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In 2015, international giving reached an all-time high.

International giving saw a 29% increase from 2011 to 2015.

2015 $9.3 B
2011 $7.2 B

The average grant size more than tripled between 2002 and 2015.

2015 $604.5 K
2002 $200.9 K

International giving by community foundations more than tripled from 2011 to 2015.

The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation accounted for over half of total int’l giving from 2011 to 2015.

$35.4 B TOTAL
$17.9 B (50.7%)

$314.5 M
$103.1 M

2011 2015

INTERNATIONAL GIVING BY SELECT SUBJECTS, 2011-2015

HEALTH
$18.6 B (52.5%)
The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation accounted for 80% of int’l health giving. More on page 12

REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH CARE
giving nearly tripled. More on page 13

$35.4 B TOTAL INT’L GIVING 2011-2015

CLIMATE CHANGE
$835.6 M (2.4%)
More on page 14

DISASTERS
$391.3 M (1.1%)
More on page 16

EBOLA
Int’l disaster giving saw a 260% increase in 2014, 80% of which was in response to the ebola crisis. More on page 17

2015 $1.0 B

THE STATE OF GLOBAL GIVING BY U.S. FOUNDATIONS, 2011–2015
Background

This report represents the latest in a decades-long collaboration between Foundation Center and Council on Foundations to regularly analyze the data and trends on international grantmaking by U.S. foundations. It’s the tenth report published by the two organizations since the collaboration started in 1997. In 2017, Foundation Center and the Council on Foundations also published the first-ever report analyzing international grantmaking by U.S. community foundations, Local Communities with Global Reach: International Giving by U.S. Community Foundations. The previous analyses can be accessed at: https://www.issuelab.org/libraries/foundation_center/international_grantmaking_by_us_foundations.

Methodology

This analysis is based on grants data from Foundation Center’s research sample, FC 1000, which includes all grants of $10,000 or more reported by 1,000 of the largest U.S. foundations. For the purposes of this analysis, a grant is considered international if it’s for a non-U.S. recipient or for a U.S. recipient for international programs or programs implemented abroad.

The geographic distribution of grants is determined by the geographic area served by each grant. In instances where this information is not available, the geographic focus is based on the location of the recipient organization.

To avoid double counting grant dollars, the analysis of aggregate grantmaking for specific regions or issue areas does not include grants awarded to other grantmakers. Grants to grantmakers are included when adding up the total grant dollars awarded by individual foundations.

For community foundations, discretionary grants are included and donor-advised grants are included only when provided by the foundation. Grants to individuals are not included.

Grants may benefit multiple subjects, and may therefore be counted more than once.

Data on bi- and multi-lateral aid are sourced from the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). These data can be accessed from http://stats.oecd.org.

About Foundation Center’s Grants Data

In February 2018 Foundation Center’s grants database contained more than 8.6 million grant records worth more than $400 billion. The vast majority of grants in the database—about 97%—represent grantmaking of U.S.-based foundations.

- **Internal Revenue Service (IRS) tax form 990.** All U.S. foundations are required to submit this form, which contains information about each grant awarded by the foundation. The majority of the data in Foundation Center’s database are derived from these records.

- **Grants reported directly to Foundation Center** through the eReporting program. Foundations enrolled in this program share data about their grantmaking directly with Foundation Center.

- **Publicly available sources.** Foundation Center also collects publicly available information about grantmaking, including from open databases and news sources.

All the data are processed and indexed according to the facets and codes in the Philanthropy Classification System (PCS), which include geographic location or area served by organizations and programs, support strategies, subjects, populations served, organization type, and transaction type. Starting in 2015, all the grants in the database are coded through an automated process with select review by data experts. This process is trained for accuracy with a supervised machine learning model that draws on Foundation Center’s 60 years of experience in manually indexing information about grantmaking. Each grant in the database is assigned all relevant codes, which means one grant can be counted towards support for multiple subjects, populations, or strategies. This simultaneous coding allows for exploration of how funding for multiple subjects, geographies, populations, and strategies intersect.
TRENDS IN GLOBAL GIVING
BY U.S. FOUNDATIONS, 2011–2015

The average grant size more than tripled from 2002 to 2015.

Both overall and int’l grantmaking resumed a long-term trend of growth in 2011 after a two-year decrease following the financial crisis.

INTERNATIONAL GIVING AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL GIVING, 2002–2015

Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation accounted for 51% of international giving from 2011 to 2015 and the 2012 decrease in overall international giving was largely due to a spike in their grantmaking in 2011. When Gates’ grantmaking is excluded from the dataset, international giving grew at a slower rate (21%) during the five-year period. When excluding Gates, international giving did not recover to pre-crisis levels until 2012, before decreasing slightly and reaching a high of nearly $4 billion in 2015. The growth in the average size of international grants also holds when excluding Gates, with an increase of 19% from $240,701 in 2011 to $285,992 in 2015.
Silicon Valley Community Foundation

In 2006, the consolidation of two community foundations in California created the Silicon Valley Community Foundation (SVCF), which has since grown into the largest community foundation in the United States and the world. When SVCF was created, the organization embraced a new definition of what community means, moving beyond a place-based construct to better reflect the broad philanthropic interests of their region. Silicon Valley is an incredibly diverse region, and many donors have leveraged SVCF as a philanthropic partner for donor and corporate advised funds that support organizations around the world.

Today, SVCF supports the diverse interests of its donors and their connections to local, national and global communities, recognizing that social issues are not confined to singular spaces. To support their international grantmaking, SVCF manages a global charity database with more than 11,000 vetted organizations in 88 countries. Although SVCF made $198M in grants for international programs in 2015, that represents less than a quarter of their overall grantmaking that year and the majority of SVCF’s grantmaking continues to be for domestic programs.

The growth in int’l giving by community foundations was largely driven by SVCF.
International giving by community foundations more than tripled from 2011 to 2015.

Total int’l giving 2011: $103.1 M (1.4%)
Total int’l giving 2015: $314.5 M (3.4%)

Even when excluding SVCF, int’l giving by community foundations saw a 71% increase from 2011 to 2015.

Total int’l grant dollars 2011-2015: $35.4 B

INDEPENDENT FOUNDATIONS
$31.8 B
89.7%

BILL AND MELINDA GATES FOUNDATION
$17.9 B
56.5% of independent foundation dollars

CORPORATE FOUNDATIONS
$2.2 B
6.3%

COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS
$910.0 M
2.6%

SILICON VALLEY COMMUNITY FOUNDATION
$436.1 M
47.9% of community foundation dollars

OPERATING FOUNDATIONS
$501.2 M
1.4%
### TOP FUNDERS BY INTERNATIONAL GRANT DOLLARS, 2011–2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE RANK</th>
<th>INTERNATIONAL $</th>
<th>(% OF FUNDER'S TOTAL $)</th>
<th>2011 RANK</th>
<th>2012 RANK</th>
<th>2013 RANK</th>
<th>2014 RANK</th>
<th>2015 RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>$17,990,304,573</td>
<td>(87.0%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation</td>
<td>$1,107,845,151</td>
<td>(49.0%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ford Foundation</td>
<td>$1,049,558,292</td>
<td>(40.6%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Foundation to Promote Open Society</td>
<td>$872,228,798</td>
<td>(59.2%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation</td>
<td>$750,918,359</td>
<td>(52.3%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Walton Family Foundation</td>
<td>$593,716,706</td>
<td>(30.5%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Rockefeller Foundation</td>
<td>$542,631,413</td>
<td>(75.2%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The David and Lucile Packard Foundation</td>
<td>$481,419,773</td>
<td>(37.4%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Open Society Institute</td>
<td>$476,158,807</td>
<td>(80.6%)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Silicon Valley Community Foundation</td>
<td>$437,254,191</td>
<td>(16.9%)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bloomberg Philanthropies</td>
<td>$402,289,429</td>
<td>(53.5%)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation</td>
<td>$395,144,642</td>
<td>(34.4%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOP FUNDERS BY NUMBER OF INTERNATIONAL GRANTS, 2011–2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE RANK</th>
<th>NO. OF INT'L GRANTS</th>
<th>(% OF FUNDER'S TOTAL GRANTS)</th>
<th>2011 RANK</th>
<th>2012 RANK</th>
<th>2013 RANK</th>
<th>2014 RANK</th>
<th>2015 RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>5,238</td>
<td>(65.2%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ford Foundation</td>
<td>4,044</td>
<td>(53.0%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Silicon Valley Community Foundation</td>
<td>2,649</td>
<td>(15.3%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Foundation to Promote Open Society</td>
<td>2,328</td>
<td>(52.4%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Citi Foundation</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>(39.6%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Rockefeller Foundation</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>(69.4%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>(49.3%)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>(29.8%)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The David and Lucile Packard Foundation</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>(26.1%)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. John Templeton Foundation</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>(29.1%)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The Coca-Cola Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>(52.0%)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Seattle Foundation</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>(12.6%)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TOP INDEPENDENT FOUNDATIONS

1. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation $17,990,304,573
2. The Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation $1,107,845,151
3. Ford Foundation $1,049,558,292
4. Foundation to Promote Open Society $872,228,798
5. The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation $750,918,359
6. Walton Family Foundation $593,716,706
7. The Rockefeller Foundation $542,631,413
8. The David and Lucile Packard Foundation $481,419,773
10. Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation $395,144,642
12. Howard G. Buffett Foundation $345,016,114

### TOP CORPORATE FOUNDATIONS

1. The Coca-Cola Foundation, Inc. $286,374,001
2. Citi Foundation $144,223,736
3. The JPMorgan Chase Foundation $126,076,009
5. GE Foundation $111,407,965
6. ExxonMobil Foundation $104,247,145
7. The UPS Foundation $85,934,876
8. The Wal-Mart Foundation, Inc. $77,604,642
10. The Goldman Sachs Foundation $64,116,151
11. The Bank of America Charitable Foundation, Inc. $61,980,053
12. The PepsiCo Foundation, Inc. $60,806,336

### TOP COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS

1. Silicon Valley Community Foundation $437,254,191
2. Foundation For The Carolinas $6,100,000
3. Seattle Foundation $6,100,000
4. Boston Foundation, Inc. $5,563,801
5. The New York Community Trust $4,819,773
6. The San Francisco Foundation $4,028,881
7. Greater Houston Community Foundation $3,951,442
8. Marin Community Foundation $3,498,502
9. Greater Kansas City Community Foundation $3,498,502
10. The Chicago Community Trust $3,498,502
11. The Columbus Foundation and Affiliated Organizations $3,498,502
12. The San Diego Foundation $3,498,502

### TOP OPERATING FOUNDATIONS

1. Open Society Institute $476,158,807
2. Open Doors International, Inc. $105,101,352
3. New Mighty Foundation $72,515,724
4. The Lawrence Ellison Foundation $36,122,190
5. The Packard Humanities Institute $22,508,024
6. Western Union Foundation $20,297,270
7. J. Paul Getty Trust $19,373,740
8. World Children’s Fund $16,364,987
9. The Conservation Land Trust $12,882,200
10. The Draper Richards Kaplan Foundation $9,247,145
11. Gordon Foundation $9,117,690
12. Waterford Foundation $9,117,690

Note: In some rare cases a given foundations’ international giving may not be available in Foundation Center’s annual research set for a given grant year.
Most international grants from U.S. foundations support specific projects or programs, despite continued calls from non-profit leaders to increase general support grants.

Does project support, as opposed to general support grants, hinder non-profits? A growing body of research suggests unrestricted funding is critical to the effectiveness and sustainability of civil society organizations. This is because general support grants allow organizations to cover the full costs of doing their work, which improves their overall financial sustainability by allowing them to be nimble and responsive to changing contexts that impact their work, without seeking funder approval.¹

International Giving Continues to Flow Through Intermediaries

Calls for aid to localize so that more funds flow directly to civil society groups is not a new debate. This analysis shows that U.S. foundations continue to fund primarily through intermediaries. Further, direct grants to local organizations were substantially smaller in size, averaging just under $242K, while grants to intermediaries averaged just over $554K.

However, it’s important to note that these intermediaries vary in type and structure and our data included a variety of intermediary organizations, such as:

- INGOs operating programs in a different country than the country where they are headquartered.
- U.S. public charities re-granting funds directly to local organizations. To avoid double-counting dollars, these grantmaking public charities are not part of Foundation Center’s research set but represent an important group of funders specifically focused on channeling funds directly to local organizations.
- Organizations indigenous to their geographic region but working across countries, i.e. not just in the country where they are headquartered.
- Multilateral institutions working globally, such as funding through the World Health Organization.
- Research institutions conducting public health research or vaccination programs targeted at specific countries that differ from the country where they are headquartered.

DEFINITIONS

U.S. BASED INTERMEDIARY: refers to grants awarded to U.S.-based organizations for work implemented in or focused on another country.

NON-U.S. BASED INTERMEDIARY: refers to grants awarded to an organization based outside the U.S., but for work focused on or implemented in a different country that the country where that organization is based.

DIRECT: refers to grants awarded to organizations based in the country which the grant was serving.

GENERAL SUPPORT DIRECT TO LOCAL ORGS: general support grants to organizations based in the country which the grant was serving.
INTERNATIONAL GIVING BY SUBJECT, 2011–2015

Including the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

Excluding the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

Note: Each grant can benefit multiple subjects.
International giving for reproductive health care grew more than 2x as a share of total international giving from 5% in 2011 to 11% in 2015.

In 2009 the Obama administration reversed the global gag rule. The rule restricted foreign NGOs from using any of their own, non-U.S. Government funds to provide, counsel, or refer for abortions if they were also receiving funds from the U.S. government for other activities. While the use of U.S. Government funds for these services has been restricted since 1973, the gag rule prevented foundations and other non-government donors from providing support for reproductive health care to NGOs that rely on U.S. federal funds to sustain other parts of their operations and programs. The increase in reproductive health care funding in the years immediately following the reversal is suggestive of the gag rule’s effect on non-government funding flows.
The main driver behind the 2012 increase was a $100 M grant awarded by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation to ClimateWorks Foundation.

**Note:** We know that at least 64% of total U.S. foundation giving for climate change from 2011 to 2015 was international, meaning it was reported as having a specified non-U.S. geographic focus. This proportion decreased by 12% from 2011 to 2015, reaching a high of 85% in 2012, the same year that overall climate change funding was at its highest during the time period.
Cross-Border Flows Score:
- 4.1 and up
- 3.1 to 4.0
- 3.0 and less
- N/A

Note: This list shows the top 20 non-U.S. recipient countries of international grants by dollar amount in 2015, along with each country’s score on the 2014–2015 Global Philanthropy Index’s measure of enabling environment for cross-border flows. The list shows recipient countries ranked by the amount of funding awarded directly to organizations based in that country, not by the geographic focus of the grant and is therefore different from the list of top countries on page 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>$1,894,678,464</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>$403,798,388</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>$207,438,512</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>$192,550,695</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>$135,707,689</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>$129,023,937</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>$125,449,101</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>$86,840,736</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$81,629,096</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>$74,025,273</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>$70,210,074</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>$62,521,442</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>$42,490,642</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>$40,334,596</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>$38,591,471</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>$35,492,374</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>$32,977,751</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>$32,409,256</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>$30,839,243</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>$30,257,914</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increasing Legal Restrictions on Foreign Funding

Globally, governments continue to propose and pass legislation that impacts how civil society operates. In many countries, these restrictions can complicate direct grantmaking to local organizations for U.S. foundations. Between 2012 and 2015, the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law found that 98 laws constraining the freedoms of association or assembly were proposed or enacted across more than 55 countries. 36% of these laws limited intentional funding of local civil society groups.3

Restrictive Initiatives Since 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; The Pacific</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Hemisphere</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South &amp; Central Asia</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe &amp; Eurasia</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do governments restrict civil society organizations’ access to international funding? In some countries, national governments require pre-approval of all grants made or grantees must have prior permission to receive foreign funds. They can also mandate that all foreign funding must be routed through government entities. Other countries stigmatize local organizations receiving foreign support with “foreign agent” laws. Yet other countries enact foreign funding caps for non-profits and taxation of foreign funding. Governments also refer to counterterrorism and anti-money laundering as justifications for onerous and complicated reporting and registration requirements for grantmakers and grantees.

Even as governments continue to enact restrictions on cross-border funding, our data does not show a correlation between the amount of funding flowing from U.S. foundations to a given country in 2015 and that country’s score on the Index of Philanthropic Freedom indicator of the environment for cross-border flows for the period spanning 2014–2015 (we found a correlation value of just 0.10). Of the 20 countries receiving the most direct funding from U.S. foundation in 2015, five scored lower than the global average of 3.4, indicating a challenging legal environment for cross-border giving. India is a notable example, ranking fourth by direct giving but receiving a score of just 2.1.

These findings challenge our assumptions about the impact of the legal environment on funding flows and suggest a more complex relationship than we would expect. U.S. foundations should consider the following questions as they determine their strategies for supporting organizations in difficult environments: Why does a significant amount of funding reach certain difficult environments, and not others? Are any of the strategies and mechanisms for channeling funds to countries with difficult legal environments transferable across country contexts?

2 Enabling environment for cross-border flows score for each country, from the 2015 Index of Philanthropic Freedom, Hudson Institute, https://globalindices.iupui.edu/environment/. The analysis is based on data on the enabling environment for philanthropy across 64 countries for the time period from 2014 to 2015.


The Center for Disaster Philanthropy partnered with Foundation Center in 2014 on Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy, an initiative to track philanthropic funding flows for disasters. The initiative aims to make disaster philanthropy more effective by collecting and sharing data on disaster giving. Learn more at disasterphilanthropy.foundationcenter.org

2012 was the first year that disaster giving was tracked through Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy.

MEASURING THE STATE OF DISASTER PHILANTHROPY

The Center for Disaster Philanthropy partnered with Foundation Center in 2014 on Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy, an initiative to track philanthropic funding flows for disasters. The initiative aims to make disaster philanthropy more effective by collecting and sharing data on disaster giving. Learn more at disasterphilanthropy.foundationcenter.org
Violent conflict and natural disasters were key drivers of mounting humanitarian needs during the time period between 2011 and 2015. The annual number of deaths from violent conflict worldwide more than tripled from 49,000 in 2010 to 180,000 in 2014. The number of forcibly displaced people worldwide rose from 42.5 million in 2011—already a record high since the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) started tracking forced displacement—to 65.3 million in 2015. During the same time period a cumulative total of 761 million people were killed or directly affected by natural disasters. How did U.S. funders respond to natural disasters and humanitarian crises during this time period?

4 The taxonomy used to identify and classify disaster funding was developed based on a review of 15 existing taxonomies and includes natural, man-made, and complex humanitarian disasters as well as assistance strategies spanning all stages of response from resilience, risk reduction and mitigation, preparedness, response and relief, and reconstruction and recovery. For more information, see http://disasterphilanthropy.foundationcenter.org/about/.


U.S. FOUNDATION FUNDING FOR GLOBAL PROGRAMS

- **Total Int'l Giving 2011-2015**: $35.4 B (52.6%)
  - 24,349 grants (33.2%)
- **Global Programs**: $18.6 B (52.6%)
  - 24,349 grants (33.2%)
  - The average grant size was $765 K, higher than average for overall giving.
  - 64% of funding to Global Programs came from Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.
  - 68% of all Global Programs funding went to Health programs.

**INTERNATIONAL GIVING BY REGION 2011-2015**

- **Latin America & Mexico**: $2.7 B (7.7%)
  - 8,259 grants (11.2%)
- **Western Europe**: $2.0 B (5.6%)
  - 6,507 grants (8.9%)
- **Caribbean**: $343.4 M (1.0%)
  - 1,904 grants (2.6%)
- **Sub-Saharan Africa**: $9.0 B (25.4%)
  - 9,869 grants (13.4%)
- **Middle East & North Africa**: $1.7 B (4.7%)
  - 6,857 grants (9.3%)
- **Asia & Pacific**: $18.6 B (52.6%)
  - 24,349 grants (33.2%)

**GLOBAL PROGRAMS**

- 68% of all Global Programs funding went to Health programs.

**Foundation Center and the Council on Foundations**
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TOP COUNTRIES BY GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS

1. India $1.4 B
2. Israel $1.2 B
3. Nigeria $1.0 B
4. China $892.6 M
5. Mexico $782.8 M
6. United Kingdom $598.7 M
7. Ethiopia $459.1 M
8. South Africa $424.1 M
9. Kenya $406.3 M
10. Canada $390.9 M

EASTERN EUROPE, CENTRAL ASIA & RUSSIA
$570.2 M (1.6%)
2,475 grants (3.4%)

ASIA & PACIFIC
$6.6 B (18.7%)
11,446 grants (15.6%)

INTERNATIONAL GIVING BY INCOME LEVEL OF BENEFICIARY COUNTRY

LOW INCOME 16.7%
$1.9 B
UPPER-MIDDLE INCOME 28.1%
$3.2 B
LOWER-MIDDLE INCOME 38.6%
$4.3 B
HIGH INCOME 27.8%
$3.1 B

Note: Percentages reflect proportion of dollars that were possible to allocate to specific countries. Of the total $35.4 billion in international grant dollars from 2011 to 2015, $11.2 billion (about 32%) could be allocated to a specific country. Grants may benefit multiple countries. As a result, figures do not add up to 100 percent.

THE STATE OF GLOBAL GIVING BY U.S. FOUNDATIONS, 2011–2015

TOP COUNTRIES BY RECIPIENT LOCATION

1. United States $20.5 B
2. Switzerland $5.4 B
3. United Kingdom $1.7 B
4. India $667.4 M
5. South Africa $588.3 M
6. Kenya $491.2 M
7. Canada $475.1 M
8. Nigeria $450.5 M
9. China $364.3 M
10. Israel $350.7 M
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ASIA & PACIFIC

KEY FACTS

$6.6 B (18.7%)

64% of funding to Asia & Pacific came from Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Peace and Security funding to Asia & Pacific more than tripled from 2011 to 2015.

17% of funding went directly to local organizations based in the country benefiting the grant in question.

FOUNDATION GRANT DOLLARS, 2011-2015

AVERAGE GRANT SIZE, 2011-2015

TOP FUNDERS, 2011-2015

BY DOLLAR AMOUNT

1. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation $ 4.3 B
2. The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation $ 240.1 M
3. Ford Foundation $ 217.8 M
4. The David and Lucile Packard Foundation $ 190.8 M
5. The Rockefeller Foundation $ 162.1 M

ASIA & PACIFIC includes the following countries: Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei, Cambodia, China, Cook Islands, Fiji, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Laos, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Federated States of, Mongolia, Myanmar/Burma, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, North Korea, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, Tibet (autonomous region), Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Vietnam.
### INT’L GIVING BY SUBJECT AREA, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Average Grant Size</th>
<th>% Change 2011-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$3.8 B</td>
<td>+17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>$1.1 B</td>
<td>+89.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>$887.9 M</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$513.5 M</td>
<td>-42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Food Security</td>
<td>$752.3 M</td>
<td>+90.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>$300.0 M</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$340.3 M</td>
<td>-13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>$64.5 M</td>
<td>+94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace &amp; Security</td>
<td>$49.8 M</td>
<td>+241.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INT’L GIVING BY POPULATION FOCUS, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Focus</th>
<th>Average Grant Size</th>
<th>% Change 2011-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Youth</td>
<td>$2.4 B</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women &amp; Girls</td>
<td>$1.0 B</td>
<td>+52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>$1.2 B</td>
<td>-48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>$77.2 M</td>
<td>-54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants &amp; Refugees</td>
<td>$36.0 M</td>
<td>+5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td>$55.4 M</td>
<td>+102.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ People</td>
<td>$11.7 M</td>
<td>+265.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INT’L GIVING BY CHANNELS OF GIVING, 2011-2015

#### By Dollar Amount
- **U.S.-Based Intermediary**: $3.5 B (53.1%)
- **Non-U.S.-Based Intermediary**: $2.0 B (30.4%)
- **Direct**: $1.1 B (16.6%)

#### By Number of Grants
- **U.S.-Based Intermediary**: 5,958 grants (52.1%)
- **Non-U.S.-Based Intermediary**: 1,250 grants (10.9%)
- **Direct**: 4,238 grants (37.0%)

### Top Countries by Geographic Focus, 2011-2015

1. India .......................... $1.4 B
2. China .................................. $892.6 M
3. Indonesia .......................... $217.2 M
4. Pakistan .................................. $207.4 M
5. Vietnam .................................. $195.8 M
6. Bangladesh .................................. $190.3 M
7. Japan .................................. $134.4 M
8. Myanmar .................................. $108.2 M
9. Cambodia .................................. $104.8 M
10. Philippines .................. $81.5 M

---

CARIBBEAN

KEY FACTS

$343.4 M (1.0%)

24% of funding to the Caribbean came from Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

91% of funding to the Caribbean was channeled through U.S. organizations.

37% of funding to the Caribbean went to Haiti.

FOUNDATION GRANT DOLLARS, 2011-2015

BY DOLLAR AMOUNT
1. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation $81.0 M
2. W. K. Kellogg Foundation $33.6 M
3. The Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation $20.3 M
4. Ford Foundation $15.8 M
5. The PepsiCo Foundation, Inc. $11.1 M

BY NUMBER OF GRANTS
1. Johnson & Johnson Family of Companies Contribution Fund 164 grants
2. W. K. Kellogg Foundation 122 grants
3. Ford Foundation 88 grants
4. Foundation to Promote Open Society 73 grants
5. Boston Foundation, Inc. 63 grants

Founded includes the following countries: Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, Bahamas Islands, Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Greater Antilles, Grenada, Guadeloupe, Haiti, Jamaica, Leeward Antilles, Leeward Islands, Lesser Antilles, Martinique, Montserrat, Northern Saint-Martin, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saint-Barthélemy, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks and Caicos Islands, Windward Islands.
### INT’L GIVING BY SUBJECT AREA, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Average Grant Size</th>
<th>% Change 2011-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$153.0 M</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>$64.7 M</td>
<td>-82.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>$50.5 M</td>
<td>-74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$26.7 M</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Food Security</td>
<td>$15.1 M</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>$15.8 M</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$17.5 M</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>$2.8 M</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace &amp; Security</td>
<td>$415.0 K</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INT’L GIVING BY POPULATION FOCUS, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Focus</th>
<th>Average Grant Size</th>
<th>% Change 2011-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Youth</td>
<td>$42.7 M</td>
<td>140.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women &amp; Girls</td>
<td>$46.8 M</td>
<td>-16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>$19.8 M</td>
<td>-80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>$19.8 M</td>
<td>-47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants &amp; Refugees</td>
<td>$4.5 M</td>
<td>-50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td>$2.0 M</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ People</td>
<td>$1.4 M</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INT’L GIVING BY CHANNELS OF GIVING, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel of Giving</th>
<th>By Dollar Amount</th>
<th>By Number of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-Based Intermediary</td>
<td>$313.4 M (91.2%)</td>
<td>1,696 grants (89.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-U.S.-Based Intermediary</td>
<td>$14.6 M (4.3%)</td>
<td>55 grants (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>$15.4 M (4.5%)</td>
<td>153 grants (8.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support Direct to Local Orgs</td>
<td>$2.3 M (13.0%)</td>
<td>30 grants (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOP COUNTRIES BY GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Haiti</td>
<td>$128.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cuba</td>
<td>$13.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bahamas</td>
<td>$7.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dominican Republic</td>
<td>$5.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jamaica</td>
<td>$4.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bermuda</td>
<td>$3.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grenada</td>
<td>$1.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>$1.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>$1.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>$1.1 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EASTERN EUROPE, CENTRAL ASIA & RUSSIA**

**KEY FACTS**

**FOUNDATION GRANT DOLLARS, 2011-2015**

- **Including** the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- **Excluding** the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

**AVERAGE GRANT SIZE, 2011-2015**

- **Including** the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- **Excluding** the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

**TOP FUNDERS, 2011-2015**

**BY DOLLAR AMOUNT**

1. Foundation to Promote Open Society $185.6 M
2. Open Society Institute $77.7 M
3. Charles Stewart Mott Foundation $47.1 M
4. Carnegie Corporation of New York $30.8 M
5. The Coca-Cola Foundation, Inc. $29.5 M

**BY NUMBER OF GRANTS**

1. Foundation to Promote Open Society 325 grants
2. Charles Stewart Mott Foundation 303 grants
3. Open Society Institute 156 grants
4. The Coca-Cola Foundation, Inc. 154 grants
5. Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc. 152 grants

**Eastern Europe, Central Asia, & Russia** includes the following countries: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan.

Includes data from the Foundation Center and the Council on Foundations.
### Int’l Giving by Subject Area, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Average Grant Size</th>
<th>% Change 2011-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$51.4 M</td>
<td>+51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>$60.1 M</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>$39.2 M</td>
<td>-59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$93.0 M</td>
<td>+5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Food Security</td>
<td>$3.9 M</td>
<td>-51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>$123.6 M</td>
<td>+24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$9.8 M</td>
<td>+58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>$26.7 M</td>
<td>-62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace &amp; Security</td>
<td>$26.7 M</td>
<td>+196.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Int’l Giving by Channels of Giving, 2011-2015

#### By Dollar Amount

- **U.S.-Based Intermediary**
  - $177.2 M (31.1%)
- **Non-U.S.-Based Intermediary**
  - $151.8 M (26.6%)
- **Direct**
  - $241.2 M (42.3%)

#### By Number of Grants

- **U.S.-Based Intermediary**
  - 919 grants (37.3%)
- **Non-U.S.-Based Intermediary**
  - 394 grants (16.0%)
- **Direct**
  - 1,162 grants (47.1%)

### Int’l Giving by Population Focus, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Focus</th>
<th>Average Grant Size</th>
<th>% Change 2011-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Youth</td>
<td>$61.0 M</td>
<td>+15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women &amp; Girls</td>
<td>$19.4 M</td>
<td>-42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>$7.1 M</td>
<td>-35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>$5.0 M</td>
<td>-11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants &amp; Refugees</td>
<td>$3.8 M</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td>$3.4 M</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ People</td>
<td>$936.4 K</td>
<td>+42.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top Countries by Geographic Focus, 2011-2015

1. **Russia** $119.9 M
2. **Poland** $46.6 M
3. **Ukraine** $38.7 M
4. **Hungary** $34.6 M
5. **Romania** $33.5 M
6. **Moldova** $31.8 M
7. **Kyrgyz Republic** $29.9 M
8. **Estonia** $25.4 M
9. **Serbia** $24.1 M
10. **Slovakia** $23.2 M
Included in Latin America & Mexico are the following countries: Argentina, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay, Venezuela.
### INT’L GIVING BY SUBJECT AREA, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Average Grant Size</th>
<th>% Change 2011-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$745.0 M</td>
<td>+12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>$450.7 M</td>
<td>-35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>$809.8 M</td>
<td>-23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$458.8 M</td>
<td>-90.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Food Security</td>
<td>$223.2 M</td>
<td>+118.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>$350.2 M</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$46.4 M</td>
<td>-87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>$22.9 M</td>
<td>-40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace &amp; Security</td>
<td>$6.9 M</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INT’L GIVING BY POPULATION FOCUS, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Focus</th>
<th>Average Grant Size</th>
<th>% Change 2011-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Youth</td>
<td>$257.6 M</td>
<td>+5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women &amp; Girls</td>
<td>$304.0 M</td>
<td>+22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>$23.4 M</td>
<td>+535.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>$17.9 M</td>
<td>-27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants &amp; Refugees</td>
<td>$88.6 M</td>
<td>-63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td>$209.5 M</td>
<td>+23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ People</td>
<td>$4.6 M</td>
<td>+1357.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INT’L GIVING BY CHANNELS OF GIVING, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channels of Giving</th>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-Based Intermediary</td>
<td>$1.6 B</td>
<td>4,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-U.S.-Based Intermediary</td>
<td>$518.7 M</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>$547.6 M</td>
<td>2,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### THE STATE OF GLOBAL GIVING BY U.S. FOUNDATIONS, 2011–2015

1. Mexico                             | $782.8 M           |
2. Brazil                             | $315.5 M           |
3. Peru                               | $151.7 M           |
4. Colombia                           | $150.8 M           |
5. Ecuador                            | $85.1 M            |
6. El Salvador                        | $75.2 M            |
7. Chile                              | $64.1 M            |
8. Guatemala                          | $64.0 M            |
9. Bolivia                            | $63.3 M            |
10. Honduras                          | $57.6 M            |
**Middle East & North Africa** includes the following countries: Algeria, Bahrain, Cyprus, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, West Bank/Gaza Strip (Palestinian Territories), Yemen.

**Key Facts**

- **$1.7 B (4.7%)**

**Foundation Grant Dollars, 2011-2015**

- **Including** the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- **Excluding** the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

**Average Grant Size, 2011-2015**

- **Including** the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- **Excluding** the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

**Top Funders, 2011-2015**

**By Dollar Amount**

1. Adelson Family Foundation  $185.8 M
2. The Leona M. and Harry B. Helmsley Charitable Trust  $114.4 M
3. Ford Foundation  $69.0 M
4. The Harry & Jeanette Weinberg Foundation Inc  $64.8 M
5. Ted Arison Family Foundation USA, Inc.  $64.0 M

**By Number of Grants**

1. The Harry & Jeanette Weinberg Foundation Inc  318 grants
2. The Rosalinde and Arthur Gilbert Foundation  280 grants
3. Ford Foundation  269 grants
4. Ted Arison Family Foundation USA, Inc.  237 grants
5. Foundation to Promote Open Society  227 grants

**Peace and Security** funding to MENA grew by 205% from 2011 to 2015.

74% of funding to MENA was for **Israel**.

25% of funding to MENA was for programs focused on **religion**.
Sub-Saharan Africa includes the following countries: Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Republic of Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

72% of funding to Sub-Saharan Africa came from Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

23% of funding to Sub-Saharan Africa was for agriculture and food security programs.

The average size of grants for Sub-Saharan Africa was $910 K.

Including the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

Excluding the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

**TOP FUNDERS, 2011-2015**

**BY DOLLAR AMOUNT**

1. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation  $6.5 B
2. Howard G. Buffett Foundation   $240.9 M
3. Ford Foundation               $232.4 M
4. Foundation to Promote Open Society  $202.2 M
5. The Rockefeller Foundation    $185.6 M

**BY NUMBER OF GRANTS**

1. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation  1,709 grants
2. Ford Foundation                  953 grants
3. The Rockefeller Foundation       347 grants
4. Segal Family Foundation          325 grants
5. Silicon Valley Community Foundation  275 grants

Sub-Saharan Africa includes the following countries: Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Republic of Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe.
Western Europe includes the following countries: Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom.

30% of funding to Western Europe went towards health programs.

22% of funding to Western Europe was targeted at children & youth.

35% of funding to Western Europe went directly to local organizations.

### Foundation Grant Dollars, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>$529.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation</td>
<td>$179.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Oak Foundation U.S.A.</td>
<td>$94.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. John Templeton Foundation</td>
<td>$81.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The David and Lucile Packard Foundation</td>
<td>$74.6 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Grant Size, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. John Templeton Foundation</td>
<td>$2.0 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Bank of America Charitable Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$35.4 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. State Street Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$221.9 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The JPMorgan Chase Foundation</td>
<td>$224.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Silicon Valley Community Foundation</td>
<td>$270.7 K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top Funders, 2011-2015

#### By Dollar Amount

1. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation | $529.0 M |
2. The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation | $179.6 M |
3. The Oak Foundation U.S.A. | $94.3 M |
4. John Templeton Foundation | $81.8 M |
5. The David and Lucile Packard Foundation | $74.6 M |

#### By Number of Grants

1. John Templeton Foundation | 544 grants |
2. The Bank of America Charitable Foundation, Inc. | 303 grants |
3. State Street Foundation, Inc. | 266 grants |
4. The JPMorgan Chase Foundation | 245 grants |
5. Silicon Valley Community Foundation | 229 grants |
Achieving the SDGs requires more than just governments and the price tag is high—experts estimate it will cost more than $4 trillion per year from 2015 to 2030. Foundations are already beginning to partner with UN agencies, the private sector, civil society, and government to leverage their resources and work collectively to changing the world by 2030 in order to truly “leave no one behind.”

Foundations are already working globally to address issues and topics across the goals, such as alleviating hunger and investing in quality education. By linking their existing programs and aligning future strategies with the SDG framework, U.S. foundations working globally can join important conversations on how best to achieve more effective development outcomes for all.

Foundation Center estimates that foundations will spend at least $364 B on the SDGs between 2015 and 2030 and are on track to possibly surpass that estimate. This data shows that many U.S. foundations are already working globally to address issues and topics across the goals, such as alleviating hunger and investing in quality education. By linking their existing programs and aligning future strategies with the SDG framework, U.S. foundations working globally can join important conversations on how best to achieve more effective development outcomes for all.

### International Giving by Sustainable Development Goal, 2011–2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Description</th>
<th>Total Giving</th>
<th>Change from 2011-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No Poverty</td>
<td>$1.2 B</td>
<td>+50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Zero Hunger</td>
<td>$3.6 B</td>
<td>+53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Good Health and Well-being</td>
<td>$17.0 B</td>
<td>+37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality Education</td>
<td>$2.8 B</td>
<td>-31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gender Equality</td>
<td>$4.9 B</td>
<td>+80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clean Water and Sanitation</td>
<td>$971.5 M</td>
<td>-30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Affordable and Clean Energy</td>
<td>$791.6 M</td>
<td>-40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Decent Work and Economic Growth</td>
<td>$2.9 B</td>
<td>+27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure</td>
<td>$1.4 B</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reduced Inequality</td>
<td>$248.9 M</td>
<td>+45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sustainable Cities and Communities</td>
<td>$1.2 B</td>
<td>+2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Responsible Consumption and Production</td>
<td>$652.5 M</td>
<td>+24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Climate Action</td>
<td>$827.9 M</td>
<td>-22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Life Below Water</td>
<td>$383.1 M</td>
<td>+18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Life on Land</td>
<td>$2.1 B</td>
<td>+48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions</td>
<td>$3.5 B</td>
<td>+3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Partnerships for the Goals</td>
<td>$643.0 M</td>
<td>-30.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SDGs formally did not go into effect until January 2016. Still, the distribution of foundation funding by SDGs during the five year period before will serve as a baseline for tracking U.S. philanthropic efforts toward the achievement of the global goals.

Foundations should consider the following in reviewing the figures:

• How did foundation funding for SDGs differ from ODA from 2011 to 2015?
• Based on this, which goals will be strategic areas for foundations to focus on going forward?
• Were there strategic reasons for the distribution of funding from 2011 to 2015? If so, why, and do the same strategic considerations still hold true?

**Why report on funding by SDGs before the goals went into effect?**

The SDGs formally did not go into effect until January 2016. Still, the distribution of foundation funding by SDGs during the five year period before will serve as a baseline for tracking U.S. philanthropic efforts toward the achievement of the global goals.

Foundations should consider the following in reviewing the figures: