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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WHER’s Executive Director, Akudo Oguaghamba, at a Psychological Empowerment workshop run by WHER in Nigeria. Credit: WHER
Lesbian, bisexual, and queer (LBQ) groups are doing groundbreaking work. Activists are working at the intersections of gender, sexuality, race, class, and disability to challenge systemic oppression while also building knowledge among LBQ communities on holistic security, self- and collective care, social norm change, and legal and policy advocacy. Under often hostile conditions, LBQ groups are working with focus and determination to build the visibility of LBQ people by creating feminist art and cultural spaces, organizing their communities, and building awareness of LBQ people and their human rights.

With historical roots in women’s and gay rights movements, as well as other social justice movements, autonomous LBQ organizing has grown significantly in the last twenty years, often in reaction to sexism in mixed LGBTQI groups and homophobia in women’s groups, and also because LBQ agendas are distinct and need focused attention. LBQ women and non-binary people confront misogyny, homophobia, and heteronormativity; those facing multiple oppressions contend with racial and economic injustices as well. These power dynamics and social norms expose them to a unique set of human rights violations, including particular risks of violence, especially violence within the family, and discrimination in accessing education, health care, housing, and employment.

While their efforts are critical to advancing the well-being of LBQ people and achieving multiple social justice agendas, LBQ groups struggle to access funding. Despite unprecedented momentum in philanthropy to create resourcing pipelines for grassroots movements, resources for LBQ groups are inadequate and have not kept pace with the innovative ways in which they are organizing.

These two statements capture the extent of the marginalization and hostility that LBQ people face, as well as the hope and potential of the growing movement of LBQ groups that are visionary, creative, strategic, and resilient.

Resourcing for LBQ organizing has failed to keep pace with the needs and the capacities of LBQ groups and movements that are operating in increasingly hostile and violent contexts.

This report, Vibrant Yet Under-Resourced: The State of Lesbian, Bisexual, and Queer Movements, presents a compelling picture of the current lack of resourcing for LBQ communities and makes a powerful case for why more and more effective funding is urgently needed.
Based on a mixed-methods approach, this report presents findings from surveys conducted in 2018 with 378 LBQ groups from all regions of the world and 67 donors, including public and private foundations, as well as follow-up interviews resulting in four case studies of LBQ groups (for further details about the sample, please see the research methodology in Chapter 1, page 22, and Appendix 1: Methodology, page 78). Following are the key findings that showcase why increased funding to LBQ groups is worthwhile, necessary, and urgent.

1. LBQ groups are young and quickly growing in numbers.

There has been tremendous growth of LBQ groups in the last two decades in all regions of the world. Most groups (89%) have been founded in the last twenty years, and more than half (61%) have been formed since 2010.

2. LBQ groups work in intersectional ways.

LBQ groups tie their communities’ well-being to a range of social justice issues. They identify strongly with lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, and intersex movements and women’s rights movements, but more than half (53%) of LBQ groups also work with other types of communities and on other issues such as the right to health (32%), young people’s rights (26%), and sex workers’ rights (20%). In doing so, they elevate the needs of LBQ communities, bring LBQ leadership to diverse movements, and contribute to progress on multiple social issues.

3. LBQ groups utilize multiple robust organizing strategies to achieve their aims.

An overwhelming majority (around 90%) of LBQ groups use movement building, advocacy, and capacity building as key strategies in their activism. Close to three-quarters (71%) use cultural change strategies, including creating media and art, preserving LBQ history, and addressing the restrictive cultural norms that underpin the oppression they face, and more than two-thirds (69%) engage in research and knowledge production to fill major information gaps about LBQ people and their experiences.

LBQ groups also provide life-saving support to their own communities, addressing the violence and trauma they experience. Nearly two-thirds (63%) offer direct health and social services, as well as mental health and wellness support to LBQ communities, and more than half (56%) use safety-related strategies in their work.

4. LBQ groups have extremely small budgets and very little access to external funding.

The median budget for LBQ groups in 2017 was $11,713. Nearly three-quarters (72%) of LBQ groups operate on annual budgets of less than $50,000 per year; in fact, approaching half (40%) reported an annual budget of less than $5,000.

5. Most LBQ groups have no savings or assets.

Groups are working under precarious conditions with little protection or recourse in times of financial crisis. Approaching three-quarters (70%) of LBQ groups have no savings, and about a quarter (27%) have no assets. Among those that do, most are assets that quickly depreciate (e.g., computers, office equipment). Given the substantial financial insecurities LBQ groups face, if they lose funding, they may be forced to dissolve or resort to other work to sustain themselves.

6. Funding for LBQ groups is sparse everywhere, with significant regional differences.

Whereas the median external funding for LBQ groups in North America was $244,000, in every other region the median external funding received was less than $10,000. Groups in Europe and Central Asia and in Asia and the Pacific had the lowest median external funding at $1,150 and $1,170, respectively.

The key inclusion criteria for the activist survey was respondents that belong to groups that are self-governing or autonomous, and work specifically on LBQ issues or with LBQ communities. In addition, the survey protocol required that LBQ people comprised the majority (50% or more) of the group’s leadership. As such, this research focuses on groups that are LBQ-led. In our discussion of LBQ groups in this report, we are referring to LBQ-led groups. We have used the terms “LBQ groups” and “LBQ-led groups” interchangeably.

The majority of LBQ groups have few, if any, paid staff and are heavily reliant on volunteers. One-quarter of all groups have no full-time staff (28%), and another 25% have just one or two staff full-time members.
7. LBQ groups receive insufficient support to fully implement their strategies. Fewer than one in four groups using advocacy, community movement building, and capacity building—the three most common strategies—reported receiving sufficient funds for their planned activities. Other strategies critical to the visibility and well-being of LBQ groups receive even less attention: despite two-thirds of LBQ groups prioritizing these areas of work, fewer than half (44%) of donors funded research and knowledge production, while direct services, including for mental health, was funded by the fewest donors (32%).

8. LBQ groups face multiple barriers to accessing and implementing funds. The barriers to funding that LBQ groups most frequently reported included: a lack of requests for proposals reflecting their priorities and strategies, requirements to present a successful fundraising track record, a lack of donor response to their queries, and delays in payments once funding is awarded.

9. LBQ groups receive primarily short-term and restricted funding. More than half (56%) of LBQ groups have never received multi-year funding and less than a quarter (22%) received unrestricted funding, hampering their ability to do long-term and self-directed work. A third (34%) of LBQ groups are generating community funding to resource their work.

Overall, the findings suggest a vibrant and growing area of activism in urgent need of greater and better quality resourcing. LBQ groups around the world are working to address some of the most pressing challenges facing oppressed communities and struggle to access the resourcing that will make their work sustainable. Their growing activism presents an important opportunity for donors to adjust funding strategies to ensure that they meet the needs and priorities of LBQ groups.

3 — “LBQ-inclusive” funding is defined as broad funding, e.g., LGBTQI or women’s rights funding, that is inclusive of LBQ communities and issues, but not specifically aimed at LBQ communities and issues.
RECOMMENDATIONS TO DONORS

1. **Increase funding for LBQ communities and direct it to LBQ groups.**
   Dedicated new funding for LBQ issues and direct it to LBQ-led groups, especially those based outside of North America.

2. **Make funding more accessible to LBQ groups.**
   Simplify application requirements. Partner with public foundations, women's funds, and intermediaries that have the capacity and expertise to support small and/or unregistered LBQ groups.

3. **Improve the quality of funding for LBQ groups.**
   Provide flexible and unrestricted funding that allows LBQ groups to pursue their own agendas. Build multi-year partnerships that allow LBQ groups to do long-term strategic work.

4. **Direct funding to regions where LBQ groups’ access is especially limited.**
   Address funding gaps by channeling new resources to especially under-funded regions: Middle East/Southwest Asia, Europe and Central Asia, and Asia and the Pacific.

5. **Invest in research and knowledge production and service provision, two priorities of LBQ groups that are particularly under-funded.**
   Investing in research and knowledge production will bolster advocacy and movement-building. Supporting direct services, including mental health and wellness, is critical for the well-being and sustainability of LBQ organizers and movements.

6. **Increase non-financial support to LBQ groups and ensure it meets their needs.**
   Make dedicated efforts to invest in the organizational capacity building of LBQ groups and to connect them with new donors, contributing to their sustainability and resilience.

7. **For donors without LBQ-specific portfolios, ensure that funding intended to be LBQ-inclusive actually reaches LBQ communities.**
   Develop specific and measurable strategies to ensure funding actually reaches LBQ communities. For example, ask non-LBQ-specific grantees about the strategies they use to reach LBQ people, their track record in promoting the rights of LBQ people, or how many people in their leadership identify as LBQ.

8. **Seek to “de-silo” funding for LBQ groups’ intersectional work.**
   There are meaningful opportunities for women’s rights and gender equality donors to increase support for LBQ groups; donors who focus on sexual and reproductive health and rights, HIV and AIDS, young people, sex workers, and other issues and constituencies should also consider how LBQ groups fit into their portfolios.

Please see the full text of these recommendations on pages 73-74.
1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY
INTRODUCTION

Worldwide, LBQ organizing is vibrant and expanding. LBQ activists are doing groundbreaking work. Around the world, they are working at the intersections of gender, sexuality, race, class, and disability to challenge systemic oppressions. They work to develop their constituents’ skills in legal and policy advocacy, and to raise their constituents’ awareness on issues ranging from health rights, to decriminalization of sexual orientation, to sex and sexual pleasure. They are working in hostile settings to create awareness of the human rights and well-being of LBQ people, and are building intersectional feminist art and cultural spaces, while also training LBQ people in self-defense and holistic self- and collective-care. They envision building healthy and well-balanced relationships in their families, their communities, their workplaces, and with the Earth.

Research shows that resourcing for LBQ activism is insufficient. While their efforts are critical to advancing the human rights and well-being of LBQ people, resourcing for their work is inadequate and has not kept pace with the

LBQ-identified women and non-binary people live in communities everywhere in the world and face serious human rights violations globally, including discrimination, exclusion, violence, lack of legal protection, and lack of access to health care, education, and employment. In response to these violations, LBQ people are organizing to fight stigma and isolation, build community, and advocate for their human, economic, social, and political rights. LBQ activists and groups are working toward a future where their constituents can live self-determined lives and enjoy safety, bodily autonomy, and pleasure. They envision building healthy and well-balanced relationships in their families, their communities, their workplaces, and with the Earth.

This research provides a picture of the current landscape of LBQ organizing by exploring how and where LBQ groups work, their infrastructure (e.g., finances and staffing), and their experiences with accessing funding. It also provides information on the current state of donor resourcing for their work. In addition to quantitative data, the report includes four qualitative case studies that are based on conversations with four LBQ grantee partners of Astraea and/or Mama Cash. These case studies, drawn from a variety of regional contexts, illustrate many of the report’s findings, including the energy and dynamism of current LBQ organizing as well as the violence and repressive contexts in which so many groups work, and the challenges they face in adequately resourcing their activism.

On terminology: Following a year-long consultation with activists, “LBQ” is the term used throughout this report. LBQ focuses on sexual identity and is inclusive of lesbian, bisexual, and queer women, both cisgender and trans, and all non-binary people on the gender spectrum who relate to a lesbian, bisexual, and/or queer identity. For many people, labels are often inadequate or unwanted, language is limited, and gender exists on a continuum. LBQ in this context serves as the operational definition from which this research has been conducted and served as a key inclusion criteria for participation in this study.

The key inclusion criteria for the activist survey included respondents that belong to LBQ-identified organizations that are autonomous, and work specifically on LBQ issues or with LBQ communities. In addition, survey protocol required that LBQ people comprised the majority (50% or more) of the group’s leadership.
Research methodology

This research asked three questions:

1. What is the current infrastructure of LBQ groups?
2. How do donors resource LBQ groups?
3. How much alignment is there between the needs and visions of LBQ groups and donor resourcing for LBQ activism?

The research draws on two analytic perspectives to answer these questions: 1) the experiences of LBQ activists, and 2) the experiences of foundation donors that either directly or indirectly fund LBQ activists, groups, or issues. An advisory committee of 11 LBQ activists guided the project. Advisory committee members were grantee-partners of Astraea and/or Mama Cash and included activists from Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and Central Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, Middle East/Southwest Asia, and North America. An informal group of five funders with experience in LBQ, LGBTQI, and women’s rights grantmaking provided feedback on the donor components of the research.

A mixed methods approach consisting of desk research, interviews, and two surveys — one aimed at activists and a second for donors — was utilized to answer the research questions.

For more details on the report methodology, please refer to the “Methodology” section in the Appendix 1 on page 78.

Data presentation throughout this report

Findings throughout this report have been rounded to the nearest whole number. In some cases, this results in data that may not add up to 100%.

Activist data

Activists who took part in the survey filled in a questionnaire made available via SurveyMonkey. Some questions were optional, and not all respondents answered all survey questions; this sometimes resulted in substantial missing responses. In cases where more than 10% of the total 378 respondents did not provide an answer, we have indicated in the text the number of responses (n) for that question. Data is at times stratified by region and budget size of groups. Unfortunately, low levels of participation and our inability to reach more groups working in the Middle East/Southwest Asia region for the activist survey resulted in a very small sample size (n=5) and prevented the inclusion of regional analysis for the Middle East/Southwest Asia.

Based on feedback from grantee-partners and advisory committee members, Astraea and Mama Cash developed regional groupings that aim to respect the principle of self-determination by the people of those countries, but with the recognition that these may be contested groupings. The groupings used can be found in Appendix 3.

In presenting the data stratified by the budget size of LBQ groups responding to the survey, the following categories were used:

- Small budget: groups with an annual budget between $1 and $25,000;
- Medium budget: groups with an annual budget between $25,001 and $100,000;
- Large budget: groups with an annual budget of $100,001 or more.

Responses from LBQ groups with a “zero annual budget” have also been included and analyzed in the report but did present some challenges. For example, in response to a question on external funding sources for LBQ groups, zero budget groups identified some sources of funding. This apparently contradictory information may be the result of receiving small one-off gifts or for other reasons that are unclear.

The budget categories used in this report reflect the low level of resourcing for LBQ organizing. What we have termed a “medium” or even “large” budget for LBQ groups would likely be considered small by donors or groups working in other issue areas.

Donor data

The research conducted with funders collected data on two types of funding:

1. “LBQ-inclusive” funding, which is broad funding, e.g., LGBTQI or women’s rights funding, that is inclusive of LBQ communities and issues, but not specifically aimed at LBQ communities and issues.
2. “LBQ-specific” funding, which is funding directed specifically to LBQ communities or issues. Some donors provide both LBQ-specific and LBQ-inclusive funding.

Accurately collecting data on how much LBQ-inclusive funding actually reached LBQ communities was difficult given that donors do not typically track this information. As such, quantitative funding data for LBQ groups was collected only on LBQ-specific funding.

All currency is reported in US dollars. OANDA Currency Converter was used to convert currencies into US dollars. The exchange rate was based on the date of survey completion.
2. HISTORY AND CURRENT CONTEXT

Members of Insight teach a self-defense class in Ukraine. Credit: Insight Ukraine
HISTORIES OF LBQ ORGANIZING

LBQ activism is not new. LBQ-identified women and non-binary people have been active and influential in social movements in contexts around the world for (at least) the last 50 years. The rich history of LBQ activism around the world would fill volumes and is outside the scope of this report. This section aims to briefly frame the history of LBQ activism in contexts around the world, as relevant grounding for this report.

Emerging from women’s and gay liberation movements

Two social movements can be tagged as birthplaces of global LBQ organizing as it exists today: the women’s liberation and feminist movements and gay liberation and rights movements. LBQ activists have been at the forefront of these movements, and in many contexts, autonomous organizing has grown out of them.

LBQ activists were prominent in women’s rights and feminist thinking and activism in the 20th century. While women’s liberation movements initially focused on equality between women and men, LBQ activists often pushed for a more radical agenda that challenged patriarchy and heteronormativity, not only in society but also in women’s rights movements. This frequently caused tension, as women’s movements were not always ready to embrace lesbian visibility or promote lesbian rights which were often considered divisive or too controversial. This often led LBQ activists to leave more mainstream feminist groups to start their own organizations.

For example, in North America and Europe, the notion of “political lesbianism” originated in the late 1960s among Second Wave radical feminists as a way to fight sexism and “compulsory heterosexuality.” “Lesbian feminism” gained energy in the 1970s and 80s as LBQ women encouraged women to direct their energies away from men and towards other women.

LBQ activism also has deep roots in, and made substantial contributions to, gay liberation and rights movements. Often finding that their needs, demands, and identities were invisible, however, and grappling with sexism from their gay male counterparts, LBQ-identified women were frequently separated from mixed gay liberation movements. However, LBQ groups have organized conferences, formed regional and global alliances, and seized opportunities to coordinate and engage across borders to build collective agendas and shared strategies. It was the Asian Lesbian Network, led by a Thai lesbian organization, that proposed strategic lesbian visibility and inclusion in the global women’s rights conference, which set forth a distinct separation of lesbian activism around the world from general women’s rights movements and organizations.

Building transnational LBQ movements

While much LBQ organizing is local and takes place within national borders, LBQ activists have long reached out across these boundaries to connect with others and break isolation, develop shared political agendas, build solidarity, and learn from others’ experiences. LBQ groups have organized conferences, formed regional and global alliances, and seized opportunities for regional and international advocacy, asserting the importance of LBQ visibility and attention to their specific agendas.

intersectional and cross-movement organizing

For example, on the African continent, the Coalition of African Lesbians (CAL) emerged in 2003 from a coalition of 14 organizations in ten countries, challenging intersectional and cross-movement organizing. While LBQ organizing can be viewed as an autonomous movement, it is important to note that the thought leadership of LBQ women is present and deeply rooted across social movements focused on other human rights or issue areas, including movements for climate justice, anti-racism and Black liberation, criminal justice reform, anti-militarism, and reproductive justice, among others.

The need to create autonomous organizations in order to raise consciousness, identify specific needs, and build community power has been true of LBQ people who belong to other historically oppressed communities. For example, in the United States, Black lesbian organizing emerged not only from the women’s and gay movements, but also the civil rights movement. The first US Black Lesbian Conference held in San Francisco in 1980, named “Becoming Visible,” aimed to build community, assert Black lesbian presence and experiences, and create a forward agenda.

There are many other examples of LBQ members of historically excluded and exploited groups coming together to build community in reaction to discrimination and exclusion from LGBTQI+ and women’s communities dominated by more privileged members. See, for example, the case study on Rromnjako Ilo in this report, a group that organizes LBQ people within Serbia’s Roma community.

In addition, LBQ women have been part of other social movements, such as peace protests or reproductive justice. In the Balkans, LBQ women were at the forefront of the anti-militaristic and anti-war movements in the 1980s and 1990s, mobilizing and organizing across state boundaries. More recently, LBQ activists have been central to challenging attempts to ban abortion and other attacks on human rights in Poland.

13 – In the 1970s and 80s, activists in Europe and North America identified primarily as lesbian women or, occasionally, as bisexual women. Identification with queer, trans, and non-binary identities came later, in the 1990s and first two decades of the 21st century. For the purposes of this report, we will be using “LBQ” and “non-binary,” recognizing that these terms are being retroactively applied at times, and not necessarily a reflection of the terminology used over the past 50 years.
16 – Marked as a historic moment of visibility for LBQ organizing in a UN context, the major global gathering of LBQ activists is documented in the “We Are Here” film directed by Shi Tou and Jing Zhao. See also, “Lesbian Visibility and Sexual Rights at Beijing” by A. Wilson https://www.pojoto.org/stories/32583014/.
and Argentina, advocating for the ratification of the Istanbul convention in Bulgaria, and challenging racism and police violence in the Movement for Black Lives, which is a continuation of a long history of Black queer activism in the United States.

Current contexts for LBQ organizing

The first two decades of the 21st century have seen an increase in political conservatism and nationalism, the rise of an “anti-gender ideology” movement, and the promotion of patriarchal values and restrictive ideas about gender identity in contexts worldwide. Governments have deliberately demonized progressive causes and actors, promoting conservative social and family values which frame families as only being legitimate when consisting of a heterosexual couple and their children.

Conservative forces have deliberately demonized progressive causes and actors, promoting conservative social and family values which frame families as only being legitimate when consisting of a heterosexual couple and their children.23

Activists that challenge discriminatory religious, political, and social values are easy scapegoats, and LBQ activists and groups are often the “canary in the coal mine.”24 warning of broader crackdowns on civil society. Societies with restricted civil society space frequently promote patriarchal values and traditional (binary) gender identities and roles as part of conservative, nationalist rhetoric. Activists are experiencing “an increase in state-sponsored rhetoric that prescribes and enforces narrow patriarchal and heterosexual gendered behaviour and sexual identity”25 as putting LBQ organizing under pressure.26

Governments have attacked and repressed progressive causes and actors, promoting conservative social and family values which frame families as only being legitimate when consisting of a heterosexual couple and their children.22

In increasingly conservative and repressive contexts, LBQTI+ and feminist groups and movements become targets for conservative civil society and state actors. Activists that challenge discriminatory religious, political, and social values are easy scapegoats, and LBQTI+ activists and groups are often the “canary in the coal mine,”24 warning of broader crackdowns on civil society. Societies with restricted civil society space frequently promote patriarchal values and traditional (binary) gender identities and roles as part of conservative, nationalist rhetoric. Activists are experiencing “an increase in state-sponsored rhetoric that prescribes and enforces narrow patriarchal and heterosexual gendered behaviour and sexual identity”25 as putting LBQ organizing under pressure.26

The first two decades of the 21st century have seen an increase in political conservatism and nationalism, the rise of an “anti-gender ideology” movement, and the promotion of patriarchal values and restrictive ideas about gender identity in contexts worldwide. Governments have deliberately demonized progressive causes and actors, promoting conservative social and family values which frame families as only being legitimate when consisting of a heterosexual couple and their children.

Conservative forces have deliberately demonized progressive causes and actors, promoting conservative social and family values which frame families as only being legitimate when consisting of a heterosexual couple and their children.23

Activists that challenge discriminatory religious, political, and social values are easy scapegoats, and LBQ activists and groups are often the “canary in the coal mine.”24 warning of broader crackdowns on civil society. Societies with restricted civil society space frequently promote patriarchal values and traditional (binary) gender identities and roles as part of conservative, nationalist rhetoric. Activists are experiencing “an increase in state-sponsored rhetoric that prescribes and enforces narrow patriarchal and heterosexual gendered behaviour and sexual identity”25 as putting LBQ organizing under pressure.26

Governments have attacked and repressed progressive causes and actors, promoting conservative social and family values which frame families as only being legitimate when consisting of a heterosexual couple and their children.22

In increasingly conservative and repressive contexts, LBQTI+ and feminist groups and movements become targets for conservative civil society and state actors. Activists that challenge discriminatory religious, political, and social values are easy scapegoats, and LBQTI+ activists and groups are often the “canary in the coal mine,”24 warning of broader crackdowns on civil society. Societies with restricted civil society space frequently promote patriarchal values and traditional (binary) gender identities and roles as part of conservative, nationalist rhetoric. Activists are experiencing “an increase in state-sponsored rhetoric that prescribes and enforces narrow patriarchal and heterosexual gendered behaviour and sexual identity”25 as putting LBQ organizing under pressure.26

This section aims to highlight the key human rights violations and threats that LBQ people face, as it is vital to understand the specificity of their experiences. The oppression that LBQ women experience as women is compounded by their sexuality and (sometimes) gender expression, making LBQ women and non-binary people more vulnerable to human rights violations and making it hard for them to access justice.

Criminalization

Homosexuality is criminalized in 73 jurisdictions around the world.27 45 of these countries explicitly prohibit same-sex conduct between women28 through LBQ people can experience the effects of criminalization whether the law directly names them or not. Furthermore, LBQ women experience criminalization not only from laws explicitly focused on homosexuality, but also laws that disproportionately impact women, such as laws about adultery, abortion, and sex work, and those that permit child marriage and rape within marriage. Criminalizing laws sanction violence and discrimination by the state. Combined with repressive social norms and resulting economic inequalities, such laws make LBQ women particularly vulnerable to violence, particularly from family members, intimate partners, and community members.

Violence

LBQ people experience high rates of violence from their families, which is often less visible than street or state violence. For example, in Ghana, LBQ women have been thrown out of their homes by their families, had their children taken from them, and been beaten by family members who expect them to conform to societal expectations to marry and have their children. In Ghana — and around the world — LBQ women are vulnerable to forms of violence such as extortion and blackmail through threats of being outed, and are reluctant or unable to report violence due to police and state oppression.29

In South Africa, research has shown that violence against women is particularly high.20, Rape, often gang rape, is used to “discipline” women. Black lesbians are specifically targeted for this type of violence as a way of “correcting” their behavior, and punishing their love and intimacy with other women and the perceived insult to men for being “rejected.”30


In recent years, violence and oppression against LGBTQI communities has escalated visibly in the North Caucasus. However, whereas violence against gay men in the province of Chechnya has received extensive media coverage, the violence experienced by LBQ women, often at the hands of family members, remains largely invisible. The Queer Women of the North Caucasus project documents how common family violence is for lesbian, bisexual, and trans women.34

So-called “honour killings” based on lesbophobia and misogynoy have been documented, and LBQ women report having experienced psychological abuse and physical violence within their families. One out of four has experienced sexual abuse. More than one-third had been married by force or under threat. This is also true in other regions where state or state-sanctioned violence against gay men is very public and a well-known human rights issue, but less visible forms of violence against LBQ-identified women and non-binary people can pass unnoticed.

Women (including LBQ activists) and trans human rights defenders appear to be particularly vulnerable to backlash and repression due to “the use of sexualised violence to silence or intimidate them”, according to the report Standing Firm by Mama Cash and Urgent Action Fund. The report states:

“In highly patriarchal societies where there is also a lack of access to justice, gendered attacks – especially those involving the use of gender-based violence – are highly effective in silencing women and trans activists whose voices are already marginalised, reinforcing women’s inferior social status and discriminatory social norms around gender behaviour and roles. Gender-based violence silences their voices through fear, as well as by undermining the support of their families or communities for their public role.”34

**Discrimination**

Women in general experience discrimination in education, healthcare, housing, and employment, and LBQ women are even more vulnerable. For example, in Kenya, girls and young women suspected of lesbian sexual activity have been expelled from their secondary schools, sometimes after being forced to denounce their peers.35

Employment discrimination based on sexual orientation, or an perception of someone’s orientation, is widespread worldwide. An Asia-Pacific report to the UN Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women documents cases of contract termination or forced resignations based on the sexual orientation or gender identity of the women.36 Evictions or refusal of accommodation are common in many countries when the sexual orientation of LGBTQI tenants is discovered or suspected. LBQ women are even more likely to experience this form of discrimination, as in many societies women are less likely to be given accommodation without a man. Discrimination is even more acute for LBQ women who present as “masculine” or androgynous.37

**Women’s Access to Healthcare**

Women who present as masculine or androgynous may also experience discrimination in accessing healthcare due to “the use of sexualised violence to silence or intimidate them”.26

Discrimination in accessing healthcare is widespread and takes many forms. LBQ women are less likely to have health insurance than heterosexual women, because most employers do not offer coverage for unmarried domestic partners. Even LBQ women with insurance or state-provided healthcare tend to avoid going to doctors for fear of experiencing stigma or discrimination; as a result, they are more likely to develop health complications. A significant area of healthcare discrimination experienced by LBQ women is related to motherhood. Many countries still do not have medical systems set up to support lesbian women on the path to parenthood, and the heteronormative nature of healthcare systems in general does not make it easy anywhere.
Women within Roma communities often experience sexual abuse and are frequently sold into marriage at 12 or 13 years of age. Working in Roma settlements, Rromnjako Ilo has begun to work collaboratively with other organizations to introduce therapeutic counseling and legal aid for Roma LBQ women. These services are often an entry point for the group’s more long-term work to shift social norms. Their peer support workshops and counseling also contribute to building a community for LBQ people who often have no other safe place to be themselves. This has created access to resources for many LBQ women, bringing visibility to their needs. However, it has also forced Rromnjako Ilo to disguise their identity as an LBQ organization in court proceedings to ensure, to the extent possible, that LBQ women can pursue divorce or custody claims without encountering discrimination.

Using a feminist disability lens, Rromnjako Ilo works holistically to support all Roma LBQ women, including those with disabilities. In building awareness of diverse sexualities and disabilities among Roma women, they support women in the community to recognize and name their multiple identities. Supported by Rromnjako Ilo, many Roma women realize for the first time that they have a right to make decisions about their bodies and to claim any sexual identity they wish to. Their advocacy against early and forced marriage, imposed heterosexuality, and sexual abuse, as well as their efforts to increase the visibility of LBQ Roma women, underscore the group’s holistic approach. As a member of the group says:

“We have established new norms about sexuality in a closed society. We are breaking taboos.”

This is inherently risky work. Their community-based activism and resulting visibility have led to physical attacks, threats to burn their office, and repeated hacking of the group’s website, all of which have forced them to flee their office space and develop countermeasures to ensure their safety.

CASE STUDY: RROMNJAKO ILO

CHALLENGING CLOSED AND PATRIARCHAL SOCIETIES — REACHING LBQ WOMEN IN ROMA COMMUNITIES

Rromnjako Ilo (A Roma Woman’s Heart) fights homophobia, patriarchy, racism, and the invisibilization of LBQ Roma women in a closed, patriarchal society. Twelve years ago, LBQ Roma activists, empowered by the emergence of feminist movements in Serbia and the social changes they were witnessing, founded Rromnjako Ilo. Today, the group remains the only organization serving LBQ Roma women in Serbia. Working intersectionally and recognizing the impact of gender, sexuality, class, race, and disability, Rromnjako Ilo builds support, both within the Roma community and the larger society, for Roma women’s bodily rights. The group also raises awareness about the violence and discrimination that Roma women face within their communities and in the larger society. For instance, even the non-Roma lesbian movement in Serbia tends to ignore the experiences of queer Roma women.

Resourcing: Since its inception, Rromnjako Ilo has struggled to find consistent long-term funding. LGBTQI rights gains within the Balkans (for example, more tolerance of Pride parades and recognition of same-sex relationships in Croatia) have led many bilateral donors to stop funding without recognizing that gains have not been consistent throughout the region and that in countries like Serbia, women still lack economic and bodily rights. Working at the intersections of identities also raises fundraising challenges. For example, if the group tries to access funding for Roma communities and discusses their work with LBQ women, they are told to apply for LBQ-specific funding by donors. Similarly, if they apply for LGBTQI funding and speak of working in the Roma community, they are told to apply for funding for Roma people or ethnic minorities. Rromnjako Ilo struggles to resource their direct service work to build knowledge and self-esteem among Roma women, and they also have difficulty raising funds for the digital and physical security of staff.
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WHAT ARE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF LBQ GROUPS?

This chapter describes the basic infrastructure of LBQ organizing. It reviews when LBQ groups were founded, where they are based, the extent to which they are registered, and how they are staffed. This chapter also discusses the movements LBQ groups identify with and the strategies they use in their work.

Regional distribution and year of founding

LBQ groups are young, quickly growing in numbers, and organizing all around the world.

LBQ groups in our sample are organizing in all regions of the world, demonstrating a vibrant movement that is active across the globe.39 It is also an actively growing movement. Although groups responding to the survey were founded as long ago as 1968, most groups (89%) have been founded in the last twenty years, with 61% established since 2010, highlighting the tremendous growth of LBQ groups in the last two decades. This trend holds true across all regions, with the exception of groups in North America whose founding dates are more evenly distributed over the last 30 years.

Registration status

The majority of LBQ groups are registered; however, there are significant differences across regions.

Globally, more than half (60%) of LBQ groups are registered, 9% are in the process of registering, and 31% are not registered. Across regions, however, registration varies noticeably. In North America, where 80% of LBQ groups report being registered, the most of any region in our sample, minimal legal impediments likely make it easier for groups to register.40 At 50%, registration of LBQ groups is lowest in Asia and the Pacific. Many factors may contribute to this, including complex registration processes, costs of registration, and local political contexts, to name a few.

Homophobic and transphobic bias in regulatory frameworks is an important factor in how many LBQ groups are registered. A recent study on the right to register shows that in 55 countries, LGBTQI organizations cannot legally register as LGBTQI organizations. It found that, for example, in Africa, where 70% of LBQ groups in our sample report being registered, 39% of LGBTQI groups either use neutral language in describing the objectives of their group when registering or register on the basis of focusing on other issues (e.g. women’s rights or health rights).41 Lack of registration can act as a barrier to accessing funding from foreign and domestic foundations and government sources, and impede public confidence, collaboration with other civil society organizations, and relationships with government officials, contributing to LBQ groups’ concerns about organizational sustainability. Indeed, LBQ groups with larger budgets are more frequently registered, suggesting that registration provides opportunities for groups to access funding. For example, 86% of LBQ groups with medium budgets and 88% of LBQ groups with large budgets are registered, while only 34% of zero budget and 52% of small budget groups report being registered.

 Movements and issues

LBQ groups are working intersectionally.

LBQ groups are working intersectionally and choosing not to be constrained by artificial issue “silos” that can limit work across movements and issues. More than half of LBQ groups identify with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and trans movements and women’s rights movements because their lives sit at the intersection of both. They also identify with broader movements and issues such as sexual and reproductive health and rights (45%), the right to health (32%), HIV and AIDS (30%), rights of intersex people (29%), young people’s rights (26%), and sex workers’ rights (20%), among others.

39 — The small showing of LBQ groups from the Middle East/ Southwestern Asia in this sample highlights a problem seen in other research (e.g., trans and intersex groups and young feminists) that aim to be globally inclusive but have difficulty obtaining data from groups in this region. This informational void on the specifics of LBQ priorities and organizing in the region invisibilizes the work of Middle Eastern LBQ activists and is most likely an important factor in how underfunded the region is.


41 — Ibid. Pg 20-21.
The broad nature of work being done by LBQ activists underscores how LBQ activists prioritize intersectional approaches in their work and tie their communities' well-being to a range of social justice and human rights issues. In doing so, they make visible the needs of LBQ communities across different issue areas and also contribute to progress in other movements.

Activists’ strategies

Multiple strategies are at the heart of LBQ organizing.

LBQ groups are using wide-ranging strategies in their work, and even among groups using the same strategy, diverse sub-strategies are being deployed. Movement building, advocacy, and capacity building were the most common strategies used by LBQ groups. Of the groups doing advocacy, most (85%) worked primarily at the national and local levels, but more than a third (39%) also worked regionally and internationally. Among those engaged in capacity building, groups equally prioritized internal-facing priorities, such as strengthening LBQ communities (74%), and the external work of building knowledge about LBQ communities and issues (73%).

Cultural change strategies are also essential to LBQ organizing. Groups are harnessing the power of creativity to counter the invisibility of LBQ people and issues, and address the restrictive social norms that underpin the oppressions that LBQ people face. Among the groups that reported using cultural change strategies in their work, more than half created media (58%) and used art for their activism (53%), while over a third (37%) preserved the rich history of LBQ organizing through community archiving. Other strategies that are essential to increasing the visibility of LBQ people and issues are also an important part of LBQ organizing. More than two-thirds (69%) of groups engaged in research and knowledge production, of which the majority (63%) specifically focused on building knowledge about human rights violations experienced by LBQ communities.

Service provision by LBQ groups is significant. Of the 63% of groups engaged in service provision, 66% offered mental health and wellness services for LBQ communities and 63% provided direct health and social services. The prevalence of these types of strategies emphasizes the hostile circumstances under which LBQ activists work, the life-saving support LBQ groups are offering to their communities, and the priority placed in addressing trauma experienced by LBQ communities and ensuring physical and mental well-being.

Respondents could select all the strategies that they use in their work.

The chart below shows the percentage of LBQ groups that identify with each movement:

- LGB rights: 73%
- Women’s rights: 58%
- Human rights: 56%
- Trans rights: 53%
- Sexual and reproductive health and rights: 45%
- Right to health: 32%
- HIV and AIDS: 30%
- Intersex rights: 29%
- Youth rights: 26%
- Sex workers’ rights: 20%
- Right to development: 17%
- Economic justice: 17%
- Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers: 14%
- Children’s rights: 12%
- Democracy: 12%
- Racial justice: 12%
- Workers’/labour rights: 10%
- Peace: 8%
- Internet freedom: 7%
- Environmental justice: 6%
- Human trafficking: 5%
Staff and volunteers

The majority of LBQ groups are understaffed and rely heavily on volunteers.

A lack of paid staff can be one of the biggest obstacles to executing a group’s vision. LBQ groups have a median of two full-time staff and two part-time staff. Twenty-eight percent of groups have no full-time staff, and a quarter (25%) report having only one or two full-time staff members. Part-time staffing is equally bleak. A quarter (26%) of LBQ groups have no part-time staff members while a third (34%) have only one or two. The experience of LBQ groups in our sample highlights that LBQ groups are doing their work with the support of very few paid staff, if any.

Even among groups with a higher number of staff, the actual experience of staffing can vary. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the staff of many LBQ groups are underpaid. Funding shortages have led activists to share salaries (i.e., distribute one salary among multiple staff members), accept a stipend as a salary, or donate their salaries back to their groups in order to implement activities that remain unfunded. Groups have also noted that secondary employment is sometimes necessary in order to subsidize their work and activism.

LBQ groups are powered by volunteers. Ninety percent of LBQ groups engage volunteers to support their work, with a median number of five volunteers. This is consistent among LBQ groups regardless of region or budget size. This may indicate that LBQ groups are strongly rooted in their communities and have a strong organizing model or vibrant base of constituents. The high number of volunteers and low levels of staff, however, also suggest that volunteers are filling gaps in paid staff, if any.

Even among groups with a higher number of staff, the actual experience of staffing can vary. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the staff of many LBQ groups are underpaid. Funding shortages have led activists to share salaries (i.e., distribute one salary among multiple staff members), accept a stipend as a salary, or donate their salaries back to their groups in order to implement activities that remain unfunded. Groups have also noted that secondary employment is sometimes necessary in order to subsidize their work and activism.

The questions regarding full-time staff were answered by n=278; part-time staff, n=273; and, volunteers, n=316.

43 Throughout this research, consultations with LBQ activists and groups have frequently returned to the staffing practices discussed here. To supplement the research findings, anecdotal evidence drawn from the case studies and input from the activist advisory committee was used to highlight the experiences of LBQ groups as related to staffing.
As in many Latin American countries, lesbians in Paraguay are not criminalized, but neither are they legally protected. Existing in this vacuum has negative implications for those that need protection — for instance, lesbian mothers or binational couples — and especially for those that are more vulnerable to discrimination in the workplace or to attacks in public or private spaces because of their ethnicity, class, age, gender expression, and other factors. Pentecostal churches, which actively campaign against sexual rights, have increased their power and influence in Paraguay. Against this backdrop, Aireana Grupo por los Derechos de las Lesbianas was established as a lesbian feminist group in 2003.

Initially part of an umbrella gay and lesbian group, Aireana’s founding members realized the agenda was set by the men, leaving little space for their issues as lesbians; so they created their own group. Aireana is concerned not just with lesbian liberation or the ‘LBQ collective’, but with the liberation of all oppressed peoples, including trans people, other sexual and gender dissidents, cis-straight women, and all those who are economically and racially oppressed. Their intersectional approach is embodied in the visible presence of their drums band which performs in other movements’ demonstrations, such as those led by peasants or by the families of victims of institutional violence and in their leadership of a multi-stakeholder coalition, including people with disabilities, Indigenous and rural peoples, and migrants, among others, that led to the Anti-Discrimination Bill in Paraguay.

Aireana works at many different levels ranging from political advocacy (nationally and regionally) to running a hotline. However, they view their cultural change work — projects like their theatre group or drums band — as having the greatest and most lasting impact.

Their view of liberation also translates into autonomy in their activism, organizing, and advocacy. For example, they are selective about what funding they accept (e.g., from feminist funders or foundations whose resources do not come from sources that Aireana would find politically objectionable).

In 2005, Aireana opened La Serafina, a lesbi-feminist cultural space that is open to all people. Encountering hostility in public is a daily experience for sexual and gender dissidents, feminists, leftists, and other progressive people, and La Serafina offers a space that feels free and safe. It has also been effective in making people more open and accepting towards sexual and gender diversity through enjoying the space together. While the space has never made a profit, Aireana values the freedom it offers in a hostile context. Someone told them once that, at peak time, La Serafina looked like one of the “Sense8 orgies”, and they feel very proud of that.

Life is to be enjoyed. We don’t want Aireana ever to be a chore, a burden for us, but rather something that we – and others – can enjoy. And nurturing creativity in us and in others is the best way we have found to do that.”

Since 2005, Aireana has hosted an annual LesBiGayTrans Film Festival, drawing an increasingly large audience each year. Aireana has found that film provides a good entry point for people who have limited access to discourses about sexual diversity, for example, teachers bringing entire high school classes to attend events, and inviting Aireana members to join discussions afterwards.

Another important cultural project is the Tatucada, Aireana’s drums band which is open to interested cis or trans women or non-binary people. Tatucada is well-known in social justice demonstrations in Asuncion, from environmental justice to Indigenous rights, or in support of justice for victims of Paraguay’s long military dictatorship. It has allowed Aireana to have a fluid relationship with other social movements and to open up dialogues with them. Tatucada allows its members to experience rhythms and become a ‘force of nature’ while playing, and this is valued highly by Aireana. The name Tatu means armadillo in Guarani, and it is also used to refer to the vulva (the reason it was chosen).

44 — “Sense8” is a Netflix television series that has been recognized for its portrayal of LGBTQ characters and diverse sexualities and sexual expression.
Women’s Health and Equal Rights Initiative (WHER); Psychological Empowerment Workshops focusing on building self-esteem, self-confidence, self-awareness, and self-acceptance and learning about sexuality, sexual orientation, and gender identity/expression issues; Credit: WHER
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This chapter reviews the budgets of LBQ groups and the funding they receive. It describes LBQ groups’ sources, duration, and type of funding, the barriers LBQ groups face in accessing funds, and the safety nets available to them.

In understanding groups’ access to funding, the political or ethical acceptability of funding sources is also an important consideration, particularly among groups with histories of autonomous feminist organizing. LBQ organizing is intersectional and political, and in deciding what money to seek out or accept, groups’ choices may be informed by donor alignment with the perspectives and approaches that groups value and prioritize.

In discussing the budget sizes of groups, the following categories are referenced in this chapter and throughout the rest of the report:

- **Zero budget** - Annual budget of zero ($0) dollars.
- **Small budget** - Annual budget between $1 to $25,000.
- **Medium budget** - Annual budget between $25,001 to $100,000.
- **Large budget** - Annual budget of $100,001 or more.

Budgets and external funding

LBQ groups have very small budgets and, in most regions, limited access to external funding.

A substantial portion of LBQ groups have very small budgets (in the survey, “budget” was defined as “the cost to run your group for one year”). A quarter (25%) of groups reported having no-existent or zero annual budget. Overall, 40% of LBQ groups had a budget of less than $5,000, nearly half (47%) had an annual budget of less than $10,000, and almost three quarters (72%) operated on less than $50,000 annually. The median annual budget for the total sample was $11,713. The n size for the annual budget question = 270.

The data show that money is heavily concentrated in North America, where the median annual budget is $315,000. By contrast, in no other region does the median budget even reach $20,000 annually. LBQ groups in Europe and Central Asia have the smallest median budgets, at $5,000, and groups from across the region are struggling. Nearly half (43%) of LBQ groups have very small budgets and, in most regions, limited access to external funding.
groups in Eastern Europe and Central Asia operate on less than $5,000 annually, and in Western Europe, just over half (53%) work with less than $5,000 per year. Additionally, at the global level, younger LBQ groups tend to work with zero or small annual budgets: 83% of groups with zero budgets and 70% of groups with small budgets were formed since 2010.

In addition to asking respondents about their group’s annual budget, we also asked how much external funding the group received in 2017. “External funding” was defined as “including government and foundation funding and excluding membership fees, community fundraisers, events, and individual contributions from founders or their family members.” (Note: in some cases groups that reported a zero annual budget also reported receiving some, usually modest, external funding.) The data shows that LBQ groups overall received very little external funding, if any (n for this question = 265).

A third (34%) of groups received no external funding in 2017: nearly half (48%) of all groups reported that their external funding was less than $5,000 (e.g., including those that received no external funding). Regional analysis shows stark differences in funding received by LBQ groups in North America compared with groups in all other regions. The two regions of Europe and Central Asia and Asia and the Pacific had the lowest median external funding at $1,150 and $1,170, respectively, while the median external funding amount of $244,202 received by groups in North America far exceeded that of any other region, suggesting that groups in North America have access to much greater funding than groups in all other parts of the world.

Duration and type of funding

LBQ groups rely on short-term and restricted funding to do their work.

Long-term funding is critical for sustainable organizing. In 2017, 29% of LBQ activists reported receiving funding lasting 1-2 years; 20% had received funding of less than one year, and only 5% had received funding that lasted 2-4 years. Overall, more than half (56%) of LBQ groups have never received multi-year funding (n responding to this question = 216); never having received multi-year funding was particularly common in Europe and Central Asia (69%) and Africa (66%).

Not surprisingly, the proportion of LBQ groups who have received multi-year grants increases substantially by budget size. While less than a third (30%) of LBQ groups with small budgets have received multi-year funding, this percentage rose to 57% of groups with medium budgets and nearly all groups with large budgets (87%).

The prevalence of short-term funding and the challenges it presents are compounded by the lack of access to unrestricted funding. Only 22% of LBQ groups received unrestricted funding in 2017.

---

46 — Multi-year funding was defined as an awarded grant lasting a minimum of two years.
Sources of funding

Foundations and community-generated sources are the most common sources of funding for LBQ groups.

Forty-one percent of LBQ groups received funding from foundations and intermediaries in 2017, the most often cited source of funding for LBQ groups. Community-generated sources are also a critical source of support for LBQ groups, with a third (34%) receiving some form of community-generated funding. Individual donors, one of the sub-categories included in community-generated funding, are particularly important for groups with medium budgets (25% receive individual donor funding) and large budgets (41% receive individual donor funding). Very few LBQ groups (5%) were able to or chose to access corporate funding.

Only a quarter (24%) of all LBQ groups received any type of government funding, and it is rare for LBQ groups of any budget size and in almost all regions. No more than 11%, and often much less, of LBQ groups in Europe and Central Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, Asia and the Pacific, and Africa received funding from any individual government source. LBQ groups based in North America fared better: 20% reported receiving state and federal funding. Groups in North America also accessed the broadest range of funding sources overall, including from LGBTQI funds, individual donors, private foundations, community fundraisers, and income-generating activities.

Limited access by LBQ groups to government funding underscores the importance of foundation and community funding for the sustainability of LBQ groups; it also raises questions of how government funding can become more accessible.

Barriers to funding

LBQ groups face multiple barriers to accessing and implementing funds.

In finding potential donors, 31% of groups identified a lack of requests for proposals that expressed interest in supporting their priorities or strategies as an obstacle. The most frequent barriers to applying for funding were an insufficient funding history and a lack of responses to inquiries made by the group (both mentioned by 17% of respondents), followed closely by not being registered, not having audited financial statements, and onerous applications (each mentioned by 15%). Nearly a quarter (22%) of LBQ groups experienced no problems when trying to implement external funding once it had been awarded, but 15% experienced long delays before receiving payments.

---

47 — The category of foundations and intermediaries includes public and private foundations, LGBTQI funds, women’s funds, and subgrants from non-governmental organizations.

48 — To gauge the variety and availability of funding sources for LBQ groups, respondents were asked to select all their funding sources in 2017. To capture the breadth of donor types, some overlapping categories were included, such as, for example, LGBTQI funds which could be both public or private foundations.

49 — Community-generated funding sources include crowdfunding, community fundraisers, membership fees, income generating activities, and individual donors.

50 — The category of government funding includes multilaterals, as well as respondent’s own national, state, and municipal level governments, or the government or embassy of a foreign government.

51 — Respondents were asked to select all the barriers they faced in finding, applying, and implementing external funding.
Figure 12. Barriers to finding potential donors

- RFPs did not express interest in strategies we consider important: 32%
- RFPs did not express interest in LBQ-specific activism: 24%
- Did not know opportunities for funding: 20%
- Did not know where to look for funding: 16%
- Unsure if we were eligible: 15%
- Did not have time to look for funding: 10%
- RFPs were not in a language we speak well/at all: 7%
- Did not seek out donor funding: 3%
- Did not face any barriers: 3%

Figure 13. Barriers to applying for funding

- Limited funding history: 17%
- Donor(s) did not respond to our inquiries: 17%
- Not registered with the government: 15%
- No audited financial statements: 15%
- Applications were onerous: 15%
- Funding was too small for our project/budget: 10%
- Language barrier: 10%
- Did not have time to look for funding: 10%
- Funding was too big for our project/budget: 9%
- Did not seek out donor funding: 7%
- Did not face any barriers: 3%

Figure 14. Barriers to implementing funding once it had been awarded

- Did not face any barriers: 22%
- Long delays before receiving payment: 15%
- Reporting requirements were onerous: 11%
- Changes to project design/targets not permitted: 6%
- Lack of capacity for financial reporting: 6%
- Lack of capacity for monitoring and evaluation: 6%
- Donors did not respond to inquiries: 5%
- Lack of capacity for financial management: 5%
- At/A: did not receive external funds: 4%
- Donor(s) kept requesting changes to project design: 4%
- Lack of capacity for narrative reporting: 4%
- Language barrier/instructions inaccessible: 3%
- Political/legal climate in country: 2%
- Lack of capacity - inadequate human resources: 1%

Savings and assets

Most LBQ groups have no savings or assets to rely on if fundraising fails.

Examining the savings and assets of LBQ groups is important because it gives an indication about the financial health and stability of LBQ groups and the ability of the group to weather fundraising setbacks. The data show that for most LBQ groups, financial insecurity is the norm. Groups are working under precarious conditions that offer little in the way of protection or recourse in times of financial crisis.

Nearly three-quarters (70%) of LBQ groups have no savings (n for this question = 250). More than half of all groups in the sample (52%) anticipated that they would continue to work on a voluntary basis if their group ran out of money. More than a quarter (27%) also had no assets in 2017 and among those that did, most were assets that quickly depreciate, such as equipment, like computers (36%) and furniture (20%).52 The near universal lack of property ownership (3%) makes LBQ groups vulnerable to the whims of landlords, including rent increases and evictions. Given the substantial financial insecurities LBQ groups face, a financial crisis or fundraising failures may force groups to dissolve or resort to other work to sustain themselves.

52 — Respondents were asked to select all assets that they owned. These assets include anything of value that could be converted into cash in the future. It only referred to assets owned by the group and not by individual staff members or volunteers.
Family violence against LGBTQ people in Indonesia is prevalent. LGBTQ people are routinely expelled from their homes, subjected to forced marriage and marital rape, or forced to wear religious garments as a way of changing their sexual orientation. Non-binary and trans people may be forced to dress in ways that conform to society’s expectations of their perceived gender. Collaborating with and building awareness among activists and communities from different movements has been an important strategy for Talita Kum to challenge violence and promote the well-being of LGBTQ people.

To build support for LGBTQ people, Talita Kum has collaborated with women’s rights organizations to push for the inclusion of LBQ women. They also work with religious groups, leaders, and scholars to humanize LBQ people and change norms about diverse sexual identities in religious communities. But their quest for the liberation of LGBTQ people starts close to home. Talita Kum names self-liberation, or coming in (the notion of “coming out” to oneself), as one of the most critical and important parts of their work. It is focused on an acknowledgement of self and pride in oneself, without fear of rejection or being seen as a sinner. To this end, the organization offers peer support and an online resource center with vlogs, live-stream workshops, and articles to provide access to affirming resources. These types of services not only contribute to the health and well-being of their constituency, but also allow them to reach more people and serve as a launchpad to broader conversations about sexuality, consent, sexual pleasure, identity, and human rights.

Mobilizing allies and building communities where LGBTQ people feel supported is the foundation of Talita Kum’s work. From its early years, starting in 2009 as a volunteer collective, to the more formalized organization it has been since 2014, Talita Kum has used community organizing to create grassroots change to improve the lives of LGBTQ people.

We don’t just focus on the number of LGBTQ communities reached, but also on the quality of that outreach. We want to help people acknowledge themselves and their rights as citizens of Indonesia.

To this end, the organization offers peer support and an online resource center with vlogs, live-stream workshops, and articles to provide access to affirming resources. These types of services not only contribute to the health and well-being of their constituency, but also allow them to reach more people and serve as a launchpad to broader conversations about sexuality, consent, sexual pleasure, identity, and human rights.

Most donors tend to fund national organizations based in Jakarta, so organizations such as Talita Kum that are based outside of the capital or don’t have connections to Jakarta-based national organizations have limited access to funding. Many of the organizations that are funded are also able to produce audited statements, which Talita Kum is having done for the first time in 2019. For the upcoming year, the organization is keen to earmark funds for health insurance and for the self care and personal well-being of its community organizers but has not found any donors interested in supporting this (although the group has been able to use their limited core funding for these needs in the past).
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IS DONOR SUPPORT ALIGNED WITH ACTIVISTS’ NEEDS?

This chapter presents a picture of foundation funding for LBQ groups. It describes how donors are distributing their resources to LBQ-specific and -inclusive groups, the regions and strategies they fund, what motivates their grantmaking for LBQ communities, and their provision of non-financial support.

Donor sample

Sixty-seven respondents comprise the sample, representing donors from Africa (9%), Asia and the Pacific (7%), Europe and Central Asia (37%), Latin America and the Caribbean (10%), and North America (36%). Women’s funds (46%), private foundations (24%), and public foundations (21%) comprised most of the sample. (Please see the methodology in Appendix 1 on page 78 for inclusion criteria in the donor survey.)

- About one-third of the donor sample (23 respondents) provided LBQ-inclusive funding exclusively. This is defined as funding with a broader thematic scope (e.g., LGBTQI or women’s rights funding) that donors characterize as being inclusive of LBQ communities and issues, but not specifically aimed at LBQ communities and issues.

- The other two-thirds of the sample (44 respondents) gave LBQ-specific funding. This is funding that is specifically directed to LBQ communities and issues. Some of the donors that provide LBQ-specific funding also provide LBQ-inclusive funding.

- Private foundations provided LBQ-inclusive (47%) and LBQ-specific funding (53%) about equally, while a higher proportion of public foundations gave LBQ-specific funding (69%) as compared to LBQ-inclusive funding (31%).

In 2017, the median LBQ-specific grant size among donors in our sample was $51,600; the median number of grants was eight. Over half (58%) of the donors surveyed indicate they provide general or unrestricted funding. This suggests that the donors surveyed are giving considerable unrestricted funding, and likely more unrestricted funding than is typical of philanthropy at large (i.e., including the full range of philanthropic donors, most of whom are not reported in this sample), as activists clearly struggle to access this type of resourcing.

To supplement our findings, relevant portions of the data collected for the 2015/2016 Global Resources Report (GRR) by the Global Philanthropy Project (GPP) and Funders for LGBTQ Issues are presented here (see page 55). The GRR data provides a more comprehensive overview of the LBQ funding landscape and, indeed, shows that LBQ-specific funding is an extremely small portion of overall funding directed to LBGTQI communities.

Global Resources Report findings: an overview of LBQ-specific funding

The 2017-2018 Global Resources Report: Government and Philanthropic Support for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Intersex Communities (GRR) analyzes government and philanthropic support for LBQ communities globally, based on data from 800 foundations and corporations and 15 donor governments and multilateral agencies. Data for total funding for LGBTI issues in 2017–2018 has been stratified to show LBQ-specific funding.

The data highlights how limited LBQ-specific funding is. Globally, only 5% ($26 million) of the total $560 million in LGBTI funding could be identified as LBQ-specific. It is important to note that this represents an increase of $14 million over the $12 million in LBQ-specific funding that was identified in the previous GRR (2015–2016), when LBQ-specific funding represented only 2% of total LGBTI funding. This growth in LBQ funding between 2015-2016 and 2017-2018 is encouraging, and reflects both the funding advocacy of feminist funders and movements, as well as the growth and increasing visibility of LBQ movements.

Almost one quarter (24%) of LBQ-specific funding in 2017-2018 was directed to groups in Sub-Saharan Africa, while 24% went to groups in the United States and Canada (90% of this funding went to groups in the U.S.), 18% went to groups in Latin America and the Caribbean, and funding to international work (reaching across regions) accounted for 16%. Other regions received less LBQ-specific funding: groups in Asia and the Pacific region received 11% of the LBQ-specific funding; groups in Western Europe received 5%; and groups in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and Russia, and in the Middle East and North Africa received 3% and 2% of global LBQ funding, respectively.

Of all funding given to support work outside the U.S., over one-third (37%) of LBQ-specific funding was given by public foundations and NGO intermediaries, which overall provided more grants (396) that were smaller in size (average grant is $18,841), while private funders (23% of the LBQ-specific funding) gave fewer (57) but larger LBQ-specific grants (average grant is $50,157). The GRR data shows that donor governments and multilateral agencies rarely provide LBQ-specific funding (15 grants), but when they do, grants are much larger in size (average grant is $281,828) and accounted for 38% of the LBQ-specific funding.

Project-based support made up over half (60%) of funding provided to support work outside the U.S., while general operating funds accounted for only 24% of the funding.

During the 2017-2018 period:

- $560 million worldwide funding focused on LGBTI issues
- $26 million (5%) in funding specifically targeting LBQ women
- $260.7 million funding focused outside of the U.S. for LGBTI issues
- $20.6 million (7.9%) in funding specifically targeting LBQ women
Funding for LBQ-led groups

Most donors that give LBQ-inclusive funding do not intentionally ensure that the funding reaches LBQ communities.

It is important to note that LBQ-inclusive funding – funding that is intended to reach LBQ groups and communities – is not disaggregated to show which subpopulations it reaches. This means that the amount of LBQ-inclusive funding that reaches LBQ communities and issues cannot be determined.

Another critical finding of the research is that a majority of donors that provide LBQ-inclusive funding (67%) indicate that they do not have intentional strategies to ensure that this inclusive funding reaches LBQ communities or issues. So, they have an intention to reach LBQ activists, but lack the specific strategies to ensure that they are doing so. LBQ people clearly face discrimination and violence in daily life, and the same discriminatory and stigmatizing climate may also be present in civil society groups. For example, patriarchal values and attitudes are likely to be present in broader, mixed LGBTQI groups, while lesbo- and transphobia are likely to be present in women’s rights groups.

Donors need to engage in intentional outreach efforts to ensure that these types of attitudes and values do not prevent LBQ-inclusive funding from reaching LBQ groups and benefitting LBQ communities. A lack of intentionality in reaching LBQ communities means that donors’ funding is unlikely to respond to the specific challenges facing these communities. For donors interested in reaching LBQ communities and LBQ-led organizations, specific strategies to reach LBQ activists and groups are crucial.

Some donors giving LBQ-inclusive funding have implemented strategies to reach LBQ constituencies; these include funding grantees with strong representation of LBQ people in leadership positions, having specific LBQ population budget line items, and adopting broader approaches that include prioritizing applications from marginalized groups.

Donors with LBQ-specific funding strategies are reaching LBQ-led groups, though many more could be reached.

Respondents were asked what percentage of their LBQ-specific funding was intentionally directed to LBQ-led groups. Nearly half (49%) reported that virtually all (91% to 100%) of their LBQ-specific grant-making in 2017 was directed towards LBQ-led groups, and almost a quarter (23%) said that 41% - 50% of their LBQ-specific funding was targeted to LBQ-led groups. A smaller proportion of donors (13%) directed less than 10% of their LBQ-specific funding to LBQ-led groups, and 13% of donors did not track this data.

A lack of applications received from LBQ-led groups, groups not identifying themselves as LBQ-led, or capacity limitations may explain why some donors that aim to provide LBQ-specific resourcing are not primarily funding LBQ-led groups. The presence of LBQ-led groups in most regions in the activist sample shows that LBQ groups are organizing around the world and can be considered for funding. Donors may need to prioritize reaching and funding LBQ-led groups rather than LGBTQI groups, general women’s rights groups, or human rights groups that are not LBQ-led in order to reach LBQ communities with grant support.

Global funding landscape

Donors indicate that only one-quarter of their LBQ-specific grants reach groups outside of North America and Europe & Central Asia.

The data show that the highest number of LBQ-specific grants provided were for groups in Europe and Central Asia (38%), followed closely by groups in North America (35%). It is interesting to contrast this data with findings from the activist survey. Although donor data show groups in Europe and Central Asia receiving the highest number of grants, in the activist survey, groups in this region received the lowest median external funding ($1,150; see Figure 8, page 48) and had the lowest median budget size ($5,000; see Figure 7, page 47). This suggests that although LBQ groups in Europe and Central Asia may be receiving a relatively high number of LBQ-specific grants, they are most likely very small in size.

By contrast, groups in North America receive the highest median funding ($244,202; see Figure 8, page 48) and have the highest median budget size ($315,000; see Figure 7, page 47). A number of factors may explain why LBQ-specific resourcing disproportionately favors groups in North America, including the institutionalization of philanthropy in the United States, the visibility of North American LBQ groups, a tendency for North American philanthropic dollars to be directed to North American groups, or global philanthropic dollars being channelled through LBQ groups based in North America to groups in other parts of the world.

The lower number of LBQ-specific grants reaching groups in Africa (9%), Asia and the Pacific (8%), and Latin America and the Caribbean (10%), combined with low median external funding amounts and budget sizes (see Figures 8 and 7, page 48 and 47) for groups in these regions, reinforce just how little LBQ-specific money is reaching activists in the Global South. The data paints a very difficult funding picture for LBQ groups in the Middle East/Southwest Asia. Less than 1% of the LBQ-specific grants given by donors in this sample were granted to groups in this region.
Donors report that increased awareness of LBQ communities helps them increase their funding.

The increasing visibility of LBQ communities and activism is an important factor in increasing funding for LBQ organizing. For a large majority of donors (84%), an understanding of the human rights issues facing LBQ communities was the most important factor informing their grantmaking. For nearly half (48%), the visibility of issues affecting LBQ communities has led to an institutional increase in their LBQ-specific funding. Increasing funding for less resourced strategies like research and knowledge production or cultural change work (see Figure 16, above) could contribute to further increasing visibility and building knowledge about the human rights issues facing LBQ people and, in turn, could contribute to supporting increased funding for LBQ work.

More than half (52%) of donors also report that the strong and visible leadership of LBQ groups has led to increases in their LBQ-specific funding, while nearly two-thirds (64%) reported that the capacity of grantees to implement proposed work most informed their LBQ-specific grantmaking. Providing longer-term, unrestricted funding and offering direct support to activists and groups to build capacity on, for example, program and strategy development or monitoring and evaluation, would support activists in building their individual capacities as leaders and contribute to stronger organizations. Partnering with women’s funds, activist-led funds, or community-led funds that have a demonstrated expertise in this area would increase the impact of such capacity building.

**Figure 16. Donor-funded strategies**

- Community, movement and network building: 89%
- Advocacy: 77%
- Capacity building: 55%
- Cultural change work: 45%
- Safety of LBQ human rights defenders (HRDs) and activists: 43%
- Research and knowledge production: 32%
- Direct health and social services, mental health: 32%

**Figure 17. Funding for strategies used by LBQ groups**

- Research and knowledge production:
  - Wanted to use strategy but could not because of a lack of funding: 10%
  - Use of strategy fully funded: 40%
  - Use of strategy funded in part: 50%
- Safety of LBQ HRDs and activists:
  - Wanted to use strategy but could not because of a lack of funding: 31%
  - Use of strategy fully funded: 47%
  - Use of strategy funded in part: 43%
- Cultural change work:
  - Wanted to use strategy but could not because of a lack of funding: 16%
  - Use of strategy fully funded: 55%
  - Use of strategy funded in part: 43%
- Direct health and social services, mental health:
  - Wanted to use strategy but could not because of a lack of funding: 30%
  - Use of strategy fully funded: 40%
  - Use of strategy funded in part: 40%
- Capacity building:
  - Wanted to use strategy but could not because of a lack of funding: 15%
  - Use of strategy fully funded: 47%
  - Use of strategy funded in part: 43%
- Community, movement & network building:
  - Wanted to use strategy but could not because of a lack of funding: 16%
  - Use of strategy fully funded: 55%
  - Use of strategy funded in part: 43%
- Advocacy:
  - Wanted to use strategy but could not because of a lack of funding: 24%
  - Use of strategy fully funded: 42%
  - Use of strategy funded in part: 40%

*Data in this chart reflects the number of responses to the individual strategies questions in the activist survey (see explanation on page 40).
Strategies funded

Data show a lack of donor funding for key strategies.

The strategies that LBQ groups report using most frequently (see Figure 16 on page 62) are also the ones funded by most donors. In 2017, 89% of donors funded community, movement, and network building, 77% funded advocacy, and 73% funded capacity building—all key activist strategies. However, other strategies central to LBQ organizing were funded to a much lesser extent. Less than half (43%) of donors in our sample funded research and knowledge production, while direct services, including mental health and well-being, were funded by the fewest donors (32%).

Even among the highest donor-funded strategies, most LBQ groups did not receive enough funding to fully implement the strategies they use in their work. Less than a quarter of groups that are using advocacy (24%), community and movement building (21%), and capacity building (16%) received sufficient funds for their planned activities.

Additionally, the impact of some of the more frequently funded strategies, such as movement building and advocacy, would very likely be strengthened if less-funded strategies, like research and knowledge production, received greater resourcing. Successful movement building and advocacy is supported and strengthened by research and knowledge production, and knowledge building strategies are particularly salient given the invisibilization of LBQ people and the human rights violations that they face. Yet, LBQ groups wanting to implement research and knowledge strategies often have difficulty accessing sufficient funding for these strategies. Research and knowledge production was the strategy activists mentioned most often as not implemented at all (31%) because of a lack of funding.

Similarly, effective and sustainable organizing is dependent on the physical and mental well-being of LBQ activists and the communities they serve, but direct service provision is the least funded strategy by donors. Prioritizing funding for the direct health and well-being of LBQ communities is central to supporting their work. Prioritizing funding for direct services would also acknowledge that state-provided services cannot be assumed. Creating stronger alignment between movement strategies and funding strategies by incorporating a focus on the well-being of activists and the sustainability of LBQ movements will improve the safety and human rights of LBQ people and will amplify donor impact.

Intersectional funding

Donors aspire to engage in flexible and intersectional grantmaking, while activists report difficulty accessing funding outside traditional portfolios.

Donors are overwhelmingly interested in funding LBQ groups that are working at the intersection of multiple issues, yet activists indicate that the funding they are able to secure usually comes through conventionally defined portfolios. A large majority (85%) of the donors surveyed were interested in providing funds that facilitated activism across multiple issue areas; however, LBQ groups report most often receiving LGBTQI funding (82%, n=130), LBQ funding (71%, n=123), and human rights funding (68%, n=81). Sixty-one percent (n=89) applied for and received women’s rights funding. Groups applying for funding in other thematic areas were much less successful. For example, nearly half (47%, n=38) of LBQ groups applied for but did not receive health-related funding (excluding sexual and reproductive health) or youth and children’s rights funding (43%, n=30), and more than a quarter (27%, n=31) applied for but did not receive funding related to economic justice despite the important intersections with these issues.

There are many opportunities for donors to fund LBQ groups across different thematic areas or programs within their institutions. More than half of the donors in this sample fund women’s rights, gender justice, sex workers’ rights, sexual and reproductive rights, economic justice, migrants’ rights, and workers’ rights. However, LBQ-specific funding most frequently comes from their institution’s LGBTQI rights (57%) portfolios. While LBQ groups are clearly implementing cross-movement work, survey data indicate that many donors’ practices are still rooted in more siloed funding approaches.
Non-financial support

Very few LBQ groups receive non-financial support.

Non-financial support is not reaching most LBQ groups. The data suggest a discrepancy between the non-financial support donors report providing and the support activists are able to access. Donors, for example, report networking opportunities as the most common (88%) type of non-financial support they provided, and it is the most common type of non-financial support received by LBQ groups, yet only about a quarter (24%) of LBQ groups report receiving this type of support.

LBQ groups are also not receiving the types of non-financial support they most need. Nearly a quarter (23%) of LBQ groups identified introductions to donors that might be interested in funding their work as the type of non-financial support they would most benefit from but which they did not receive.

Groups also report capacity building support for program and strategy development, fundraising, and monitoring and evaluation as areas where they could benefit from additional support. Many donors reported providing non-financial support to build capacity in the areas of programmatic and strategy development (46%), fundraising and grant-writing (44%), and monitoring and evaluation (39%), although only between 10-12% of LBQ groups received these types of support, suggesting that although donors provide these types of support, they are not reaching all of the groups that could benefit.

Increasing access to non-financial support provides LBQ groups with opportunities to build skills and develop knowledge that is directly relevant to the sustainability of their groups. For example, in building the capacity of LBQ groups in program development, monitoring and evaluation, and resource mobilization, donors would be providing support that could be instrumental in buoying LBQ groups during periods of financial crisis, or strengthening the skills of activist-leaders while also increasing the visibility of LBQ groups. Providing grantees with more and diverse types of non-financial support that is driven by the needs of LBQ groups would contribute to the vibrancy of LBQ movements and the operational resilience of LBQ groups, representing a shift toward more holistic resourcing of LBQ groups.

Figure 18. Non-financial support provided by donors

Figure 19. Non-financial support received vs. non-financial support desired but not received by LBQ groups
CASE STUDY: MESAHAT

“THE STATE IS A PATRIARCHAL GUARDIAN”:
HOLISTIC SECURITY IN THE NILE VALLEY

Since its founding in 2015, Mesahat Foundation for Sexual and Gender Diversity has emerged as a critical support for LBQ people in the Nile Valley area (Egypt and Sudan). Activists created Mesahat to elevate the concerns of LBQ people and respond to the ongoing threats, discrimination, and violence they face. Non-binary and gender non-conforming people experience a fundamental lack of safety, and the state fails to recognize ongoing threats, discrimination, and violence they face. While trans people are not legally criminalized in Egypt, authorities often circumvent laws to arbitrarily trap and arrest trans and gender non-conforming people. In recent months, the state has arrested “suspicious” people — such as feminine nine men — in public spaces.

Women also frequently face violence at the community level. Unmarried women in their late twenties arouse suspicion, and cases of virginity tests, forced marriages, and home imprisonment have all been documented. Gender-based violence poses significant challenges to Mesahat field activists who document cases of discrimination and violence: feminine-presenting women are subject to sexual harassment while masculine-presenting women face aggression and violence. The near complete lack of state protection puts both activists and LBQ people at risk.

Mesahat uses a three-pronged approach to improve the lives of LBQ people in Egypt and Sudan: 1) building the capacity of queer youth leaders, 2) providing holistic security, including personal safety through protection and sheltering, tools and awareness on digital security, and self-care and psychological well-being, and 3) compiling queer oral history that captures the life experiences of queer people in Egypt and Sudan.

Mesahat believes holistic security to be the single most important service the organization offers. In 2017, a picture of a raised rainbow flag during a concert by Mashrou’ Lilea, a popular Lebanese band, went viral and led to a crackdown by the state. The media picked up the story, and within days, LBQ people were receiving death threats and 73 people were arrested (virtually all of them had been uninvolved in the incident with the flag). By offering psychological and relocation support, as well as other services needed to ensure the safety of LBQ people, Mesahat’s holistic security services were instrumental in providing LBQ people with a much needed safety net following the concert.

Mesahat’s holistic security services were instrumental in providing LBQ people with a much needed safety net following the concert.

Its security work is also an important knowledge-gathering tool. Holistic security allows Mesahat to learn more about the needs of activists, community members, and especially the needs of non-binary and gender nonconforming people, whose gender presentation jeopardizes their safety. Through its understanding of community needs, Mesahat is able to offer services which oftentimes are out of reach for LBQ people. For example, Mesahat offers activists access to a network of therapists and psychiatric covers the cost of psychological support. Similarly, they also provide access to digital security tools (e.g., VPN, anti-virus, Microsoft suite, unregistered phone numbers, and mobile phones), many of which are too expensive or otherwise inaccessible to activists. While this initially started as an emergency program, Mesahat’s holistic security services are now considered critical to the sustainability and continuity of their work.

Resourcing: Mesahat faces many challenges in accessing and implementing funding for their work. They are frequently excluded from funding opportunities because they are unregistered in both Egypt and Sudan. When Mesahat is awarded a grant or receives money, it is frequently contingent on funds being used in Egypt only, and not Sudan. Mesahat believes that these restrictions may be rooted in the belief that activism in MENA is underfunded and that there is little utility in funding resources in Sudan, which is seen as a “hopeless” case. Mesahat’s 2018 annual budget was $103,000 USD, of which only $5,000 USD could be used in Sudan.

In other cases, donors have sometimes prescribed the types of work Mesahat should do and should avoid. In the past, foundations based in the Global North have pushed for greater organizational visibility without recognizing that simple discussions with the state are impossible or even dangerous, forcing Mesahat to reject funding or collaboration with these donors. Funding for advocacy work can also be stymied by donor expectations that advocacy will be collaborative, while failing to recognize that civil society is often homophobic and transphobic, and that without long-term awareness building work, collaboration will not succeed. Funders interested in supporting Mesahat often have a keen interest in funding advocacy work, while the organization’s most pressing needs lie in the area of capacity building.

“Human rights work in Egypt and Sudan is difficult. Let alone work on LBTQI issues.”
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The research shows that LBQ activism is growing all over the world. These vibrant groups are determinedly doing their work with intense commitment and very little money, often in quite harsh and repressive circumstances. In their organizing across diverse movements, they are improving the lives of LBQ people while advancing multiple social justice causes. They are, however, also struggling. LBQ groups are under-resourced and under-staffed, and they have weak safety nets. They organize intersectionally but are typically funded through narrowly defined portfolios. They envision long-term structural and systemic change, but are principally funded with short-term, often project-based grants.

The foundation donors who participated in this research see the value of LBQ groups’ work, but current levels of funding are insufficient. Many donors are funding LBQ work through broad funding that is meant to include LBQ communities, but without strategies to ensure that the funding actually reaches LBQ-led groups. It is encouraging that half of the donors surveyed indicated an intention to increase LBQ funding in the next two years. This presents an important and timely opportunity for dedicated action to close the funding gap and ensure LBQ groups get the critical funding they need.

By providing more and better quality funding to LBQ-led groups, donors can unleash the power of LBQ groups to secure transformative change in their communities. Given rising conservatism, nationalisms, and fundamentalisms around the world, and the importance of building and supporting strong movements to fight back, funding grassroot LBQ groups who are working intersectionally and addressing some of the most pressing challenges facing our world is a smart and underutilized strategy that will enable all donors to support and advance progressive political organizing around the globe.

Recommendations to donors

1. Increase funding for LBQ communities and direct it to LBQ groups.

LBQ groups are doing creative and critical social change work, but they are hampered by insufficient funding. Forty percent of groups have a budget of less than $5,000 USD, and a third of groups are receiving no external funding at all. New funding should be dedicated for LBQ issues and directed to LBQ-led groups, especially those based outside of North America. LBQ groups are strongly rooted in their communities, have expertise on the specific needs of LBQ people, and have the greatest accountability to LBQ people within movement ecosystems. LBQ groups work intersectionally, use multiple and diverse strategies, and are building the movements we need to fight for justice.

2. Make funding more accessible to LBQ groups.

Many LBQ groups are recently formed and have limited experience applying for funding; two in five groups are unregistered. Donors should make funding more accessible to LBQ groups by simplifying application requirements, providing feedback on rejected applications, and partnering with public foundations, women’s funds, and intermediaries that have the capacity and expertise to reach and support small and/or unregistered groups.

3. Improve the quality of funding for LBQ groups.

LBQ groups require sustained funding to establish themselves and to do effective work. However, more than half (56%) of LBQ groups have never received multi-year funding and less than a quarter (22%) receive unrestricted funding. Donors should:

• Provide flexible and unrestricted funding that allows LBQ groups to pursue their own agendas, respond to changing circumstances, invest in their own capacities, and reduce the risk of burnout; and,

• Build multi-year partnerships that allow LBQ groups to do long-term planning and strategic work. Long-term funding also enables activists and donors to develop working relationships built on trust and sustained collaboration.

4. Direct funding to regions where LBQ groups’ access is especially limited.

While LBQ groups are under-funded across the globe, there are stark regional differences. Groups in Europe and Central Asia and Asia and the Pacific had the lowest median external funding at $1,150 and $1,170, respectively. Donors should address these gaps by targeting new resources to these regions, which have strong and diverse LBQ groups and movements. While we did not have sufficient activist data to report on the Middle East/Southwest Asia, it’s clear that this region also needs dedicated attention.

5. Invest in research and knowledge production and in service provision, two priorities of LBQ groups that are particularly under-funded.

Across the board, LBQ groups report that they do not have sufficient funding to implement their strategies, with some particularly notable gaps. More than two-thirds (69%) of LBQ groups engage in research, and ensure it meets their needs. Knowledge production, addressing the limited public understanding about LBQ communities and the rights violations they face. Nearly two-thirds (63%) provide direct health and social services to their communities, responding to the failures of larger institutions to meet LBQ people’s needs. However, less than half (43%) of donors in our sample funded research and knowledge production, and only a third (32%) funded service delivery. Donors should give particular attention to these areas. Investing in research and knowledge production can serve the additional goal of raising visibility among funders and making the case to address LBQ groups’ funding gaps. Supporting direct health services, including mental health and wellness, is critical for the well-being of LBQ organizers and the sustainability of their movements.

6. Increase non-financial support to LBQ groups and ensure it meets their needs.

LBQ groups have very limited access to non-financial support to invest in their organizational capacities, with just around 10% reporting that they receive it at all and significant disparities between what they report accessing and what donors report providing.
LBQ groups particularly need but are not receiving introductions to potential donors and capacity building support for program and strategy development, fundraising, and monitoring and evaluation. Donors should make dedicated efforts to invest in the organizational strengthening of LBQ groups as well as to connect them with new donors, contributing to their sustainability and resilience.

7. For donors without LBQ-specific portfolios, ensure that funding intended to be LBQ-inclusive actually reaches LBQ communities.

It is striking that a majority (67%) of donors who describe their work as LBQ-inclusive do not have intentional strategies to ensure that their funding is actually reaching LBQ communities. In consultation with LBQ activists, donors should develop specific and measurable strategies to ensure their funding actually reaches LBQ communities. For example, donors can ask non-LBQ-specific grantees about the strategies they use to reach LBQ people, their track record in promoting the rights of LBQ people, or how many people in their leadership identify as LBQ.

8. Seek to “de-silo” funding for LBQ groups’ intersectional work.

While the foundation donors we surveyed overwhelmingly want to support intersectional work, and LBQ groups are working across issues and movements, LBQ groups most often receive funding from LGBTQI portfolios. Donors should explore joint grantmaking initiatives that respond to LBQ groups’ intersectional organizing, including collaborations across thematic departments within institutions. There are particularly meaningful opportunities for women’s rights and gender equality donors to increase support for LBQ groups, who are working on issues of bodily autonomy, sexual rights, and gender justice. Donors who focus on sexual and reproductive health and rights, HIV and AIDS, young people, sex workers, and other issues and constituencies should also consider how LBQ groups fit into their portfolios.
Activist survey

The activist survey, a structured questionnaire, was launched on SurveyMonkey from September 19 - November 16, 2018. The survey was available in English, French, Russian, and Spanish and was widely distributed across listservs and promoted on social media. Names and other identifying information from respondents were not collected in order to ensure anonymity.

The key inclusion criteria for the activist survey included respondents that belong to groups that are self-governing or autonomous and work specifically on LBQ issues or with LBQ communities. In addition, LBQ people must comprise the majority (50% or more) of the group’s leadership. The final analytic sample included 378 LBQ groups.

Donor survey

The donor survey, a structured questionnaire, was launched on SurveyMonkey from October 2 - December 14, 2018. The donor survey was distributed through targeted dissemination and offered in English only based on the assumption that English was at least one of the working languages of the donor institution.

The key inclusion criteria for the donor survey included donors that identified as either a public, private, corporate, or community foundation or association, donor collaborative, or as a non-governmental organization or intermediary and whose institution provided resources for LBQ groups or issues in 2017. The final analytic sample included 67 donors.

Interviews

Interviews conducted in early 2019 with LBQ groups that are current or former grantees of Astraea and Mama Cash informed the development of four case studies included in this report. The groups featured in the case studies use strategies that focus on community and movement-building; well-being and safety; and cultural change, including the use of activism. These strategies were selected because previously conducted research showed that these are prioritized by LBQ groups.53 Regional diversity, budget size, the focus of the group’s work, and its leadership were taken into account in selecting groups.

Data analysis

SurveyMonkey data were imported into SAS 9.4 (Cary, NC, SAS Institute Inc.) for data cleaning, creation of summary variables for analysis, and analysis. Descriptive statistics were produced with frequencies and proportions for categorical variables, and means, median, standard deviations, minima, and maxima for continuous variables.

Limitations

The survey data come from a convenience sample and may under-represent groups that did not have access to the surveys. The surveys were self-administered by individuals within the organizations (activists and donors) and have not been independently verified by the researchers through observations or formal documentation. Finally, some survey questions were optional, resulting in substantial numbers of missing responses.

LBQ activists who were not fluent in English, French, Russian, or Spanish may have found the survey inaccessible. Likewise, donor institutions that do not operate in English may not have been able to complete the survey. In at least one instance, informal translation of the survey was provided to a respondent in order to facilitate participation but there may have also been other cases.

The participation of an advisory committee member for Oceania could not be secured and this may have prevented the wider participation of activists from the region and also limited region-specific feedback.

53 — From 2016-2017 Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice and Mama Cash held two consultative meetings with 90 activists to conduct preliminary research on the movement building and funding priorities of LBQ activists as well as the strengths and challenges that LBQ movements face.
GLOSSARY

Cisgender (Ci): A term to describe people whose gender identity or expression matches the sex they were assigned at birth.

Crowdfunding: The practice of funding a project or business by raising many small amounts of money from a large number of people, typically via the Internet.

External Funding: Funding sources that include government, foundation, or other institutional funding and that exclude membership fees, community fundraisers, events, and individual contributions from founders or their family members.

Intersectionality: Intersectionality is an analytic sensibility first developed by Kimberlé Crenshaw, an American lawyer and civil rights advocate and a leading scholar of critical race theory, as a way of thinking about the intersections of racism, sexism, class and public institutional donors.

Intersectional/Intersectionality: Intersectionality has given many advocates a textual awareness to feminist issues, and provided a resistance to and rejection of heteronormative standards, assimilation, dominant notions of “normality,” and respectability politics. It also refers to people who do not fit cultural norms around sexuality and/or gender identity/expression.

In the context of this report, LBQ focuses on sexual identity and is inclusive of lesbian, bisexual, and queer women, both cis and trans, and all non-binary people on the gender spectrum who relate to a lesbian, bisexual, and/or queer identity.

LBQ: Abbreviation for the words “lesbian,” “gay,” “bisexual,” “trans/transgender,” “queer,” and “intersex.”

Non-Binary: A gender identity that cannot be defined within the gender binary (the categories of woman and man). Non-binary people understand their gender as either in-between or beyond the binary, or they reject the concept of having a gender entirely. Non-binary identities can be either fixed or fluid. Non-binary is a diverse identity, which means that non-binary has become an umbrella term as well as being an identity category in its own right. Other terms sometimes used include genderqueer, gender fluid, and gender non-conforming. Non-binary people who identify with a lesbian, bisexual, or queer sexuality are included as a focus constiuency in this report.

Private Foundation: A private foundation is a non-governmental, non-profit organization or charitable trust. Its principal fund usually comes from a single source, such as an individual, family, or corporation, and is managed by the foundation’s own trustees or directors. Private foundations support charitable, educational, religious, or other activities serving the public good. A private foundation does not solicit funds from the public.

Public Foundation (or Charity): Public foundations or charities receive funding from the public – donations from individuals and grants from government and private foundations. Some public foundations/charities give grants, while others provide direct service or other tax-exempt activities.

Queer: The word “queer” has been used in the past as a derogatory term for someone perceived to be gay or lesbian. “Queer” has been re-claimed in recent decades and is embraced by many with pride. It is a multi-faceted and complex word. Used as a collective term, it is used as a concise way of referring to all parts of the LGBT community. However, queer also refers to a resistance to and rejection of heteronormative standards, assimilation, dominant notions of “normality,” and respectability politics. It also refers to people who do not fit cultural norms around sexuality and/or gender identity/expression.

Transgender (Trans): People whose gender identity or expression differs from the sex assigned to them at birth. Some transgender people identify and present themselves as either a man or a woman; others identify with a gender non-conforming or non-binary gender category. Transgender people identity themselves by many different terms, some of which are specific to local cultures, including fa’afafine, travesti, hijra, genderqueer, or transpinoy—to name just a few.

Women’s Funds: Women’s funds are foundations that have often emerged from feminist movements and raise and distribute money in a way that supports the collective and organized power of grassroots women, girls, trans, and intersex people around the world. They bring contextual awareness to feminist issues, and provide financial resources to groups as well as other resources to realize their vision of social transformation.

Intersex: Intersex people are born with sex characteristics (including genitals, gonads, and/or chromosome patterns) that vary from typical binary notions of male or female bodies. Intersex is an umbrella term used to describe a wide range of natural bodily variations. The term “intersex” has been reclaimed by some intersex people as a part of their larger personal and political identities.

Lesbian, Bisexual, and Queer (LBQ): In the context of this report, LBQ focuses on sexual identity and is inclusive of lesbian, bisexual, and queer women, both cis and trans, and all non-binary people on the gender spectrum who relate to a lesbian, bisexual, and/or queer identity.
Regional Groupings

Africa

Asia and the Pacific
- Afghanistan, American Samoa, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Fiji, French Polynesia, Guam, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Macao, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Norfolk Island, Northern Mariana Islands, Pakistan, Palau, Philippines, Pitcairn, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Wallis and Futuna Islands

Europe and Central Asia
- Abkhazia, Åland Islands, Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Faeroe Islands, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Gibraltar, Greece, Greenland, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jersey, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Nagorno-Karabakh, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Sark, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Ossetia, Spain, Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Transnistria, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uzbekistan

Latin America and the Caribbean
- Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bermuda, Bolivia, Bonaire, Brazil, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Chile, Colombia, Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Cuba, Curaçao, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, French Guiana, Grenada, Guadeloupe, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Islas Malvinas, Jamaica, Martinique, Mexico, Montserrat, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, Saint Barthélemy, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Martin, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sint Eustatius and Saba, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks and Caicos Islands, United States Virgin Islands, Uruguay, Venezuela

Middle East/Southwest Asia
- Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Palestine/Israel, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

North America
- Canada, United States of America