increasing frequency and recurrence of disasters—even before livelihoods are restored—and a weak structure for the humanitarian system as a whole in the face of constant hurricane-force stress.

Humanitarian needs and risks also increase for certain groups – including women, children, and the elderly. For example, disasters kill more women than men, and hit women’s livelihoods hardest. As an illustration of the risk, sixty percent of all maternal deaths take place in humanitarian settings, and all forms of gender-based violence against women and girls spike during disasters and conflict.¹¹

The High Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing Report to the United Nations Secretary-General, Too Important to Fail—Addressing the Humanitarian Financing Gap noted that in “2014, every day 42,500 people were displaced by violence and conflict, while 53,000 people per day were forced from their homes

by natural disasters, 90 percent of which were due to weather-related events.”¹² The Secretary-General’s Report described the economic and financial cost of conflict and violence in 2014 as an estimated US\$14.3 trillion.¹³ That was just for one year -- and not an unrepresentative one. Yet even these staggering figures do not begin to portray the amount of death, suffering and human loss they represent.¹⁴

The causes for these ongoing conflicts are complex and often debated, but the trend is not, including bleak prospects for more displacement crises. According to Synthesis projections, “Around the world more than 60 million people have fled their homes due to conflicts and violence, the highest number since World War II. However, many current approaches to large-scale movements of displaced populations—internally displaced persons, refugees and asylum seekers—have proven inadequate and unsustainable. They also ignore the need for better sharing of our collective responsibility for such populations.”¹⁵ Responses also rarely look at migration through the lens of its potential contributions to societies, rather than a threat.¹⁶

According to the World Migration Report 2015,¹⁷ a quarter of a billion people are now living outside their countries of birth, representing 3.4 percent of the global population, an historic high. While forced migration is of concern in this paper, rather than labor migration or routine emigration, it is noteworthy that all types of human migration are simultaneously increasing at rapid rates. When people feel compelled to move because of violence, poverty or instability, they take themselves and their despair elsewhere. And these create new pockets of humanitarian need, as we have seen from the migrations across the Mediterranean Sea.

Additionally, while humanitarian needs due to disasters (provoked by natural hazards) remain the minority of such needs today, they too are steadily rising. In the last 2 decades, 218 million people each year were affected by [‘natural’] disasters [on average].”¹⁸ The UN estimates in their Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 that global average annual losses in the built environment associated with tropical cyclones (wind and storm surge), earthquakes, tsunamis and floods now average US\$314 billion per year, and will increase to US\$415 billion by 2030.¹⁹ The WHS Summary of Consultative Processes states that “[‘natural’] disasters are becoming more frequent and intense, with devastating humanitarian consequences.” With climate change factored into future projections,²⁰ the threat to sustainable development grows, along with an increase in “instability and displacement.”

There are multiple causes of this increased risk, including rapid urbanization and risky development choices. One compelling cause is the persistent mispricing and excessive discounting of the cost of accumulating risk—leading to under-investment in its reduction. With US\$90 trillion dollars expected to be invested in infrastructure worldwide from now until 2030,²¹ determining the full price of risk has never been more important. This is especially critical for the world’s poor who suffer most of disasters’ worst consequences.

12 High Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing Report to the Secretary General. Too Important to Fail – Addressing the Humanitarian Financing Gap. January 2016

13 United Nations General Assembly, One humanity: shared responsibility. Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit (Geneva, United Nations, 2016)

14 Institute for Economics and Peace. Global Peace Index 2015 (New York, 2015)

15 World Humanitarian Summit secretariat, Restoring Humanity: Synthesis of the Consultation Process for the World Humanitarian Summit (New York, United Nations, 2015)

16 See for example Alexander Betts’ powerful TED talk “Our refugee system is failing. Here’s how we can fix it”- https://www.ted.com/talks/alexander_betts_our_refugee_system_is_failing_here_s_how_we_can_fix_it

17 United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2016). International Migration Report 2015: Highlights (ST/ESA/SER.A/375).

18 Guha-Sapir D, Hoyois Ph., Below. R. Annual Disaster Statistical Review 2014: The Numbers and Trends. Brussels: CRED; 2015.

19 UNISDR (2015). Making Development Sustainable: The Future of Disaster Risk Management. Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR).

20 IPCC, 2012: Summary for Policymakers. In: Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation [Field, C.B., V. Barros, T.F. Stocker, D. Qin, D.J. Dokken, K.L. Ebi, M.D. Mastrandrea, K.J. Mach, G.-K. Plattner, S.K. Allen, M. Tignor, and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. A Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, and New York, NY, USA, pp. 1-19.

21 UNISDR (2015). Making Development Sustainable: The Future of Disaster Risk Management. Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR).

8 World Humanitarian Summit secretariat, Restoring Humanity: Synthesis of the Consultation Process for the World Humanitarian Summit (New York, United Nations, 2015)

9 United Nations General Assembly, One humanity: shared responsibility. Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit (Geneva, United Nations, 2016)

10 The Synthesis Report points out that although the size of UN-led appeals has grown from US\$3.4 billion in 2003 to \$18.7 billion in 2015, the gap between the scale of needs and the resources available to meet them is also growing.

11 *Action to Achieve Gender Equality High-Level Leaders’ Roundtable: Core Responsibilities Two and Three of the Agenda for Humanity.*

This trend to increasing risk is not unique to disasters due to natural hazards—the risks of violence and more complex crises are also clearly on the rise. For any type of emergency, the causes of increased risk include failure of national governance, failure of global governance, lack of funding to mitigate risk, and the risk of multiple shocks caused by such events, including financial crises, spiking food prices and violent extremism.

Many of the principles that are emerging for the reduction of risks due to natural hazards—around saner and greater investment in risk mitigation and reduction—may apply equally well to armed conflicts and more complex humanitarian emergencies where the trend, similarly, is to increased risks. The High Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing Report states that:

If current trends continue, by 2030, when the Sustainable Development Goals expire, the [annual] cost of humanitarian assistance will have risen to US\$50 billion and 62 percent of the world’s poor could be living in fragile and conflict-affected countries, a clear warning that humanitarian needs will spiral even higher.²²

Not only are many humanitarian workers and leaders dissatisfied with their inability to marshal sufficient additional resources to meet the rising needs, but they also feel growing dissatisfaction with many aspects of current humanitarian operations. Since UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon first called for a humanitarian summit in 2012, over 23,000 people in 153 countries provided input through consultations on priority needs and issues. Some of the most important problems identified are:

- A lack of political will to prioritize the delivery of assistance and—more importantly—the reduction of suffering in the first place by ending conflicts and displacement;
- A persistent lack of access to many of those most in need due to the targeting of aid workers, and lack of impartiality;
- A general decline in respect for humanitarian principles, rights and norms, including protection of civilians in war, and the right of asylum;
- Duplicative and unnecessary work by organizations due to disengagement with or lack of sufficient coordinating mechanisms, including those of the UN system;
- A failure to reconcile how different types of assistance, from emergency response to sustainable development, need to be delivered in synergy in order to strengthen fragile societies and communities;
- Large amounts of humanitarian funding from the region going unreported in shared databases, therefore building lack of trust and transparency, and poor accountability mechanisms;
- A dissatisfaction with the level of efficiency of many organizations, and indeed aid effectiveness in general; and
- A growing alienation of aid-recipient communities and host-country governments from international aid efforts.

The Summit provides a point in time for philanthropy to join other sectors to pivot and meet these rising challenges and opportunities, not just with increased scale of response, but in the hope of also achieving a forward leap in the quality of effort and sophistication with which we collectively address them. This opportunity is discussed further below.

PHILANTHROPY’S CONTRIBUTIONS AND POTENTIAL

Philanthropy brings resources to both prevent and respond to humanitarian crises, most of which is currently spent on immediate relief after sudden natural disasters. This contribution sits within a far larger ecosystem of the United Nations (UN), governments, civil society organizations—and businesses—addressing natural, man-made, and complex humanitarian emergencies alike. The largest share of dollars to disaster and humanitarian crises—from government donors—are channeled through coordinated mech-

anisms of the UN, through both inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations. In contrast, coordination efforts amongst philanthropy are in a very nascent phase.

Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy: Data to Drive Decisions 2015 found that at least US\$27.6 billion of funding was directed toward humanitarian crises efforts in 2013, as both official development assistance by governments and through multilaterals, corporations, individuals, and foundations.²³ This is a not insignificant proportion of the total estimated philanthropic contribution in the same year, across all sectors, of US\$55.3 billion.²⁴ The Synthesis estimates cite US\$25 billion of humanitarian assistance per annum by all sectors combined. Aid from the 29 members of OECD’s Development Assistance Committee (DAC, comprising most of the wealthiest countries in the world) totaled US\$13.6 billion, while non-DAC donors and multilateral organizations accounted for at least another US\$2.3 billion. The latter is probably an under-estimate, as definitions and tracking systems have not fully caught up with the change.

In contrast, ‘disaster-related grants’ awarded by the top 1,000 U.S. private foundations totaled US\$116.9 million in 2013, and of this the majority went for domestic needs, and thus less than US\$50 million went to international humanitarian needs. There is unfortunately no adequate source of data for global private foundations’ giving for humanitarian needs. However, foundations in all of the countries of the developed world and in higher-income countries found across all regions contribute many millions each year.

More countries outside the so-called developed countries – governments and citizens from countries of the Global South - are the newer contributors to humanitarian and development aid. Following the dual Nepal earthquakes in early 2015, India’s government pledged US\$1 billion in aid at a donor conference held in June.²⁵ Around the same time, China quintupled its annual aid to Nepal to a total of US\$720 million, becoming the country’s largest aid donor.²⁶ While this is official government-to-government aid, it was accompanied throughout China and India—and indeed most of Asia—by a huge swell of philanthropic and private giving to relief and rehabilitation efforts in Nepal from companies, foundations, cities, NGOs, and individuals alike. More recently, related to the ongoing humanitarian crisis in the Middle East, Turkey has now become the third largest humanitarian donor in the world, having spent more than US\$7.6 billion on the Syria refugees crisis and hosting 2.225 million refugees by September 2015.²⁷ Organizations from countries that are newer to humanitarian philanthropy have important perspectives to share with those who have provided aid for decades.

Compared to the relatively well-coordinated mainstream of humanitarian and development assistance from official government and inter-governmental agency sources, resources from philanthropy are provided in much more fragmented and ad hoc ways. While this is not so much the case for the most visible and largest philanthropic efforts including those mentioned above, these large efforts are in the minority. Most comes in the form of small foundation grants. Many foundations respond to televised news reports of humanitarian crises by making sudden donations to non-profit organizations in a gesture of goodwill. On the receiving end, the resulting multitude of small grants and projects can be impossible to integrate or incorporate into existing coordination mechanisms. These contributions can even go against improved standards and practices in humanitarian assistance due to a lack of communication with the larger aid community. In-kind donations are just one example of gifts that have caused more problems than they have solved, although this practice has now fortunately declined in scale. Another problem is the flood of small uncoordinated projects that strain the capacity of local organizations, governments and fragile communities.

Such aid in theory can strengthen and empower local actors. But without the right understanding of the local context, local intermediaries and mechanisms, it can sometimes do harm by overwhelming what

²² High Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing Report to the Secretary General. Too Important to Fail – Addressing the Humanitarian Financing Gap. January 2016

²³ Foundation Center and The Center for Disaster Philanthropy. Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy: Data to Drive Decisions 2015 (New York, 2015)

²⁴ Foundation Center- data.foundationcenter.org

²⁵ <http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/india-pledges-1-billion-to-quakehit-nepal/article7353542.ece>.

²⁶ <http://kathmandupost.ekantipur.com/news/2015-08-24/china-pledged-largest-foreign-aid-to-nepal.html>

²⁷ <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/23548>

is already working on the ground, and diverting resources from the very organizations that can build resilience to crises in the long-term. Arguably the greatest risk and flaw is the tendency of the philanthropy community to work in isolation, lacking an ongoing and coherent connection through coordination mechanisms to the other types of aid donors and implementers. The classic example cited on this is the response to the 2010 earthquake in Haiti, which brought out not only unprecedented generosity, but also unprecedented irresponsible philanthropy practices.

Foundations that engage more with governments, the UN system, and leading humanitarian networks – even if they don’t fund them, and even if they want to maintain independent diagnostic and evaluation functions – are almost certainly going to see their philanthropic funds have more impact. The Aga Khan Development Network is one of the oldest operating private foundations—one that has done extensive development and humanitarian work on the ground around the world, preferring to directly manage its own giving and often in countries affected by humanitarian emergencies, but built on very strong ties to local communities, faith institutions and governments.²⁸

The Conrad N. Hilton Foundation has programmed significant giving through UN agencies and capable non-governmental organizations, and supported a voluntary set of principles for endorsement by foundations.²⁹ Even while not self-identified as a major humanitarian actor, the Rockefeller Foundation has created and contributed to innovative programs for many years. Their efforts include African Risk Capacity,³⁰ Africa’s first parametric catastrophe insurance pool for insurance solutions in vulnerable regions; and the Asian Cities Climate Change Resilience Network,³¹ which laid the groundwork for the field of urban resilience, and has positively impacted many communities in dozens of cities across Asia.

The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation has supported humanitarian efforts in many ways, not least in supporting drought-tolerant agriculture through long-standing support to AGRA (Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa), an important contribution to disaster risk reduction.³² The Ikea Foundation, which owns the company and turns some of its revenue into large humanitarian grants, has provided consistent funding to UN agencies. Jointly with UNHCR, Ikea Foundation supported the Better Shelter Initiative,³³ a social enterprise which delivers modular structures temporary housing, much more durable and comfortable than traditional tents.

Businesses and corporate foundations have traditionally responded to humanitarian needs to build spirit and pride of giving in their employees and to help the communities in which they operate. They are increasingly developing support that aligns with areas of company expertise, and equally important, aiming to move beyond more traditional charity. For example, the transport company UPS has worked with a UN agency to create Logistics Emergency Teams and the UPS Foundation has contributed thought leadership in humanitarian logistics and provides first-responder personnel to rebuild supply chains. The UPS Foundation more recently has supported job training efforts among refugees in Turkey, Jordan, and Lebanon as a means of encouraging livelihood stability even in the midst of global humanitarian crises. Google made a commitment to supporting relief and recovery needs in Nepal including creating a ‘People Finder.’ Xylem Corporation is supporting clean water development initiatives that go beyond immediate relief and are geared toward meeting and supporting the Sustainable Development Goals.³⁴

Such efforts may not be perceived as significant given the far larger funding going to relief and response from official sources. But recognizing and documenting these dimensions of philanthropy and the role they play in contributing to the five core responsibilities above is an important step in building a more effective, long-term approach by the philanthropic community in general. How can we more effectively bring this philanthropy-supported human initiative and ingenuity to the table of the larger donors?

28 www.akdn.org.

29 <https://www.hiltonfoundation.org/priorities/disaster-relief-and-recovery>

30 <http://www.africanriskcapacity.org/>

31 <http://accrn.net/>

32 <http://agra.org/>

33 <http://www.bettershelter.org/>

34 <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>

THE SUMMIT—SETTING THE STAGE FOR A NEW DIALOGUE

The Summit has presented new opportunities. In a two-year consultative process, about 23,000 individuals contributed and helped shape the agenda for WHS. Five pre-identified “action” areas, as well as seven Summit leadership roundtables for dialogue, represent an unprecedented global drive for change. The Summit is situated within the push for the renewal of global frameworks for disaster risk reduction (Sendai, March 2015), achieving social, environmental and economic goals through the Sustainable Development Goals (New York, September 2015), climate change (Paris, December 2015), and urban development (Quito, October 2016). The proceedings also benefit from the reviews of the UN peace-building architecture (June 2015), UN peace operations (also June 2015), and the Women, Peace and Security agenda (October 2015); the High-Level Panels on Humanitarian Financing (November 2015) and the Global Response to Health Crises (December 2015); and the 32nd International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent (Geneva, December 2015).

This is an enormous in-gathering of thoughtful reflection and advocacy from those working at the coalface of prevention, recovery and crisis, as well as those pressing for policy change at the national and global levels. At the same time, creating and upholding such global frameworks are rarely something in which the philanthropy sector participates. At best, their grantees are active shapers and participants, and a handful of foundations join events and wider processes. But in the main, philanthropy is absent from these touchstones of coordinated reflection and action: they feel they are too process-focused, too time-consuming, too bureaucratic, too complex, and thus often perceived as not worth the effort, or even irrelevant.

As the Synthesis report notes, the world requires “a shift to a collective approach to crisis management,” including “a strong emphasis on planning beforehand, securing firm political and financial commitments to respond, managing disaster risk, and reducing vulnerability to humanitarian stress.”³⁵ Among the champions in philanthropy of new approaches include:

- The Humanitarian Forum, a network organization that has been working with organizations across the globe to reassess the humanitarian system as it currently exists.³⁶
- START, an organization dedicated to bringing together international and national NGOs for humanitarian response. Its members include Save the Children, Oxfam and Christian Aid.³⁷
- The Center for Disaster Philanthropy, an organization dedicated to transforming the field of disaster philanthropy to increase donor effectiveness throughout the lifecycle of disasters through educational, fund opportunities and strategic guidance.
- Notably, the Synthesis lays out a roadmap that, properly followed, can lead to achieving the goal of a collective approach. Future progress relies particularly on private and public partners:
- Increasing investment in preparedness, risk reduction, and plans to predictably respond before disaster strikes.
- Agreeing in advance of disaster on cooperation agreements that enable a more predictable, inclusive and disciplined response.
- Taking steps now to scale up measures to support and protect individuals and communities most vulnerable to disasters.
- Building best practices for managing and responding to disaster risk in countries affected by conflict.

The report provides evidence that in countries around the world where governments and private agencies are investing in scientific risk management, “disasters caused by natural hazards can be handled differently” for better outcomes. In a now famous early example, cyclone shelters and early warnings

35 World Humanitarian Summit secretariat, *Restoring Humanity: Synthesis of the Consultation Process for the World Humanitarian Summit* (New York, United Nations, 2015)

36 <http://www.humanitarianforum.org/>

37 <http://www.startnetwork.org/start-fund>

installed along the coast of Bangladesh have severely reduced death tolls compared to the number of lives lost when a super-cyclone there killed up to a half million people 45 years ago.³⁸ Most such shelters are simple concrete platforms built on stilts in Bangladesh’s huge flood plain, accompanied by sirens.

In 2015, eleven years after the Indian Ocean tsunami killed an estimated 230,000 people in 14 countries, UNESCAP finds there are still many important gaps in the detection, warning, and education systems needed, blaming in part a gap between scientists and decision makers. In cooperation with the private sector, in 2015 India’s government turned on one such system, which can quickly send a mass SMS message to those in danger. The regional Indian Ocean Tsunami Warning System can now send emails and SMS warnings to users on over 700 mobile phone companies and other recipients within 2 minutes of an underwater earthquake.³⁹ Frighteningly, however, not all countries hit in 2004 have yet managed to install an adequate national instant messaging system. Nor is tsunami detection and warning enough; community education programs are also critical—ensuring people know how to respond.

The Synthesis also gives guidance on other elements for effective disaster management and mitigation. For example, the report suggests that agreements that set out “clearly agreed financial responsibilities, before and after an event,” delineate what governments are expected to do at the national and local level, and articulate the expectations from the international community, “would reduce arguing over who should respond, who should lead and should share the burden, all of which can lead to delayed or poor quality responses.”

Suggestions on boosting measures to “provide a safety net in times of crisis” range from scaling up cash payments to serve the needs of the most vulnerable the moment disaster warnings are triggered, to similarly developing mechanisms “to provide rapid resources when triggered.”

Taking into account the problems caused by disasters in areas already suffering from conflict, the WHS Synthesis notes these natural hazards only add another layer of “shock.” As a possible remedy, the report suggests “making sure there is good conflict analysis and understanding power dynamics at the community level as a prerequisite to support disaster response planning and programming.”

Arguably the most important contribution of the WHS Synthesis is how it can help shift the conversation from one singularly focused on how philanthropy responds to disasters to one about how philanthropy can invest in efforts designed to prevent, according to the WHS, “recurrent and predictable disasters always becoming events associated with huge suffering.”⁴⁰

Broadening philanthropic horizons

Over the years many have advocated for private humanitarian giving to serve a larger purpose that is more aligned with humanitarian goals. We have observed that there is no question that the private donor community is more than willing to step forward in times of disaster, and now today, increasingly navigating complex humanitarian emergencies. Our second observation, however, is that most donors do not realize that humanitarian emergencies, whether slow-onset or cataclysmic events, are but one facet of the larger development humanitarian dialogue.

While much of the philanthropic sector is just now becoming familiar with the concept of the disaster lifecycle (preparedness, mitigation, response, recovery), that continuum still does not adequately acknowledge the great deal of development work undertaken by the United Nations and supporting organizations. With that in mind, the conveners of the World Humanitarian Summit are breaking with past thinking that speaks about a relief to development continuum. They are moving the discussion to one focused on thinking about human well-being, development, and security. A key to this discussion is overcoming the “humanitarian-development” divide. They stress “redirecting development assistance quickly and flex-

ibly—to where it is needed most, and even, where appropriate, using the implementing modalities of humanitarian aid.”⁴¹

Efforts to bridge that divide, according to the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing, encourage joint planning exercises between humanitarian and development organizations, supporting vulnerable communities’ efforts to become self-reliant, and allowing humanitarian organizations to plan their own exit. From a donor perspective:

It means donors having funding windows in place that can intervene in areas including livelihoods and basic services before longer-term development funding kicks in (such as the crisis or post-crisis trust funds being put in place by a number of donors). Such initiatives must become second nature for donors and organizations alike.⁴²

It is also important that foundations that embrace humanitarian giving acknowledge the links with other global frameworks, especially the 17 overarching Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).⁴³ If the many global frameworks cited above are daunting to digest, these goals are a starting point that give us a roadmap to 2030 that both contributes to, and builds upon, humanitarian efforts.

Time to Pivot in How We Contribute

Private donors often disengage after supporting initial response efforts. In fact, that generous outpouring of donations, which typically occurs in the days immediately after a disaster strikes, all too often ends a few months later, even before there has been sufficient time to do a comprehensive needs assessment and develop a plan both for longer-term recovery and mitigation of future risks.

The global adoption of the SDGs⁴⁴ represents a considerable opportunity shift in the ability of private funders to look not just at discrete projects, but rather at holistic, collaborative efforts that seek a lasting solution. Out of the SDGs grew the SDG Philanthropy Platform,

A vehicle to enable partnerships in the global development space and to help them flourish to achieve global development outcomes as the world transitions from the MDGs to the SDGs. Philanthropy has adopted a systemic approach to funding and policy work, shifting from fragmented individual projects to long-term collaborative efforts in line with national priorities and SDGs.⁴⁵

There is no question of the importance of giving to alleviate immediate suffering. But there is far greater benefit in thinking and acting more strategically. The Conrad N. Hilton Foundation is increasingly open to investing in ways that will catalyze already existing contributions, rather than to make a separate grant of its own. As Ed Cain, the Foundation’s Vice President for Programs, puts it, when the Foundation’s Board of Trustees saw the difference between giving simply to lend another small “helping hand” versus making more strategic grants, they decided “to make optimal use of our dollars.”⁴⁶ Indeed, because private and corporate foundations are so wholly independent, they are in a uniquely advantageous position to practice leverage through more innovative giving that assists larger efforts.

A growing body of research suggests that the best way for foundations to be more strategic regarding natural disasters would be to focus on reducing the risk of disasters or other emergencies happening in the first place. In many contexts, relatively small amounts of money sometimes make the biggest difference. According to both the World Bank and the United Nations, investments in disaster risk reduction and risk management can yield impressive returns in terms of reduced losses. The World Bank quotes the United States’ Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) that every US\$1 invested in haz-

41 World Humanitarian Summit secretariat, Restoring Humanity: Synthesis of the Consultation Process for the World Humanitarian Summit (New York, United Nations, 2015)

42 World Humanitarian Summit secretariat, Restoring Humanity: Synthesis of the Consultation Process for the World Humanitarian Summit (New York, United Nations, 2015)

43 <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgs>

44 <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/>

45 <http://sdgfunders.org/faqs/>

46 Edmund Cain, interview with Regine A. Webster, March 4, 2016.

38 World Humanitarian Summit secretariat, Restoring Humanity: Synthesis of the Consultation Process for the World Humanitarian Summit (New York, United Nations, 2015)

39 http://www.ioc-tsunami.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=8&Itemid=13

40 World Humanitarian Summit secretariat, Restoring Humanity: Synthesis of the Consultation Process for the World Humanitarian Summit (New York, United Nations, 2015)

ard mitigation generates US\$4 in future savings.⁴⁷ Worldwide, the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction⁴⁸ estimates that an investment of US\$6 in making infrastructure more risk resilient saves a whopping US\$360 in losses and damage. Joe Ruiz, director of the UPS Humanitarian Relief Program, echoes that sentiment: “Every dollar spent upfront in some type of resilience initiative can be helpful to prevent the same recurring events that happen if all you do is respond after disasters.”

The WHS provides an opportunity for philanthropy to see the bigger picture and recalibrate its strategies, milestones, and partnerships. “When hazards strike, pre-planned and pre-financed domestic capacity and response is often the best way to save lives and reduce losses. International assistance plays an important role but must be better managed to ensure it complements domestic efforts. Investing in community resilience, and local and national disaster risk management capacities, is imperative, resulting in an approach that is ‘as local as possible, as international as necessary.’”⁴⁹

Heather Grady, a Vice President at Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors, sees the challenges inherent in foundations using a broader lens and more networked approach in humanitarian giving: “The philanthropy sector does not always make the space to converge efforts with others in ways that would actually achieve a longer term impact—internally-set strategies and timelines, and devolving responsibility for coordination to grantees who may not even know each other, are just two factors that may hamper progress.”⁵⁰ Philanthropy has a poor track record for supporting integrated and better coordinated on-the-ground assistance that benefits communities, governmental, and non-governmental organizations. It is for this reason that bold action is required.

While this paper has been forthright in identifying the weaknesses of much philanthropic giving, it has done so with the firm belief that private and corporate foundations are uniquely independent organizations. Because of this—and because of their relatively unfettered operations—they have the potential more than almost any other sector to take bold action that significantly drives improvements. They need only convince themselves, an enviable position in terms of fostering change and improvement. We offer here some recommendations, hoping that at least some will be adopted. At the same time, it is likely that the best new ideas from philanthropy are yet to come, and may be stimulated by discussions, commitments and partnerships arising from the Summit and this important moment in time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations below cover structural, policy, and practice changes, along with a collection of ideas for innovating how philanthropy approaches disaster giving.

1. Be brave and be present

Giving aid on the basis of greatest needs, wherever they occur and no matter the reason, is one of the most basic humanitarian principles. Complex humanitarian emergencies resulting from protracted civil war, drought and famine, among other causes, are often hard for the private funder community to understand and respond to appropriately with the proper resources (time, talent, funding). However, we recommend the global private philanthropic community begin responding to all humanitarian crises with its full complement of resources: convening power, flexible financial support, and a problem-solving skill set.

2. Support aid coordination

Aid must be delivered by various actors working closely together, sharing information and discussing priorities. Over several decades a body of work and coordination systems has been built up, which the

Summit seeks to further improve and build upon.

There already are effective practices, codes of conduct, and systems in place to respond appropriately and support communities affected by humanitarian crises. For example, SPHERE standards encourage effective on-the-ground humanitarian assistance. Leading humanitarian organizations routinely incorporate these in their efforts. But well-intentioned smaller NGOs and foundations aiming to help relieve distress and suffering in a foreign country may be aware of or included in these processes. Abed Rabbi bin Sahra’, of Qatar Charity asserts “Investing more effort in the dissemination of humanitarian values, principles and standards and transferring the same from their conceptual framework to practical application, taking into consideration the cultural specificities.”⁵¹

In addition, the United Nations created the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance to ensure a coherent response to emergencies and develop a framework within which each actor can contribute to the overall response effort. While imperfect, it cannot be overlooked as a source of information and experience.

Not only should philanthropy become aware of and possibly join such systems, it should invest in them. Modest-sized grants from private foundations can help to promote principles and best practices amongst private actors in humanitarian assistance, on the one hand; and on the other hand, can support critical analysis of actors of any size and sector in the service of continuous improvement in the humanitarian domain. Supporting existing entities will help philanthropy understand how it can play a more effective role in providing humanitarian assistance. Better coordination between philanthropy and other aid institutions will lead to more constructive use of foundation dollars and ultimately support the humanitarian-development bridge.

3. Support the Sustainable Development Goals

We need to ensure that private philanthropic dollars directed toward humanitarian assistance programs are utilized in a manner that supports the SDGs. The SDG agenda was developed with an enormous two-year global, consultative effort, including private foundations and businesses—now the philanthropic community has to do its part to ensure that their efforts support the SDG agenda, both by ensuring they focus on one or more of the targets and by working in synergy with others to reach them.

The SDG Philanthropy Platform (hyperlink) is one example of how philanthropy can support an agenda that requires leadership and accountability by governments and the anchor of the multilateral UN system – while building on the unique characteristics and comparative advantages of the philanthropy sector itself. Platform partners are committed to:

- Build bridges by encouraging philanthropy, the UN, governments, the private sector and NGOs to collaborate;
- Shift the philanthropy sector mindset toward a more inclusive approach;
- Advocate the importance of understanding data to achieve the SDGs and humanitarian goals;
- Improve capacity, knowledge and data sharing to use data as a driver for philanthropic investment and to achieve effective outcomes; and,
- Promote accountability in the philanthropic sector.

4. Assist the creation of additional joint appeals processes in the US and across Europe

Eight countries have emergency appeals processes already in place (Belgium, Canada, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom). According to the Emergency Appeals Alliance, two characteristics underpin most joint appeals processes: the participation of experienced global humanitarian organizations, and partnerships with national media and the private sector. The Alliance cites the benefits of collaborative approaches to disaster response, such as leveraging for part-

⁴⁷ http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTSF/Resources/Building_Resilient_Communities_Complete.pdf

⁴⁸ UNISDR (2015). Making Development Sustainable: The Future of Disaster Risk Management. Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR).

⁴⁹ World Humanitarian Summit secretariat, Restoring Humanity: Synthesis of the Consultation Process for the World Humanitarian Summit (New York, United Nations, 2015)

⁵⁰ Heather Grady, interview with Regine A. Webster, February 3, 2016

⁵¹ Abed Rabbi bin Sahra’ interview with Karina Grosheva, April 4, 2016

nerships, keeping fundraising costs low, raising media awareness for slow onset disasters, maintaining the highest standards for humanitarian relief and accountability, and building confidence among the public.

We recommend that philanthropy undertake research and subsequent pilot projects to determine the feasibility of replicating joint appeals mechanisms more broadly across Europe and within the U.S.

5. Ally with and support local organizations

A small proportion of humanitarian assistance gets to the grassroots where the need is often greatest. Danny Sriskandarajah, Secretary General of CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, argues “the goal is that local communities solve most of their problems without the help of the international community” and he encourages philanthropy to “reduce the threshold for local actors to receive resources.”⁵² Jenny Hodgson, Director of the Global Fund for Community Foundations, states “local organizations are systematically excluded—by language, by process... the very groups that might be the ones to advocate for local communities are the ... ones that are marginalized.”⁵³ There are enduring and even growing barriers to moving support to local communities, many of them mentioned above. Weak communications systems, lack of ongoing and trustworthy partnerships, onerous financial transfer regulations, and a dysfunctional marketplace for like-minded givers and receivers are some of the most important ones.

Philanthropic organizations can increase their contribution and cooperation with local organizations. UN High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing Co-Chair Kristalina Georgieva called for an increase from 0.2% to 20%.⁵⁴ Some specific steps to move in this direction include:

- Work with others to help address government policy barriers to funding local organizations (such as the U.S. Internal Revenue Service equivalency determination), possibly through new shared mechanisms that mitigate the high level of duplicative due diligence involved;
- Revise reporting requirements to better suit local capacity;
- Build new relationships with people and organizations that are closer to a given crisis;
- Allocate financial resources to allow local organizations to participate in global humanitarian discussions; and,
- Use their funds as ‘risk capital’ and ‘patient capital’.

These approaches will put more power in the hands of local communities to lead response efforts.

We recommend philanthropy create a flexible fund that would invest in local human and social safety net providers, prioritizing local talent, local resources, and local voices in times of disaster and afterward. Hodgson elaborates on this point: “the ability to mobilize quickly is already there. Philanthropy could give funds directly to community organizations so that they can continue their work.”⁵⁵ At a minimum, grants to international NGOs can stipulate a higher proportion of support be dedicated to sub-grants and partnerships with local organizations.

6. Make an intellectual investment

Expertise around effective philanthropy for humanitarian contexts exists worldwide. Philanthropic advisors, other funders, academic institutions, and relief and development organizations all offer a wealth of expertise and ‘know-how’ about effective humanitarian assistance. Key references are listed at the end of this report. We encourage philanthropic organizations to build their internal expertise to become better informed about the nature of humanitarian crises, the organizations (especially local ones) involved in the humanitarian assistance sector, needs of vulnerable populations, and the ways that official and non-gov-

ernmental organizations, and business, can work together to prevent, prepare for, and mitigate disasters and crises of all kinds. Funders who cannot build expertise internally can draw on a wealth of networks and external advisors for sound advice. Local context matters – and in today’s world, some understanding of, for example, the drivers of slow-onset crises, or how different population groups (like women, or children) are affected differently, is more important than ever. Remaining ignorant about humanitarian crises and vulnerable populations affected is no longer an option.

7. Follow the maps already drawn by others

Adhere to the recommendations that others have advanced over the past decade, which arose after years of experience, successes and failures. Thanks to the leadership of institutions like the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation, Georgetown University’s Institute for the Study of International Migration, the Council on Foundations, and the European Foundation Center, as well as the Center for Disaster Philanthropy, a large number of actionable recommendations already exist specifically for philanthropy. They include:

- Make improving the quality of funding for response and mitigation the primary objective of foundations’ disaster grant making. Every dollar spent catalyzes wider improvement in private foundation grant making.
- Develop an internal plan for handling disaster/humanitarian assistance and related development assistance requests.
- Take a comprehensive approach to disaster grant making to focus on prevention, response, and recovery.
- Build on current collaborations among grant makers to broaden the scope of disaster grant making.
- Develop greater in-house knowledge and capacity about disaster management priorities and capabilities.
- Be strongly supportive of common planning done by the [official] aid community, encouraging a cohesive overall effort in every situation.

8. Move from charity to effective philanthropy

Many foundations, appropriately, see their support in other areas as a social investment, but adopt an entirely different view when it comes to humanitarian assistance. It is time to stop thinking about disaster/humanitarian assistance giving as charity, but instead as a strategic component of a foundation’s grant making. Until the philanthropic sector breaks the cycle of responding to disasters as emergencies, and then pulling back and not doing anything more until the next event occurs, little progress will be made toward mitigating future damage from natural disasters, conflicts, and other disturbances. Reactive funding to humanitarian crises is not effective philanthropy, but rather a Band-Aid that provides short-term feelings of good will, with little impact on long-term recovery or future resilience.

9. Research global funding flows, including philanthropic funding

Currently available data provide an incomplete picture of private funder flows located outside of Europe or the United States due to definitional challenges and lack of data systems. We recommend launching a longitudinal research study that examines global funding flows that occur in low- and middle-income countries. This effort would include the United Nations Financial Tracking Service (FTS) and Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) data, but would also include money coming from sources outside of those systems. This effort would highlight the robust philanthropic efforts undertaken by low- and middle-income countries, in addition to high-income countries (where data are currently easier to obtain). Subsequent to this study, support the leadership of philanthropists in the global south in exploring new approaches and without attempting to impose what are perceived as others’ systems or values.

52 Danny Sriskandarajah, interview with Regine A. Webster, March 4, 2016

53 Jenny Hodgson, interview with Regine A. Webster, March 7, 2016

54 <http://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2015/oct/16/less-than-2-of-humanitarian-funds-go-directly-to-local-ngos>

55 Jenny Hodgson, interview with Regine A. Webster, March 7, 2016

10. Leverage the private sector

The private sector leads in both innovation and maintaining economic viability. Private foundations should seek to leverage these assets for the purpose of humanitarian assistance. There are countless ways the private sector could be mobilized more to make a difference, from technology to financial know-how, and from logistics to communications. Foundations, including corporate foundations, could play a greater role in convincing more business actors to get involved in positive ways. The Connecting Business Initiative, which will be launched at the Summit during a special session, focuses on private sector involvement for disaster risk reduction, emergency preparedness, response, and recovery. The Initiative, initiated by UNDP, OCHA and UNISDR is meeting the demand of the private sector for engagement in a more strategic and permanent way with the international community, both globally and locally. The philanthropy sector can work with grantees to both embrace, and encourage, best practices amongst this sector.

Given that the vast majority of conflict-affected populations are in Muslim counties, the role of Islamic social finance is particularly important. Work is ongoing by the World Congress of Muslim Philanthropists and others to address how waqf, zakat and other instruments such as sukuk bonds can be channeled effectively and efficiently to meet humanitarian needs. The potential certainly exists for Islamic social finance to provide more solutions.

CONCLUSION

This report aims to seize an important moment in time and use it to shift how philanthropy sector institutions conceive of their role in humanitarian efforts, and evolve and adapt their practices to be more effective organizations in those efforts. Organizational change happens at an individual and collective level when leaders have the vision and will to change, and when those in the ecosystem around them encourage and compel them to change. We believe that the ideas presented here, coupled with the ten specific and actionable recommendations above, will allow us to meaningfully seize this moment in time.



The Center for Disaster Philanthropy's mission is to transform disaster giving by providing timely and thoughtful strategies to increase donors' impact during domestic and international disasters. For more, please visit: disasterphilanthropy.org

With an emphasis on recovery and disaster risk reduction, CDP aims to:

- Increase the effectiveness of contributions given to disasters;
- Bring greater attention to the life cycle of disasters, from preparedness and planning, to relief, to rebuilding and recovery efforts;
- Provide timely and relevant advice from experts with deep knowledge of disaster philanthropy;
- Conduct due diligence so donors can give with confidence; and,
- Create plans for informed giving for individuals, corporations and foundations.



The SDG Philanthropy Platform informs and catalyzes collaboration through building awareness and connections between those working in the philanthropy sector and beyond. We share a belief that the ambitious Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are an important and effective new roadmap to a better world for all. We have brought together hundreds of foundations and philanthropists across many countries to create new partnerships to increase funding and create programs that will have greater, and more sustainable, impact on people's lives. The SDGs weave together social, economic, and environmental challenges and solutions, and their creation and endorsement by all the world's governments represents the efforts and voices of millions of people globally.

Launched by the United Nations Development Program, Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors and Foundation Center in 2014, our Platform's partnerships illustrate the dedication of foundations and philanthropists from North and South America to Asia and from Europe to Africa. The founding supporters of the platform are the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation, Ford Foundation and The MasterCard Foundation. Explore our website and learn how you can join our effort to create the world we all hope to see.

sdgfunders.org