

International Funders

IFIP

for Indigenous Peoples

FUNDING TREND ANALYSIS ON INDIGENOUS PEOPLES PHILANTHROPY

2024



Archipel
Research & Consulting

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	3
Definitions and Terminology.....	5
List of Figures & Tables.....	7
Executive Summary.....	8
The Need for Indigenous Philanthropy Transformation.....	10
Data Gaps in Indigenous Philanthropy.....	13
Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Organizations Benefitting Indigenous Peoples.....	15
Section 1: Global Analysis of Indigenous Funding.....	16
How has Indigenous Philanthropy Changed since 2016?.....	19
How is Indigenous Philanthropy Represented Regionally?.....	27
How Much Funding Goes to Intersectional Groups and Issues?.....	32
What Subject Areas do Grants Support?.....	34
What Strategies for Grants Support?.....	36
Who Receives Grants for Indigenous Peoples?.....	44
Who Funds Indigenous Peoples?.....	45
What is the Data Telling Us?.....	48
Section 2: International Survey of Indigenous Philanthropy.....	49
Who Did We Hear From?.....	49
Indigenous Funding Perspectives and Concerns.....	51
What Needs to Change and Improve?.....	52
Section 3: Interviews with Leaders in Indigenous Philanthropy.....	55
Theme 1: Holistic Approaches to Funding.....	55
Theme 2: Relationship Building in Indigenous Communities.....	59
Theme 3: Barriers and Gaps in the Funding Landscape.....	61
Theme 4: Innovative Application and Reporting Processes.....	66
Theme 5: Recommendations for Non-Indigenous Philanthropists.....	68
Theme 6: Indigenous Leadership and Control.....	72
Theme 7: Climate and Environment.....	75
Future Action: 20 Recommendations to Advance Indigenous Philanthropy.....	77
Appendix A: Methodology.....	84
Appendix B: Indigenous Peoples Organization and Indigenous Led Funds	85



Acknowledgements

International Funders for Indigenous Peoples

Thank you to the dedicated team at the International Funders for Indigenous Peoples (IFIP) for their invaluable commitment and diligent efforts in meticulously analyzing and categorizing the grants. It is through their dedication and understanding of the Indigenous Peoples' movement and philanthropy that this report represents the first of its kind's endeavor in philanthropy.

Lourdes Inga, Quechua, Executive Director

Chanda Thapa, Magar, Program Director

Anabel López, Mixtec, Program Coordinator

Winnie Kodi, Nuba, Membership and Communications Manager

IFIP would also like to express our appreciation to Chris Cardona, former Senior Program Officer, Philanthropy at Ford Foundation for his feedback and comments on the early review of the report.

Archipel Research & Consulting, Inc.

Thank you to all the members of our team for their contributions and dedication:

Megan Julian, Stó:lo, Research Manager
Dr. Muna Osman, Research Methodologist
Sabre Pictou Lee, Mi'kmaq, Senior Researcher

Yusra Osman, Research Manager
Courtney Vaughan, Métis, Senior Researcher

Dr. Roxanne Korpan, Senior Researcher

Dr. William Felepchuk, Research Advisor

Catherine Stockall, Associate Researcher

Sophia Bain, Researcher

Latissah Alleyne, Researcher

Graham Paradis, Métis, Assistant Researcher

Hope Metallic, Mi'kmaq, Assistant Researcher

Lourdes Inga, Quechua, Executive Director

Chanda Thapa, Magar, Program Director

Anabel López, Mixtec, Program Coordinator

Winnie Kodi, Nuba, Membership and Communications Manager

IFIP would also like to express our appreciation to Chris Cardona, former Senior Program Officer, Philanthropy at Ford Foundation for his feedback and comments on the early review of the report.

Participants

We raise our hands in thanks to all the 29 research participants who shared their insights and knowledge, 19 of whom are listed below. We would also like to express our gratitude to the 11 participants who chose to remain anonymous. We learned so much from the opportunity to speak with you all.

1. **Adrian Appo**, Gooreng Gooreng (Queensland/Australia)
2. **Annie Hillar**
3. **Casey Box**
4. **Cristi Nozawa**
5. **Donna House**, Navajo Nation
6. **Erik Stegman**, Carry the Kettle First Nation (Nakota)
7. **Galina Angarova**, Buryat
8. **Katy Scholfield**
9. **Kris Archie**, Secwapémc Nation
10. **Liz Liske**, Yellowknives Dene First Nation
11. **Marama Takao**, Māori
12. **Melissa Stevens**
13. **Patty Krawec**, Lac Seul First Nation
14. **Pratima Gurung**, Gurung – National Indigenous Disabled Women Association of Nepal
15. **Rosalie Nezien**
16. **Tania Turner**
17. **Teresa Zapeta**, Maya
18. **Victoria Sweet**, Anishinaabe
19. **Wanda Brascoupe**, Citizen of the Tuscara Nation & Member of Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg

Candid

We thank the staff at Candid who worked with IFIP to provide the needed data over the course of this research.

A Message to Readers

We ask readers to please cite this report and acknowledge the collective wisdom of the knowledge holders who contributed to this research.

Please use the following citation: Archipel Research and Consulting (2024). *Global Funding Trend Analysis on Indigenous Philanthropy*. International Funders for Indigenous Peoples.





Definitions and Terminology

2SLGBTQQA+: This acronym collectively refers to members of the Two-Spirit, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, questioning, intersex, and asexual communities as well as others who identify as gender or sexually diverse.

5Rs of Indigenous Philanthropy: IFIP envisions value-based partnerships that incorporate the “5Rs” to re-frame funding relationships and to shift to a new paradigm of giving based on Respect, Relationships, Responsibility, Reciprocity, and Redistribution.

Candid: Non-profit organization that includes a grants information database. Candid is the leading U.S.-based repository for data about foundation giving, providing access to a range of current philanthropic information with quality standardized data points. This database was used in this report’s quantitative analysis.

CEDAW: Refers to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, an international treaty adopted in 1979 by the United Nations General Assembly. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, usually abbreviated as “CEDAW Committee,” is the United Nations (UN) treaty body that oversees the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

CEDAW General Recommendation N.39: refers to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) adoption in General recommendation No.39 (2022) on the rights of Indigenous Women and Girls. It represents the first language in a binding international treaty focused on the rights of Indigenous Women and Girls and is a result of the years of advocacy and leadership of Indigenous Women.

Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions (IG/AR): This category includes Tribal, First Nations, Aboriginal Governments, and Councils Organizations created by sovereign First Nations (Tribal, Aboriginal, Indigenous) Governments or Councils. Funding programs created by regional federations of Indigenous Peoples, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and health and economic development agencies are also included.

Indigenous-led Philanthropy: Giving by Indigenous Led Funds and Indigenous Peoples Organizations informed and guided by Indigenous worldviews, values, and protocols, and led and managed by, for, and with Indigenous Peoples (See full definition in Appendix B).

Indigenous Led Funds: Indigenous Led Funds are guided by indigenous worldviews and led-by and for Indigenous Peoples. Indigenous Led Funds strengthen self-determination and support a process that empowers the communities, at the local to the global level, to be able to change paradigms and shift power relations addressing the asymmetry of powers and resources to recognition and reciprocity (See full definition in Appendix B).

Indigenous Peoples: An official definition of “Indigenous” has not been adopted by any United Nations system body. Instead, the UN uses an understanding that intends to honour the diversity of Indigenous Peoples based upon the following: self-determination at the individual and community level; historical continuity; strong links to territory; distinct social, economic or political systems; and distinct language, culture, and beliefs. The most fruitful approach is to identify, rather than define indigenous peoples. This is based on the fundamental criterion of self-identification as underlined in key human rights documents (United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues n.d.)

Indigenous Peoples Organizations (IPOs): This category includes an organization, forum, platform, or other body Indigenous Peoples use to organize that has as its primary role to serve Indigenous Peoples and their communities, rights, self-determination or has as one of its main roles to fund Indigenous Peoples Organizations or community projects, and whose mission is for the benefit of Indigenous Peoples (See full definition in Appendix B).

Indigenous Philanthropy: Grantmaking by Indigenous Led Funds and non-Indigenous funding organizations and intermediaries to fund organizations and initiatives to support Indigenous Peoples.

Non-Indigenous Organizations (Non-IPOs): This category refers to funders, intermediaries, collaboratives, NGOs, and organizations that are not an Indigenous Peoples Organization.

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP): Adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on September 13, 2007, UNDRIP is a UN document that contains minimum standards for the recognition, promotion, and protection of the rights of Indigenous Peoples.




List of Figures & Tables

Figure 1.1. The value of grants organized by organization type from 2016 to 2020.....	18
Figure 1.2a. Value potentially benefiting Indigenous Peoples.....	19
Figure 1.2b. Total Value of Global Philanthropy from 2016 to 2020.....	20
Figure 1.2c. The number of grants potentially benefiting Indigenous Peoples	20
Figure 1.2d. Changes in funding trends over five years.....	22
Figure 1.3a. Funding trends by organization from 2016.....	24
Figure 1.3b. Funding trends by organization from 2017.....	24
Figure 1.3c. Funding trends by organization from 2018.....	25
Figure 1.3d. Funding trends by organization from 2019.....	25
Figure 1.3e. Funding trends by organization from 2020.....	26
Figure 1.4. Regional distribution of Funding 2016-2020.....	28
Table 1.5. Regional distribution (%) of grants from 2016 to 2020.....	29
Table 1.6. Regional distribution of the value and number of grants across organization type,2016.....	29
Table 1.7. Regional distribution of the value and number of grants across organization type, 2017.....	30
Table 1.8. Regional distribution of the value and number of grants across organization type, 2018.....	30
Table 1.9. Regional distribution of the value and number of grants across organization type, 2019.....	31
Table 1.10. Regional distribution of the value and number of grants across organization type, 2020..	31
Figure 1.11.a. Women Grants across five years given to IG and IPO combined.....	32
Figure 1.11.b. Children and Youth Grants across five years given to IG and IPO combined.....	32
Figure 1.11.c. People with Disabilities across five years given to IG and IPO combined.....	33
Figure 1.11.d. 2SLGBTQQIA+ across five years given to IG and IPO combined.....	33
Table 1.12. Top subject areas across organizations and years.....	35
Table 1.13. Top four grantmaking strategies across years and organizations.....	37
Table 1.14. Top five recipients globally from 2016 to 2020.....	39
Table 1.15. Top five recipients outside of North America from 2016 to 2020.....	40
Table 1.16. Top five Indigenous Peoples Organizations and Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions recipients outside of North America from 2016 to 2020.....	42
Table 1.17. Top five Indigenous Peoples Organizations and Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions recipients from 2016 to 2020.....	43
Table 1.18. Top five funders globally from 2016 to 2020.....	46
Table 1.19. Top five funders grantmaking outside North America from 2016 to 2020.....	47
Figure 2.1. Regional representation among survey respondents.....	49
Figure 2.2. Indigenous identity among survey respondents.....	50
Table 2.3. Perspectives on the most under-resourced areas among respondents.....	51
Table 2.4. Funding priority areas identified by respondents.....	53
Figure 2.5. Advancing Indigenous priorities through funding.....	53

Executive Summary

This report was developed by International Funders for Indigenous Peoples (IFIP), the only global philanthropy network dedicated to Indigenous Peoples worldwide, and Archipel Research and Consulting, an Indigenous-owned and women-led firm, as a global analysis of the state of funding to Indigenous Peoples between 2016 to 2020 and ways that these funding approaches can improve into the future. This report is the first of its kind to provide such an analysis on a global scale. As such, this report can inform funders of the state of funding to Indigenous Peoples, promote research- and data-informed advocacy, and amplify Indigenous philanthropy.

Examining grants from 2016 to 2020 across organization type, regions, and years, the global funding analysis found consistent patterns of pervasive and systemic inequities in Indigenous philanthropy and challenges Indigenous Peoples face in accessing global philanthropy. A persistent data gap is the lack of disaggregated data, transparency, and an accountability mechanism to validate the level of funding that actually reached Indigenous Peoples Organizations out of grants made to Non-Indigenous Organizations.



Globally, only 0.6% (\$4.5 billion) of giving was identified as benefiting Indigenous Peoples as outlined by the available data in Candid from 2016 to 2020.


This data is inclusive of funding to Indigenous Peoples in Canada and the United States, specifically Native Americans, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, First Nations, Inuit, and Métis as well as grants referring broadly to Indigenous Peoples across the globe. This report also includes funding to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in Australia, though a lower number; only 46 Australian funders are represented in Candid's data. In terms of regions most funding is concentrated in a few specific subject areas or sectors and heavily concentrated on Non-Indigenous Organizations. **Of the \$4.5 billion (0.6%), Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions and Indigenous Peoples Organizations received \$1.5 billion (0.3%) of the global giving.** Our analysis reveals the constraints within funding opportunities for recipients that restrict the scope of supported programs and organizations in the region. This limitation may hinder the growth of areas that do not align with funders' priorities.

The qualitative funding analysis drew on a **literature scan, a survey of philanthropy sector respondents including Indigenous Peoples, interviews with Indigenous stakeholders and philanthropy workers, and a dialogue session.**

The survey findings are complementary to the funding scan. Regarding Indigenous Peoples' funding needs, environment was consistently identified as a priority. The funding scan also found environment as a key subject area of grants across several regions, specifically in Latin American and the Caribbean. We also found in the survey 90% of the respondents pointed to the need for more direct support to Indigenous-led organizations to advance Indigenous priorities through funding. Participants also emphasized the need to invest in strengthening Indigenous-led organizations to enable them to design and administer funds and to develop Indigenous grantmaking at the grassroots level.

The insights and perspectives shared in the interviews and discussion session complement the survey data and contextualize the funding gaps and disproportionalities outlined in the quantitative funding scan within broader systemic issues. Interview results are organized into seven key themes: holistic approaches to funding, relationship building in Indigenous communities, barriers and gaps in funding landscape, innovative application and reporting processes, recommendations for non-Indigenous philanthropists, Indigenous leadership and control, and climate and the environment.

This report concludes with 20 recommendations generated from the results of the global funding scan, survey, and interviews that may serve as a tool to funders committed to addressing asymmetries of power in philanthropy, centering Indigenous rights and leadership, addressing barriers to funding for Indigenous Peoples, and putting into practice IFIP's values of the 5Rs of Indigenous Philanthropy: **Respect, Relationships, Responsibility, Reciprocity, and Redistribution.**





The Need for Indigenous Philanthropy Transformation


Embarking on this research project has been a long-coming and significant step the International Funders for Indigenous Peoples (IFIP) has taken to address a systemic issue and the asymmetry of power across philanthropy, and the disproportional lack of direct access of philanthropic funding to Indigenous Peoples and their communities worldwide. This reality motivated this research project.

While Indigenous Peoples account for 6.2% of the global population, they have been systemically and historically excluded from and underrepresented in every sector, including philanthropy. Indigenous Peoples are rights holders with individual and collective rights as Peoples and have a distinct legal and political status. Indigenous Peoples' rights are recognized under international law in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and the International Labor Organization, Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, also known as ILO Convention 169, which is a major binding international convention. Most recently, the UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW Committee) adopted general recommendation No. 39 on the rights of Indigenous Women and Girls.

The recommendation provides guidance to states parties on legislative, policy, and other relevant measures to ensure the implementation of their obligations in relation to the rights of Indigenous Women and Girls under the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW).


As such, IFIP calls on funders to distinctively identify funding to Indigenous Peoples and support the calls to provide direct funding to Indigenous Peoples Organizations and communities. To improve the quality of available funding data, Indigenous Peoples should not merely be considered as “vulnerable groups,” “underserved,” “marginalized,” or any other “stakeholders.” Further, we encourage funders to move away from using terms such as DEI and BIPOC as it continues to invisibilize Indigenous Peoples in philanthropic data and makes it impossible to disaggregate data.

Within the global philanthropy ecosystem, International Funders for Indigenous Peoples (IFIP) is the only philanthropic network dedicated specifically to Indigenous Peoples worldwide. IFIP's mission is to shift power, mobilize resources, and build partnerships to amplify Indigenous leadership and support the self-determination and rights of Indigenous Peoples, their local communities, and territories worldwide.



IFIP's mission is to shift power, mobilize resources, and build partnerships to amplify Indigenous leadership and support the self-determination and rights of Indigenous Peoples, their local communities, and territories worldwide. IFIP serves as a key conveyer and catalyst for defining and developing the field of Indigenous Peoples funding. IFIP envisions value-based partnerships and to practice a new paradigm of giving based on "The Five R's of Indigenous Philanthropy" - Respect, Reciprocity, Responsibility, Relationships, and Redistribution.

While IFIP has seen several indications over the past decade that the relationships between some funders and Indigenous communities is improving, overall, funding for Indigenous Peoples remains inadequate and vastly disproportionate when we take into consideration the wisdom, knowledge, and solutions Indigenous Peoples hold to many of the world issues facing humanity. To build on these efforts, International Funders for Indigenous Peoples (IFIP) partnered with Archipel Research and Consulting to conduct a global analysis of the state of funding to Indigenous Peoples between 2016 to 2020 and ways that these funding approaches can improve into the future.



We connected with Indigenous donor/funding organizations, granting bodies, re-granting bodies, and Indigenous Peoples Organizations across the globe to better understand the state of funding between funders and Indigenous Peoples. This included a survey of 40 participants from the philanthropy sector (20 of whom were themselves Indigenous), interviews with 29 Indigenous stakeholders and philanthropy professionals, and a dialogue session with 55 Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants at IFIP's 2023 Global Conference. These activities took place between December 2022 and March 2023. Across the research streams, we engaged with 125 participants. This report therefore provides a baseline to the philanthropy sector by which IFIP intends to monitor progress, transparency, and accountability.

After investing financial resources to access CANDID's data on Indigenous philanthropy, IFIP and Archipel collaboratively reviewed over 34,200 grants to determine the level of direct grants to Indigenous Peoples Organizations. To systematize analysis, the data was organized using five broad categories: Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions, Indigenous Peoples Organizations, Non-Indigenous Organizations, invalid or unknown grants, and grants with insufficient information. Archipel's team reviewed grants made to organizations in Canada, while the IFIP team reviewed all other international grants to identify organization type. These activities took place between April 2023 and December 2023. Based on these findings, we offer 20 recommendations for future action in philanthropy sector serving Indigenous Peoples.

IFIP sees this research as a first step and baseline to inform and lead to additional funding trends, toolkits, and platforms to bring to light to funding gaps, and more importantly, the opportunities to collaborate for systems change in funding to Indigenous Peoples.

IFIP's plans include further research and creating tools and mechanisms for keeping funders informed and aware of the progress they are making in addressing gaps in their giving.

This report is the culmination of a collaborative effort and is the first of its kind. As such, this report can inform funders of the state of funding to Indigenous Peoples and promote data-informed advocacy to amplify Indigenous philanthropy. This report is also an invitation to reflect on the findings and recommendations and to take action towards a new paradigm of giving one that recognizes Indigenous Peoples as rights and knowledge holders, and critical partners to philanthropy.





Data Gaps in Indigenous Philanthropy

There is growing availability of global philanthropic data across the globe. This data helps organizations understand the nature and trends of grant making and global giving across time, regions, and types of grants. Despite this wealth of data, there are significant challenges in the nature and availability of data specific to Indigenous Peoples and Indigenous Peoples Organizations. Therefore, these existing data gaps and limitations largely prevent a full analysis of the current state of philanthropic funding for Indigenous Peoples. Timely, relevant, and comprehensive data on Indigenous philanthropy is essential to understand and document disparities and inform equitable policy transformation.

At this time, the data is insufficient or not disaggregated for Indigenous-led organizations. These ongoing data gaps hamper the ability to paint a complete picture. As the numbers of Indigenous-led organizations and funders grow, it is important to develop data methods and systems to understand their successes, challenges, and needs. Moving forward, a complete assessment of how data on Indigenous-led organizations are collected and reported will be important for a nuanced understanding of gaps and improved efforts to address these gaps and strengthen systems.

Where data are available, the proportion of grants and funding going to organizations serving Indigenous Peoples is very low. The data highlighted the importance of continuing efforts to address data gaps both within and beyond the philanthropic sector. This required improved availability of high-quality and comprehensive data that are disaggregated by Indigenous-led organizations and specific Indigenous Peoples served. This goal is a prerequisite for efforts to advance equitable philanthropic funding, not only for supporting Indigenous-led organizations, but also ensuring funding is directly reaching and benefiting Indigenous Peoples' communities.

It is important to highlight the impact of miscoded grants currently misclassified as Indigenous Peoples' beneficiaries. These miscoded grants include terms such as indigenous or native plants and animals, indigenous malaria, as well as grants serving people of India or Asia Diasporas.

Data as a cornerstone to understanding gaps and advancing Indigenous philanthropy. Data are critical to identifying where funding gaps exist, guiding efforts and resources to address these gaps, measuring progress on these efforts, and developing accountability processes. Without sufficient detailed data, funding gaps remain invisible and unaddressed.

Data are key for identifying how awarded grants are reaching Indigenous Peoples. As grants are awarded, insights into the organizations receiving grants is important. Additionally, data are not available on the number and nature of Indigenous-led organizations both regionally and globally. Once there is clear and transparent data on the organizations receiving grants, it will be important to understand which Indigenous communities these funds are or are not reaching and benefiting. At this point, we lack much of the data to answer these timely questions.



Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Organizations Benefiting Indigenous Peoples

With the available data, it is difficult to distinguish between funding exclusively benefiting Indigenous Peoples and funding where Indigenous Peoples are aggregated with a range of other beneficiaries and, therefore, we cannot discern the extent to which these grants are benefiting Indigenous Peoples. Grants explicitly benefiting Indigenous Peoples in some cases also identify other racial and ethnic or marginalized populations as beneficiaries. This can lead to an overcounting of funds benefiting Indigenous Peoples. For example, the Silicon Valley Community Foundation, a community foundation based in the US, funded a grant of \$280,000 to the Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice, a non-Indigenous organization, working to benefit a range of people, including children and youth, ethnic and racial groups, Indigenous Peoples, low-income people, offenders, and victims of crime and abuse. The target populations represent different ethnic and cultural groups as well as intersecting social identities and experiences of different populations. Furthermore, terms such as *BIPOC* (Black, Indigenous, and People of Colour) and *DEI* (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) make it impossible to determine the level of funding exclusively to Indigenous Peoples.

If we prioritize grants going exclusively to Indigenous Peoples, with no references to another population, this will significantly reduce the total number of grants with the added concern that some grants do not specify a population. Additionally, it is difficult to determine how much of grants made to non-Indigenous Organizations could be reaching Indigenous Peoples as the available data does not generally include information on grantees' mandates, who they serve, and nor how much trickle down to Indigenous communities or organizations. Rather than limit the number of grants included, we opt to use the organization type to assess whether funds are exclusively benefiting Indigenous Peoples.

This report aims to analyze grants trends across three types of organizations: Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions, Indigenous Peoples Organizations, and Non-Indigenous Organizations. When we look closer at types of organizations, grants going to Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions and Indigenous Peoples Organizations are exclusively benefiting Indigenous Peoples. However, grants going to Non-Indigenous Organizations are more likely to benefit multiple populations.

Overall, it is essential to note that the current philanthropy data landscape does not possess the means to accurately discern the extent to which grant identifying multiple beneficiary communities provide support directed toward Indigenous Peoples.

Section 1: Global Analysis of Indigenous Funding

Over the last decades, the International Funders for Indigenous Peoples (IFIP) has strived to transform the relationship between the funding world and Indigenous Peoples to one of mutual understanding and benefit by ensuring funders respond to the needs and priorities of Indigenous Peoples through Indigenous-led organizations and initiatives. IFIP's 5R's of Indigenous Philanthropy—Respect, Relationships, Responsibility, Reciprocity, and Redistribution—have paved the way to reframe funding relationships for greater beneficial impact. In line with this effort, IFIP distinguishes between Indigenous philanthropy and Indigenous-led philanthropy.

Indigenous Philanthropy: Grantmaking by Indigenous Led Funds and non-Indigenous funding organizations and intermediaries to fund organizations and initiatives to support Indigenous Peoples.

Indigenous-led Philanthropy: Giving by Indigenous Led Funds and Indigenous Peoples Organizations informed and guided by Indigenous worldviews, values, and protocols, and led and managed by, for, and with Indigenous Peoples.

Indigenous philanthropy, specifically global funding to support Indigenous Peoples, has increased over the last decades, yet funding is still fragmented, inadequate, and not guided by Indigenous worldviews, values, and protocols nor led by and for Indigenous Peoples.

IFIP, with their members, partners, and allies, have been working to understand how many grant dollars are going to support Indigenous Peoples and specifically, how many grant dollars are going to Indigenous Peoples Organizations guided by Indigenous worldviews, values, and protocols and initiatives led by and for Indigenous Peoples. Many Indigenous Peoples Organizations are underfunded and have limited access to flexible multi-year funding.

To better understand the scope of this challenge and the funding pathways available to Indigenous-led initiatives, this report uses recent philanthropy data from 2016 to 2020 to examine funding trends of grants benefiting Indigenous Peoples, their communities and initiatives, specifically focusing on trends across different organizations. Specifically, using detailed Candid data across five years, this global scan focused on three themes: (a) global funding dedicated to Indigenous Peoples; (b) multiple comparisons across years, regions, and subject areas; and (c) global and regional top funders and recipients. A more detailed methodology can be found in Appendix A and B.

This report presents complex data in an accessible way by organizing the results across the type of organizations first, then regions and subject areas at the end. **There are three different organization types included in this analysis: Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions (inclusive of Tribal colleges/universities), Indigenous Peoples Organizations, and Non-Indigenous Organizations.** The IFIP team, over several months, reviewed the recipients and descriptions of over 34,000 grants as well as the websites and leadership team to identify and categorize an organization as Indigenous or non-Indigenous (See Appendix A for the methodology and Appendix B for full description of Indigenous Peoples organizations and Indigenous Led Funds).

Why might our figures be different from other reports?

The data for this report is based on Candid data from 2016 to 2020. The figures in this report may be different from other reports for several reasons. Candid periodically updates its grant database to be as comprehensive as possible, and the data for this report was accessed in the summer of 2023. The analysis of grants for this report was disaggregated across organization types in relation to Indigenous Peoples. Additional analyses were conducted to examine closely the population, subject, and strategy codes provided by Candid.

There may also be variations in the percentages representing the amount of global funding directed to Indigenous Peoples. For example, the Council on Foundations reports that in 2016 to 2019, 1.4% of global funding was directed to Indigenous Peoples using Candid's "Foundation 1000" data, including the top 1,000 foundations based in the US with grants over \$10,000 USD. Our analysis shows a lower value because we included more than 8,000 funders and expanded the search to include funders outside of the United States. Similar to the Council on Foundations report, we included a minimum cutoff of \$10,000 USD for grants to be included and excluded US federal funders.

Grants with insufficient information about the recipients to determine their organization type or when the recipient is anonymous were excluded from the analysis. As the figure below shows, the impact of excluding those recipients categorized as having "insufficient information" is low as they represent small percentages of the overall recipients (between 0.1% and 1.0%).




Figure 1.1. The value of grants organized by organization type from 2016 to 2020.

Additionally, some recipients included in the Candid data were deemed to be invalid when they were incorrectly coded as potentially benefiting Indigenous Peoples. This miscoding in Candid occurred when recipient organizations were related to “native” plants and animals or Asian diaspora communities (e.g., Indian diaspora). In these cases, Archipel labelled these recipients as invalid, representing percentages between 3.3% to and 6.1%. Grants with insufficient information and grants labeled as invalid or unknown were excluded from the analysis (exact values outlined in the Figure 1.1 above).

How has Indigenous Philanthropy changed from 2016 to 2020?

According to Candid, global philanthropy has given approximately \$701.7 billion through grantmaking from 2016 to 2020. From the \$701.7 billion given, only \$4.5 billion was identified as benefiting Indigenous Peoples, of which, \$1.5 billion (0.3%) went directly to Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions and Indigenous Peoples Organizations.





Figure 1.2a. Value identified as benefiting Indigenous Peoples based on the combined giving to Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions, Indigenous Peoples Organizations, and Non-Indigenous Organizations.



Total Value of Global Philanthropy from 2016 to 2020: \$701.7 B

Total Value identified as Benefiting Indigenous Peoples from 2017 to 2020: \$4.5 B (0.64%)

Figure 1.2b. Total Value of Global Philanthropy from 2016 to 2020




Figure 1.2c. Value identified as benefiting Indigenous Peoples based on the combined giving to Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions, Indigenous Peoples Organizations, and Non-Indigenous Organizations.

Of all global funding reported to Candid, approximately 0.6% of grants went to organizations serving Indigenous Peoples.

Globally between 2016 and 2020, we find the proportion of grants dedicated to Indigenous Peoples was highest in 2020. Indigenous Peoples make up 6.2% of the global population and are three times more likely to be living in extreme poverty as compared to non-Indigenous people. The current proportion of global funding dedicated to Indigenous Peoples is thus insufficient compared to the Indigenous population and need.

Across the 5 years, the value of grants for Indigenous Peoples was \$4.5 billion across 32,516 grants. From this value, grants to Indigenous Peoples Organizations (including Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions and Indigenous Peoples Organizations) were \$1.5 billion across 11,301 grants, and Non-Indigenous Organizations received \$3.0 billion across 21,215 grants.

The comparative analysis of funding trends from 2016 to 2020 and a detailed breakdown for each year can be found in Figure 1.1 and 1.3. Figure 2(a) offers a historical perspective to facilitate a better understanding of the evolving trends over time. These trends outline the steady increase in Indigenous funding from about \$776 million in 2016 to just over a billion in 2020.

We can see from 2016 to 2020, there has been sustained and increasing grant dollars for Indigenous Peoples. We document a 20% increase in grant dollars from 2017 to 2018, however, the growth diminished to a 5% increase for 2019 and a 1% increase for 2020. When comparing only 2016 and 2020, we see a 40% increase in grant dollars, yet only a 22% increase in the number of grants.

It can be difficult to attribute any one cause to the increase in 2018, however, there are a few events to consider. Indigenous Peoples have been mobilizing to call for recognition, rights, and inclusion. In 2017, IFIP adopted a new strategy and expanded its influence resulting in new members joining who have previously not collaborated with IFIP. This trend in growth and reach of IFIP has continued. As detailed in the top funders section, NoVo Foundation was the top global funder for 2018, giving \$84.6 million across 105 grants, followed by the Ford Foundation at \$74 million across 140 grants. The value of grantmaking given by these two funders in 2018 is unmatched across all five years (see Table 13).

Annual changes in the number and value of grants show a similar pattern of increasing value with fewer numbers of grants.

The relationship between grant number and size indicates an increase in grant size overall. The relationship between funders and recipients indicates possible increased interest among funders in funding Indigenous Peoples, as well as a possible disconnect between funders and those seeking funding. This could also indicate that few recipients are appealing to more funders to meet their project needs.

A potential explanation for the increase in the value of grants and fewer grants could be the increase in multi-year funding for organizations to repeat grantees. However, existing data gaps in Candid's database prevent an analysis of grant descriptions and duration. Long-term funding allows for planning, predictability, and security, but may lack the flexibility required to adapt to changing community needs and priorities.

As we examine grants benefiting Indigenous Peoples more closely, we find that funding over five years did not equally benefit Indigenous Peoples Organizations or Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions.




Figure 1.2d. Changes in funding trends over five years.

Funding Trends by Organization

Understanding the state of global Indigenous philanthropy requires we distinguish between three groups of recipients of funding for Indigenous Peoples (See Definitions and Terminology section for definitions of each category):

- Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions (**IG/AR**)
- Indigenous Peoples Organizations (**IPOs**)
- Non-Indigenous Organizations (**Non-IPOs**)

Although these types of organizations are defined specific to Indigenous Peoples, it is important to note that the scope, nature, and service provision of any organization will vary substantially both between and within each category. The scope of the data used for this report includes a diverse spectrum of entities and organizations including in the cases of the US and Canada economic development organizations, healthcare institutions, and colleges, among others.

When we examine the total grant dollars for each year, the numbers tell a different story. As outlined in Figure 1.1, the majority of grants are received by non-Indigenous Organizations. Although we discuss the three types of organizations, in this report, we showcase funding trends for Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions and Indigenous Peoples Organizations at the forefront to draw attention to these important trends and gaps.

In addition to organization type, this report analyzes grants by years, regions, issues, and populations.

Despite consistent growth in grant dollars for Indigenous philanthropy, not all organizations benefit equally. Between 2016 and 2017, even though the overall funding for Indigenous Peoples increased, we find the grant dollars going to Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions decreased by just over \$3 million.

Looking more closely at the number and value of grants, we find Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions and Indigenous Peoples Organizations **receive less funding per grant on average** than Non-Indigenous Organizations. For Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions, the proportion of **the value of grants** was lower than the proportion of **the number of grants**. By comparison, the proportion of value was higher than the proportion of the number of grants for Non-Indigenous Organizations. As such, Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions and Indigenous Peoples Organizations have to **apply for more grants to receive equivalent funding** to Non-Indigenous Organizations.

2016





Figure 1.3a. Funding trends by organization from 2016.

2017





Figure 1.3b. Funding trends by organization from 2017.

2018





Figure 1.3c. Funding trends by organization from 2018.

2019





Figure 1.3d. Funding trends by organization from 2019.

2020




Figure 1.3e. Funding trends by organization from 2020.




How is Indigenous philanthropy represented regionally?

It is important to note that Candid data is more complete and accurate for funding organizations and recipients based in the United States than those based in other countries. Given that funding information from outside of the United States can be incomplete, we must be cautious in our analysis of funding trends and regional differences. This highlights the need to develop databases specific to Indigenous funding that do not privilege US-based data.

Although there is sustained growth in grant dollars, based on the available data, we find regional disparities. These disparities are most pronounced for Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions and Indigenous Peoples Organizations. Over the five years, Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions outside the US only received a combined amount of 20 grants out of over 30,000 grants potentially going to Indigenous Peoples. These recipient countries included: Peru, Ecuador, Australia, Colombia, Norway, Kyrgyzstan, Bolivia, Nicaragua to name a few.

The map below demonstrates the regional distribution of funding across six (6) regions from 2016 to 2020. The six (6) regions include: **North America; Central/South America and the Caribbean; Central and Eastern Europe, Russia, Central Asia; Africa; Asia; and Pacific Rim.** To take a closer look at the regional distribution by organization type, Figure 1.4 and Table 1.5 to 1.8 outline the value and numbers of grants received across the six (6) global regions to capture regional representation in the allocation of funding.



Regional Distribution of Funding 2016-2020




Figure 1.4. Regional Distribution of Funding 2016-2020

Note: The Pacific Rim region represents primarily grants for coastal United States and Canada.

Region	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Overall
1. North America	87.1%	88%	89.5%	85.1%	93.9%	88.7%
2. Central/South America and the Carribbean	3.9%	4.8%	5%	3.6%	3.2%	4.1%
3. Central and Eastern Europe, Russia, Central Asia	1.3%	1%	1.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.9%
4. Africa	0.4%	0.6%	0.8%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%
5. Asia	3%	2.1%	1.3%	6.1%	1.3%	2.7%
6. Pacific Rim	4.2%	3.5%	2.3%	3.6%	0.6%	2.9%

Table 1.5. Regional distribution (%) of grants from 2016 to 2020.

Org	Regions (2016)						Subtotal
	North America	Central/South America and the Caribbean	Central/Eastern Europe, Russia, Central Asia	Africa	Asia	Pacific Rim	
IG/AR	549 (\$47 M)	4 (\$120,000)	1 (\$200,000)	--	--	--	554 (\$44.3M)
IPO	1185 (\$178.5 M)	54 (\$3.3 M)	1 (\$50,000)	13 (\$810,067)	13 (\$1.5M)	30 (\$8.6M)	1298 (\$192.8M)
Non-IPO	3454 (\$409.9 M)	130 (\$25.1M)	47 (\$9.4 M)	38 (\$2.3 M)	143 (\$20.2M)	109 (\$22.3M)	3927 (\$489.5M)

Table 1.6. Regional distribution of the value and number of grants across organization type, 2017.

Org	Regions (2017)						Subtotal
	North America	Central/South America and the Caribbean	Central/Eastern Europe, Russia, Central Asia	Africa	Asia	Pacific Rim	
IG/AR	451 (\$43.9 M)	2 (\$60,000)	--	--	--	--	456 (\$44M)
IPO	1475 (\$184.6 M)	93 (\$6.8 M)	10 (\$1 M)	23 (\$2.1 M)	15 (\$3.4 M)	15 (\$2.9 M)	1633 (\$200.8M)
Non-IPO	3429 (\$472.5 M)	171 (\$31.1 M)	50 (\$6.8 M)	30 (\$2.4 M)	134 (\$13.5 M)	139 (\$25.3 M)	3957 (\$551.7M)

Table 1.7. Regional distribution of the value and number of grants across organization type, 2018.

Org	Regions (2018)						Subtotal
	North America	Central/South America and the Caribbean	Central/Eastern Europe, Russia, Central Asia	Africa	Asia	Pacific Rim	
IG/AR	650 (\$94.3 M)	1 (\$425,000)	1 (\$250,000)	--	--	--	652 (\$94.9M)
IPO	1338 (\$193.5 M)	71 (\$6.9 M)	1 (\$84,000)	30 (\$1.7 M)	23 (\$2.1 M)	26 (\$1.6 M)	1491 (\$206M)
Non-IPO	3992 (\$571.1 M)	152 (\$40.6 M)	38 (\$10.3 M)	65 (\$5.9 M)	80 (\$9.98 M)	120 (\$20.5 M)	4456 (\$659.2M)

Table 1.8. Regional distribution of the value and number of grants across organization type, 2018.

Org	Regions (2019)						Subtotal
	North America	Central/South America and the Caribbean	Central/Eastern Europe, Russia, Central Asia	Africa	Asia	Pacific Rim	
IG/AR	576 (\$155.4 M)	3 (\$101,000)	1 (\$12828 M)	--	2 (\$43750)	1 (\$ 41843)	583 (\$155.6 M)
IPO	1216 (\$140.7 M)	85 (\$12.9 M)	2 (\$144,121)	32 (\$2 M)	20 (\$2.6 M)	34 (\$6.3 M)	1389 (\$164.8 M)
Non-IPO	4027 (\$517.9 M)	119 (\$21.8 M)	58 (\$7.4 M)	62 (\$4.6 M)	200 (\$55.3 M)	107 (\$28 M)	4573 (\$635.6 M)

Table 1.9. Regional distribution of the value and number of grants across organization type, 2019.

Org	Regions (2020)						Subtotal
	North America	Central/South America and the Caribbean	Central/Eastern Europe, Russia, Central Asia	Africa	Asia	Pacific Rim	
IG/AR	664 (\$69.8 M)	1 (\$60,000)	--	--	--	--	665 (\$69.8 M)
IPO	2035 (\$274.9 M)	85 (\$6.9 M)	5 (\$343,689)	17 (\$1 M)	17 (\$616,679)	21 (\$2 M)	2183 (\$285.8 M)
Non-IPO	3829 (\$616.9 M)	189 (\$25.8 M)	27 (\$4.3 M)	39 (\$4.8 M)	51 (\$12.8 M)	50 (\$4.2 M)	4192 (\$668.9 M)

Table 1.10. Regional distribution of the value and number of grants across organization type, 2020.

It is important to note that because of the way Candid collects data related to global funding, the data related to funding organizations and recipients based in the United States is more complete and accurately represented. Data related to funding outside of the United States may be incomplete, and thus there are more gaps in the useability of this data. This points to the need to develop databases for global Indigenous funding that do not privilege US-based data. To this end, IFIP plans to work with its members to track funding to Indigenous Peoples and will enter into a data quality partnership agreement with Candid to enhance data quality and disaggregation.

How much funding goes to intersectional groups and issues?

This report presents disaggregated data based on funders' thematic or subject priorities and intersectional representation in specific populations to provide a comprehensive view of funding patterns.

In addition to Indigenous Peoples, grants can also identify subpopulations such as women, youth, people with disabilities, and people identifying as 2SLGBTQIA+. Although this report examines funding trends across three types of organizations, for the purposes of diverse identities within Indigenous communities, we have grouped grants supporting Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions and Indigenous-led organizations (as outlined in Table 9).

Women




Figure 1.11.a. Women Grants across five years given to IG and IPO combined.

Note: Grants may identify multiple populations and may therefore be counted in more than one category.

Children & Youth




Figure 1.11.b. Children and Youth Grants across five years given to IG and IPO combined.

People with Disabilities




Figure 1.11.c. People with Disabilities across five years given to IG and IPO combined.

This direct comparison of Indigenous-led and non-Indigenous grants highlights the state of Indigenous-led funds primarily supporting Indigenous Peoples Organizations or community projects focusing on women, children and youth, people with disabilities, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ people.

Funding increased for specific populations and not for others over the five years. We find funding for women oscillates in alternating years. For example, despite a decrease in the overall funding for women, we find funding increased for Indigenous-led funds. We also find a unique increase among Indigenous funds for 2SLGBTQQIA+ funding. Considering people with disabilities, grant dollars for Indigenous-led funds have been a significantly small portion of the overall funds going to those with disabilities.

2SLGBTQQIA+





Figure 1.11.d. 2SLGBTQQIA+ across five years given to IG and IPO combined.



What subject areas do grants support?

Our data covers 18 subject areas across all grants and organizations. **The top funded subject areas over the five-year period were environment, education, health, and human rights.** Focusing specifically on the top funded subject areas, the table below examines the distribution across organization types.

Across these years, support from funders increased for most subject areas, however, the top seven subject areas were environment, human rights, education, human services, arts and culture, community and economic development, and health. The table includes the top four subject areas across organization types for each year.

This analysis highlights several important trends. Although our data does not differentiate between recipient and funder subject areas, we see environment is a consistently important issue associated with grants. Across these subject areas, 2018 is a significant year of both increases and decreases. **For environment and education, 2018 marks the continued growth of these issues, with an increase of 27.7% for environment and 6.8% for education, while health drops significantly by 21.8%. Unfortunately, health continued to drop by 30.8% into 2020.**

Regional variations in priorities can raise significant questions about the funding processes and priorities. For example, who identifies these priorities and how are they implemented is important to consider. Funding priorities set externally by funders affect the work being funded in each region and the resources organizations have access to. Ideally, regional organizations and groups can have access to funding opportunities that reflect priorities they identify internally, and not be confined by predetermined priorities. If there are limited areas for grants, it could limit work being funded in the region that falls outside of them and inhibit growth in areas not predetermined by funders as priorities. This data does not indicate where funding priorities originate from, therefore these questions are considerations to note and not conclusions.



Table 1.12. Top subject areas (environment, education, health, and human rights) across organizations and years.

Subject	Org	Value \$ (# of Grants)				
		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Environment	Overall	\$116.4 M (740)	\$133.5 M (849)	\$162.5 M (920)	\$142.3 M (1125)	\$164.1 M (1107)
	IG & AR	\$4.8 M (41)	\$2.59 M (31)	\$2.94 M (34)	\$3.8 M (45)	\$1.9 M (30)
	IPOs	\$24.1 M (203)	\$20.97 M (260)	\$26.2 M (250)	\$22.5 M (233)	\$47.5 M (363)
	Non-IPOs	\$87.4 M (496)	\$109.98 M (558)	\$133.4 M (636)	\$115.95 M (847)	\$114.6 M (714)
Education	Overall	\$126.1 M (883)	\$146.7 M (965)	\$151.1 M (1085)	\$163.7 M (1194)	\$158.8 M (1301)
	IG & AR	\$10.95 M (84)	\$9.78 M (83)	\$12.38 M (96)	\$11.7 M (98)	\$7.2 M (77)
	IPOs	\$41.9 M (223)	\$45.01 M (230)	\$44.7 M (239)	\$47.7 (261)	\$36.99 M (345)
	Non-IPOs	\$73.3 M (576)	\$91.87 M (652)	\$94.1 M (750)	\$104.3 (835)	\$114.6 M (879)
Health	Overall	\$90.2 M (461)	\$110.3 M (457)	\$84.9 M (456)	\$66.4 M (481)	\$57.97 M (599)
	IG & AR	\$6.6 M (81)	\$4.5 M (61)	\$8.72 M (69)	\$6.8 M (46)	\$6.2 M (32)
	IPOs	\$47.5 M (110)	\$51.01 M (126)	\$14.7 M (113)	\$8.2 M (94)	\$17.4 M (172)
	Non-IPOs	\$36.2 M (270)	\$54.81 M (270)	\$61.5 M (274)	\$51.4 M (341)	\$34.5 M (395)
Human Rights	Overall	\$16.1 M (220)	\$40.4 M (224)	\$75.1 M (323)	\$40.9 M (308)	\$67 M (546)
	IG & AR	\$268,677 (5)	\$176,321 (9)	\$ 1.45 M (20)	\$496,000 (11)	\$149,728 (4)
	IPOs	\$2.68 M (54)	\$2.9 M (57)	\$6.36 M (76)	\$7.5 M (74)	\$18.5 M (166)
	Non-IPOs	\$13.1 M (161)	\$37.29 M (158)	\$67.3 M (227)	\$32.9 M (223)	\$48.34 M (376)

Note: Grants may have multiple subject areas and may therefore be counted in more than one category.

What strategies do grants support?

We examined what strategies funders prioritized in their grantmaking across the five-year period and organization type. Our data included 16 strategies associated with grantmaking. Strategies were associated with grants and not specific to a recipient or funder. In general, grants can often prioritize multiple or a combination of strategies to address the specific focus of the grant. Different strategies also receive varying levels of funding and attention. For our analysis, we focused on the top four strategies: program support, general support, advocacy and system reform, capacity-building and technical assistance.

Across all organizations and years, general and program support were the most common strategies and policy advocacy and capacity building for the least common strategies funders supported through grantmaking. This analysis highlights the disproportionate amount of funding going to program support. Compared to the three most common strategies, the value of grants focused on program support is consistently three times higher than the other top strategies. This is important to consider given the limitations associated with program support, including being short-term and restrictive, compared to general, capacity-building, and advocacy support.

What is significantly telling about the data is that despite the statements and show of support by funders around “trust-based philanthropy,” we clearly see that Non-Indigenous Organizations are benefiting from general support grants at a higher rate than Indigenous Peoples Organizations indicating a systemic pattern in philanthropy.



This table outlines the value and number of grants supporting the four grantmaking strategies across four years and the three organization types. Of note, **there was no data for strategy available for 2020.**

Strategy	Org	Value \$ (# of Grants)			
		2016	2017	2018	2019
Program support	Overall	\$285.7 M (2042)	\$796.6 M (6046)	\$960.1 M (6599)	\$956 M (6560)
	IG & AR	\$27.8 M (284)	\$44 M (456)	\$94.9 (652)	\$155.6 M (583)
	IPOs	\$62.1 M (416)	\$200.8 M (1633)	\$206 M (1491)	\$164.8 M (1392)
	Non-IPOs	\$195.8 M (1342)	\$551.7 M (3957)	\$659.2M (4456)	\$635.6 M (4585)
General support	Overall	\$91.5 M (1183)	\$166.3 M (1353)	\$232.2 M (1560)	\$143.9 M (1345)
	IG & AR	\$1.8 M (31)	\$4.37 M (49)	\$4 M (55)	\$5.1 M (64)
	IPOs	\$22.5 M (269)	\$31.48 M (376)	\$32.4 M (307)	\$38.7 M (359)
	Non-IPOs	\$67.2 M (883)	\$130.44 M (925)	\$195.8 M (1198)	\$100.1 M (922)
Capacity-building and technical assistance	Overall	\$76 M (337)	\$47.8 M (366)	\$68.6 M (389)	\$54.2 M (399)
	IG & AR	\$1.73 M (15)	\$833,388 (13)	\$5 M (38)	\$5 M (23)
	IPOs	\$18.7 M (113)	\$15.54 M (144)	\$12.7 M (110)	\$13.8 (120)
	Non-IPOs	\$55.6 M (209)	\$31.46 M (209)	\$50.9 M (241)	\$35.4 M (256)
Policy advocacy and system reform	Overall	\$72.7 M (346)	\$55.5 M (419)	\$71.9 (300)	\$35.9 M (217)
	IG & AR	\$2.24 M (11)	\$2.16 M (16)	\$1.1 M (17)	\$2.3 M (12)
	IPOs	\$15.4 M (117)	\$15.99 M (158)	\$4.3 M (84)	\$3.1 M (43)
	Non-IPOs	\$55.1 M (218)	\$37.34 M (231)	\$66.4 M (199)	\$30.4 M (162)

Note: Grants may have multiple support strategies and may therefore be counted in more than one category.

Table 1.13. Top four grantmaking strategies across years and organizations.

Who receives grants for Indigenous Peoples?

Across the five years, we find most of the top recipients are Non-Indigenous Organizations. From 2016 to 2019, there was only one Indigenous organization among the top five recipients. Uniquely, in 2020, we find there is one Indigenous organization and one organization affiliated with an Indigenous government. It is worth noting that all of the top recipients based on value and number of grants are based in the United States.

In 2016 and 2017, the Smithsonian Institution was the top recipient overall based on both number and value of grants. Located in Washington, DC, the Smithsonian Institution is the largest museum, research, and education complex in the world. It includes the National Museum of the American Indian. The Smithsonian Institution alone received 7.3% of overall funding to Non-Indigenous Organizations in 2017. Three of the grants included in this database are explicitly directed toward Indigenous Peoples and subjects including a grant for the National Museum of the American Indian (\$101,000), support for the museum's efforts to enable less well-resourced tribes to use and study the museums collections (\$250,000), and funding for a workshop on North American Indigenous learning (\$48,850).

Across these five years, there is a huge disparity in funding received by Non-Indigenous Organizations compared to Indigenous Peoples Organizations and Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions. For example, in 2017, Non-Indigenous Organizations received 71% of overall funding potentially benefiting Indigenous Peoples and 64% of all grants. Further analysis is warranted to understand who is receiving this funding and whether those resources are supporting and enriching the lives of Indigenous people. When funding is going to Non-Indigenous Organizations, it is less likely to be benefiting Indigenous people than when it is received by Indigenous Peoples Organizations and Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions that are led by Indigenous people with Indigenous mandates.

Tables 1.12 and 1.13 outline the distribution of funds globally and specifically among international recipients. This provides a concise and comparative overview of the distribution of funds also added to the geographic distribution presented in Figure 1.4 and Tables 1.5 to 1.8.

Year	Recipient	Org	Value \$ (# of Grants)
2016			
	Smithsonian Institution	Non-IPO	\$43.4 M (182)
	Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium	IPO	\$32.2 M (9)
	New Venture Fund	Non-IPO	\$21.2 M (4)
	World Resources Institute	Non-IPO	\$14.9 M (40)
	Native Forward Scholars Fund	IPO	\$12.8 M (3)
2017			
	Smithsonian Institution	Non-IPO	\$48.1M (155)
	Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium	IG/AR	\$34.3 M (9)
	Nia Tero	Non-IPO	\$27.0 M (1)
	Clinton Health Access Initiative Inc	Non-IPO	\$26.4 M (1)
	World Resources Institute	Non-IPO	\$15.9 M (37)
2018			
	Nia Tero	Non-IPO	\$37.0 M (3)
	Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society	Non-IPO	\$22.8 M (10)
	World Resources Institute	Non-IPO	\$21.5M (42)
	Enterprise Community Partners Inc.	Non-IPO	\$17.9M (47)
	Seventh Generation Fund for Indigenous Peoples Inc.	IPO	\$16.6 M (19)
2019			
	Zero to Three: National Center for Infants Toddlers and Families	Non-IPO	\$59.5M (156)
	Kiran Nadar Museum of Art	Non-IPO	\$27.2 (1)
	World Resources Institute	Non-IPO	\$24.4 M (88)
	Enterprise Community Partners Inc.	Non-IPO	\$19.6 M (35)
	Indian Community School Inc	IPO	\$18.4 M (2)
2020			
	Optus Bank	Non-IPO	\$50.0 M (1)
	NDN Collective Inc	IPO	\$23.8M (59)
	Enterprise Community Partners, Inc.	Non-IPO	\$22.2 M (32)
	First Nations Development Institute	IPO	\$21.5M (66)
	World Resources Institute	Non-IPO	\$19.5M (60)

Table 1.14. Top five recipients globally from 2016 to 2020

Year	Recipient	Org	Value \$ (# of Grants)
2016			
	Clontarf Foundation	Non-IPO	\$8.0 M (2)
	Aha Punana Leo	IPO	\$4.3 M (6)
	The Frankfurt Zoological Society Peru	Non-IPO	\$3.2 M (2)
	Avantha Foundation	Non-IPO	\$2.8 M (2)
	Stichting Fern	Non-IPO	\$2.6 M (2)
2017			
	Instituto de Pesquisas Ecologicas	Non-IPO	\$5.5 M (1)
	University of Sydney	Non-IPO	\$3.9 M (4)
	The University of New South Wales	Non-IPO	\$3.8 M (1)
	Instituto Socioambiental	Non-IPO	\$3.1 M (4)
	Menzies School of Health Research	Non-IPO	\$3.0 M (1)
2018			
	Many Rivers Microfinance Ltd	Non-IPO	\$5.4 M (2)
	Instituto Socioambiental	Non-IPO	\$5.3 M (5)
	Centro de Estudios de Derecho Justicia y Sociedad	Non-IPO	\$3.1M (3)
	Associação do Movimento Interestadual das Quebradeiras de Coco Babaçu (MIQCB).	Non-IPO	\$2.8M (2)
	Instituto de Estudios Peruanos	Non-IPO	\$2.7 M (1)
2019			
	Coastal First Nations - Great Bear Initiative	IPO	\$3.3 M (2)
	Centro de Culturas Indígena del Perú	Non-IPO	\$2.2 M (2)
	Lembaga Gemawan	IPO	\$1.9 M (1)
	Reconciliation Australia	IPO	\$1.6 M (2)
	Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia	IPO	\$1.6 M (1)
2020			
	Indian School of Business	Non-IPO	\$3.0 M (1)
	Shakti Sustainable Energy Foundation	Non-IPO	\$3.0 M (1)
	Fundacion Gaia Amazonas	Non-IPO	\$2.1 M (3)
	Instituto Socioambiental	Non-IPO	\$2.0 M (4)
	Fase	Non-IPO	\$2.0 M (1)

Table 1.15. Top five recipients outside of North America from 2016 to 2020

3 times the funding for US-based Non-Indigenous Organizations than Non-Indigenous Organizations outside the US

It is notable that the top Non-Indigenous Organizations recipients outside of the United States received significantly lower amounts of funding than those organizations within the United States. **In 2017, while the top recipient overall and within the United States—the Smithsonian Institution—received \$48,390,008, the top recipient outside the United States—Instituto de Pesquisas Ecologicas in Brazil—received only \$16,350,000.** This means the top non-Indigenous organization in the United States received 3 times the funding of the top non-Indigenous organization outside of the United States.

Building on the previous tables on top recipient by region, Table 1.14 represents the top Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions and Indigenous Peoples Organizations recipients over the 5-year period.



Year	Recipient	Value \$ (# of Grants)
2016		
	AHA PUNANA LEO	\$4.3 M (6)
	Northern Australian Indigenous Land and Sea Management Alliance	\$1.9 M (2)
	Kimberley Land Council Aboriginal Corporation	\$1 M (1)
	Tebtebba Foundation Inc.	\$700,000 (2)
	Coordenação das Organizações Indígenas da Amazônia Brasileira	\$427,872 (1)
2017		
	Lensa Masyarakat Nusantara	\$1.8 M (1)
	WANGKI TANGNI	\$1.3 M (2)
	Associacao de Defesa Etnoambiental Kaninde	\$905,000 (1)
	Kivulini Trust	\$850,000 (2)
	Waltja Tjutangku Palyapayi Aboriginal Corporation	\$738,000 (1)
2018		
	Coordinating Body for the Indigenous Peoples' Organizations of the Amazon Basin - COICA	\$ 1.4 M (1)
	Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact Foundation	\$752,000 (4)
	Tebtebba Foundation Inc.	\$575,000 (3)
	Pawanka Fund	\$500,000 (2)
	Conselho Indígena de Roraima	\$450,000 (1)
2019		
	Coastal First Nations - Great Bear Initiative	\$3.3 M (2)
	Centro de Culturas Indígenas del Perú	\$2.2 M (2)
	Lembaga Gemawan	\$1.9 M (1)
	Reconciliation Australia	\$1.6 M (2)
	Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia	\$1.6 M (1)
2020		
	Foro Internacional de Mujeres Indígenas	\$1.5 M (7)
	Asociación de Comunidades Forestales de Petén	\$1.2 M (1)
	Asociación Coordinadora de Asociaciones y Comunidades para el Desarrollo Integral de la Región Chorti	\$575,000 (5)
	The Vanuatu Indigenous Land Defense Desk Committee Inc.	\$510,000 (2)
	Community Forestry Association of Guatemala	\$435,000 (2)

Table 1.16. Top five Indigenous Peoples Organizations and Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions recipients outside of North America from 2016 to 2020

Year	Recipient	Value \$ (# of Grants)
2016		
	Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium	\$32.2 M (9)
	NATIVE FORWARD Scholars Fund	\$12.8 M (3)
	First Nations Development Institute	\$7.5 M (13)
	American Indian College Fund	\$7.1 M (71)
	Seventh Generation Fund for Indigenous Peoples Inc.	\$6.4 M (31)
2017		
	Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium	\$34.3 M (9)
	NATIVE FORWARD Scholars Fund	\$11.1M (2)
	Institute of American Indian & Alaska Native Culture & Arts	\$8.3 M (13)
	American Indian College Fund	\$5.2 M (69)
	Thunder Valley Community Development Corporation	\$4.4 M (32)
2018		
	Seventh Generation Fund for Indigenous Peoples Inc.	\$16.6 M (19)
	American Indian College Fund	\$11.6 M (83)
	NATIVE FORWARD Scholars Fund	\$11.3 M (1)
	First Nations Development Institute	\$9.5M (21)
	National Congress of American Indians Fund	\$7.5 M (6)
2019		
	American Indian College Fund	\$18.4 M (2)
	Indian Community School Inc	\$10.9 M (74)
	First Nations Development Institute	\$8.4 M (28)
	NDN Collective Inc	\$7.3 M (20)
	ADD ONE	
2020		
	NDN Collective Inc	\$3.0 M (1)
	First Nations Development Institute	\$3.0 M (1)
	American Indian College Fund	\$2.1 M (3)
	Navajo Technical University	\$2.0 M (4)
	Native American Bank	\$2.0 M (1)

Table 1.17. Top five Indigenous Peoples Organizations and Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions recipients from 2016 to 2020


Who receives grants for Indigenous Peoples?

Despite the increasing trend of grant dollars, this data highlights that philanthropic support is extremely limited for Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions. In 2017, it is notable that three out of the top five Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions recipients are Tribal colleges in the United States. This data suggests education was a priority area for funders at this time.

In terms of the reach of funding, Tribal colleges may be an important pathway for directing funding toward Indigenous communities, as they exist with the aim of reducing inequity in postsecondary education for Indigenous Peoples. There is one funder in common among these three tribal college recipients: the **American Indian College Fund**. The American Indian College Fund is a top funder to Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions, giving 25 grants worth a total of \$3,516,710 in 2017.

Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium is one of the top Indigenous Peoples Organization recipients in both 2016 and 2017 as well as one of the top funders of Indigenous Peoples Organizations. By analyzing the funders and recipients of the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, **we can see how this is a notable example of an organization that is accessing funding from larger, often national funders while also pivoting resources to local Indigenous Peoples Organizations in Alaska.**

With the exception of the National Indian Health Board, all of the recipients of funding from the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium are in Alaska. The Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium may also be an example of a culturally appropriate funder that can help deliver local funding because they have the appropriate understanding and community connections.



Who funds Indigenous Peoples?

Across the data, there are a range of funders supporting Indigenous Peoples, however, given the nature of our data, all the top funders are based in the US. Although many are based in the US, our data include some funders outside the US.

In general, **funders can represent a range of organization types from private foundations to family and corporate foundations to public charity. In a closer examination of the type of funders, we find Africa and South/Central America and the Caribbean have a mix of funder types, including corporate, governmental, and public charities.** The top global and regional funders in Asia, however, are primarily corporations. In the Pacific region, the top global and regional funders are primarily independent foundations. Table 1.15 lists the top five funders with the highest value of grants globally.

Additionally, we find all the top funders are non-Indigenous. It is worth noting, in 2020, the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium was the first Indigenous organization to be a leading funder of Indigenous Peoples as one of the top 10 funders. As we saw in the previous section, Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium is critical to supporting Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions and Indigenous Peoples Organizations.

Table 1.14 lists the top five funders of recipients outside of North America. There is significant similarity between the top global funders and funders outside of North America both regionally and over time.



Year	Funder	Value \$ (# of Grants)
2016		
	W.K. Kellogg Foundation	\$41.0 M (84)
	Southcentral Foundation	\$31.7 M (7)
	Ford Foundation	\$31.6 M (98)
	Oak Foundation	\$25.8 M (13)
	National Christian Charitable Foundation Inc	\$24.3 M (257)
2017		
	Ford Foundation	\$44.1 M (94)
	John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	\$39.5 M (39)
	Southcentral Foundation	\$33.0 M (7)
	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	\$31.7 M (7)
	Gordon E And Betty I Moore Foundation	\$29.9 M (18)
2018		
	NoVo Foundation	\$84.6 M (105)
	Ford Foundation	\$74.0 M (140)
	John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	\$31.6 M (45)
	Margaret A Cargill Foundation	\$27.6 M (53)
	Goldman Sachs Philanthropy Fund	\$22.3 M (15)
2019		
	George Kaiser Family Foundation	\$49.5 M (145)
	Ford Foundation	\$48.9 M (119)
	Gordon E And Betty I Moore Foundation	\$24.2 M (24)
	Margaret A Cargill Foundation	\$23.8 M (54)
	NoVo Foundation	\$20.9 M (124)
2020		
	Ford Foundation	\$69.3 M (157)
	MacKenzie Scott	\$42.0 M (8)
	The Andrew W Mellon Foundation	\$38.7 M (18)
	Fidelity Investments Charitable Gift Fund	\$32.9 M (202)
	Gordon E and Betty I Moore Foundation	\$21.9 M (21)

Table 1.18. Top five funders globally from 2016 to 2020.

Year	Funder	Value \$ (# of Grants)
2016		
	Ford Foundation	\$17.2 M (56)
	Gordon E And Betty I Moore Foundation	\$10.7 M (10)
	Anonymous Australian Funders	\$8.4 M (9)
	The Paul Ramsay Foundation	\$7.5 M (1)
	The Christensen Fund	\$4.9 M (43)
2017		
	Ford Foundation	\$20.4 M (49)
	Gordon E And Betty I Moore Foundation	\$11.3 M (8)
	Anonymous Australian Funders	\$5.9 M (4)
	The Christensen Fund	\$5.4 M (43)
	The Ian Potter Foundation	\$5.1 M (3)
2018		
	Ford Foundation	\$32.6 M (65)
	Gordon E And Betty I Moore Foundation	\$9.5 M (9)
	The Ian Potter Foundation	\$6.7 M (13)
	Anonymous Australian Funders	\$6.4 M (15)
	NoVo Foundation	\$4.3 M (4)
2019		
	Ford Foundation	\$25.1 M (56)
	BHP Foundation	\$14.7 M (6)
	Gordon E And Betty I Moore Foundation	\$10.3 M (12)
	The Ian Potter Foundation	\$7.0 M (18)
	The ILR Ruth Foundation Inc.	\$4.3 M (1)
2020		
	Ford Foundation	\$22.9 M (73)
	William & Flora Hewlett Foundation	\$3.2 M (2)
	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	\$3.0 M (1)
	The UN Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women	\$2.5 M (6)
	The Christensen Fund	\$2.4 M (14)

Table 1.19. Top five funders grantmaking outside North America from 2016 to 2020

What is the data telling us?

This funding trends analysis highlights the gaps in Indigenous philanthropy. Across the Candid scan, we find consistent patterns of pervasive and systemic inequities in Indigenous philanthropy. The current philanthropy landscape is inadequate especially for Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions as well as Indigenous Peoples Organizations. Across regions and years, Indigenous Peoples face disproportionate challenges in accessing global philanthropy.

Globally, Indigenous Peoples have access to less than 1% of funding as outlined by the available data. We also find the majority of funding is concentrated in a few specific subject areas or sectors. **These patterns could reflect the limited areas of funding opportunities available to recipients, limit the programs and organizations being funded in the region, and compromise the growth in areas not linked to funders priorities.** Based on these gaps, we have identified three recommendations outlined in the recommendation section to strengthening data infrastructure for Indigenous philanthropy.

This data is critical to Indigenous philanthropy to help ground the discussion on funding for Indigenous peoples based on how much funding is going to which organizations and where in the world as well as how this landscape has changed, or not, over time. This research on funding trends is part of a larger effort by Indigenous Peoples Organizations around the world to highlight the need for Indigenous-led funds and for grants to be guided by Indigenous worldviews and protocol. Research such as this can support advocacy to ensure funders are responding to the needs and priorities of Indigenous Peoples through Indigenous-led organizations and initiatives.



Section 2: International Survey of Indigenous Philanthropy

IFIP, in collaboration with Archipel, launched an online survey for funders and recipients of global funding for Indigenous Peoples. The survey was open for approximately four weeks from January 23 to February 24, 2023. To best capture the experiences of both funders and recipients, the survey consisted of four sections to capture the global and regional experiences, perspectives, and priorities related to funding for Indigenous Peoples. For each of the questions, participants were asked to use the response options provided. Participants were also encouraged to answer as many questions as they were comfortable answering.

The first section consisted of five questions asking the participants to describe themselves, including their region, organizational details, role, and scope of activities.

The second section consisted of six questions to capture the key funding perspectives and concerns, funding structures, and what is working well and what is not working. The third section consisted of three questions about future funding improvements. The last section consisted of six questions on the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Who did we hear from?

We heard from 40 Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents working in philanthropy. Approximately 50% of the participants identified as Indigenous. Those who identified as Indigenous represented different communities across the six regions covered in the survey.




Figure 2.1. Regional representation among survey respondents

Respondents also had varying roles in funding systems: approximately 35% were donors, 27.5% recipients, and the remainder identified as both.




Figure 2.2. Indigenous identity among survey respondents

From the 10 Indigenous recipients, five were from Indigenous Peoples Organizations and five from non-governmental organization (private sector, foundation, philanthropic organization). There was only one non-Indigenous donor from government agency included in the survey respondents. There were four Indigenous donors from non-governmental organizations. From those who identified as both donors and recipients, four were from Indigenous Peoples Organizations and two non-governmental organizations.

In terms of gender identity, 65% of participants identified as women, 27.5% as men, and 2.5% each as ‘woman and non-binary,’ ‘non-binary,’ and ‘women and Two-Spirit.’ About 15% of survey participants identified as being part of the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community and 25% identified as having a disability.

The survey was available in multiple languages. Respondents reported English (70%), Spanish (10%), Portuguese (5%), French (2.5%), and Indigenous languages (5%), including K'iche' and Shipibo, as their primary language. In terms of age, the majority (55%) were between 35-54, and others between 18-34 (10%), between 55-74 (30%), or over 75 (2.5%). Only 2.5% of respondents did not report their age range.

Indigenous Funding Perspectives and Concerns

The survey asked respondents which areas were under-resourced, funding challenges they experience, effective funding strategies, and how funding can be advanced for Indigenous women's rights, 2SLGBTQQIA+ rights as well as Indigenous land rights and stewardship.

When asked to identify the most under-resourced area in Indigenous funding from a list of funding areas, participants generally identified: (a) environmental concerns (i.e., agriculture, forestry, biodiversity, climate change, and environmental justice; 45%); (b) community and economic development (i.e., human services, public safety, and health; 42.5%); (c) law and governance (i.e., human rights, international relations, and public affairs; 27.5%); (d) accessibility (i.e., disabled persons' rights and home accessibility; 25%).

Researchers examined patterns of response across Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents for the top two most under-funded areas. Although there is overall consensus on the top two areas, there were different patterns for Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents.

Most under-resourced Area	Indigenous (n=20)	Non-Indigenous (n=20)
Community and Economic Development	12 (60%)	5 (25%)
Environment	8 (40%)	10 (50%)
Law and Governance	5 (25%)	6 (30%)
Culture	5 (25%)	3 (15%)
Accessibility	5 (25%)	5 (25%)
Women	2 (10%)	3 (15%)
Gender and Sexual Diversity	1 (5%)	5 (25%)
Education	0	1 (5%)

Table 2.3. Perspectives on the most under-resourced areas among respondents

Although there are many parts to the funding process, respondents were asked to identify which aspects were most effective when funding Indigenous Peoples. The majority of respondents identified finding appropriate recipients for funds (58.3%); having resources for project-based funding (36.1%); and having an accessible application process (36.1%) as the most effective parts of their funding processes.

The survey also asked about the most important funding interventions with regard to specific topics in Indigenous rights, including women's rights, 2SLGBTQQIA+ rights, and land rights.

In terms of funding priorities for Indigenous women's rights, respondents identified the need for direct support to Indigenous-led organizations (85%); funding support for training Indigenous women (including advising and/or mentorship; 42.5%); and direct support to Indigenous-led organizations (32.5%).

To advance Indigenous 2SLGBTQQIA+ rights and priorities, respondents identified funding is needed for direct support for Indigenous 2SLGBTQQIA+ led organizations (69.2%); direct support for Indigenous-led organizations (33.3%); and funding support for training 2SLGBTQQIA+ individuals (including advising and/or mentorship; 33.3%).

In terms of funding priorities for Indigenous land rights and stewardship, respondents identified funding for: financial support for indigenous stewardship initiatives (52.5%); direct support to Indigenous-led organizations (50%); direct support to Indigenous-led environmental organizations (37.5%); and financial support for increasing Indigenous jurisdiction of lands (32%).

What needs to change and improve?

Respondents had several suggestions on how the funding process could be improved to enable more effective giving to Indigenous-led organizations.

Funding practices. The majority (60%) identified dedicating a set percentage of funds to go specifically to Indigenous-led organizations. Others identified strengthening the direct relationship between donors and funders (57.5%); and more inclusive funding and oral or video submissions for funds (40%).

Priority areas for future funding. The areas respondents identified wanting to see future funding allocated towards included environment (57.5%), community and economic development (40%), and law and governance (32.5%). Funding women (including reproductive and sexual health and sexual assault victim services) was also indicated as a priority (22.5%), along with gender and sexual diversity rights and services including 2SLGBTQQIA+ rights and sexual education (15%). In addition, 17.5% of participants indicated that culture (including arts, religion, sports/recreation, and languages) was a priority.

Future Funding Priority	Indigenous (n=20)	Non-Indigenous (n=20)
Community and Economic Development	12 (60%)	4 (20%)
Environment	8 (40%)	15 (75%)
Law and Governance	7 (35%)	6 (30%)
Culture	5 (25%)	2 (10%)
Women	3 (15%)	6 (30%)
Gender and Sexual Diversity	2 (10%)	4 (20%)
Accessibility	1 (5%)	2 (10%)
Education	0	1 (5%)

Indigenous-led organizations a priority.

When asked to select the top two ways that Indigenous priorities could best be advanced through funding, 90% of respondents indicated direct support to Indigenous-led organizations, 60% said indirect support through Indigenous intermediary funders, and 40% said direct support to Indigenous Governments and Autonomous Regions. Only 2.5% of respondents said indirect support through non-Indigenous intermediary funders.

Table 2.4. Funding priority areas identified by respondents




Figure 2.5. Advancing Indigenous priorities through funding.

Finally, when asked for additional comments, respondents emphasized the need to invest in strengthening Indigenous-led organizations to enable them to design and administer funds. The need to develop Indigenous grantmaking at the grassroots level was also identified. Language as a barrier was identified, as well as the need to highlight the intersectional nature of funding.

In conclusion, the survey findings are complementary to the funding scan results. In terms of Indigenous funding priorities and needs, environment was consistently identified as a priority. The funding scan also found environment as a key subject area of grants across several regions, specifically in Latin American and the Caribbean. We also found in the survey 90% of the respondents pointed to the need for more direct support to Indigenous-led organizations as one of the best ways to advance Indigenous priorities through funding. Overall, despite the survey participation being only 40 respondents, the findings are in line with the global funding scan with Candid data.



Section 3: Interviews with Leaders in Indigenous Philanthropy

IFIP, in collaboration with Archipel, conducted 29 qualitative interviews with leaders in the field of Indigenous philanthropy. A thorough analysis of the interview transcripts revealed seven (7) broad themes and a series of subthemes outlined in the sections below.

These results are organized into seven salient themes:

1. Holistic Approaches to Funding
2. Relationship Building in Indigenous Communities
3. Barriers and Gaps in Funding Landscape
4. Innovative Application and Reporting Processes
5. Recommendations for Non-Indigenous Philanthropists
6. Indigenous Leadership and Control
7. Climate and the Environment

Note: Participants were asked whether they wished to remain anonymous, or whether they wished to be identified by name in the report. Those who wished to remain anonymous or who did not verify their quotes are identified as “Interview Participant” in the following discussion.

Theme 1: Holistic Approaches to Funding

1.1 Wrap-Around Sustainable Funding

When Indigenous-led organizations and initiatives are provided with multi-year general operating dollars, there is an element of creativity, long term strategic thinking and an opportunity to increase economics, state stability for organizations and therefore, their staff and the communities that they serve. There are these multiple ripple impacts. (Kris Archie, Secwapémc Nation, Interview Participant)

Interview participants from a variety of organizations and regions emphasized the need for holistic approaches to philanthropic funding for Indigenous communities. This included an emphasis on the need for general operating funding and wraparound support that incorporate the holistic approaches common to many Indigenous communities. One participant stated clearly:

I’m always going to be 100% for general operating [funding], because our philosophy is what the community says is important. [...] I think we also have to get philanthropy to understand that you can’t fund one thing in Indigenous communities because we’re holistic; the way that we see it is nothing lives alone. (Interview Participant)

Another participant asserted that Indigenous-led projects need access to “unrestricted multiyear funding, really investing in leadership, investing in the organizations through a trust model that will help them do what they need to [...] I think we just need stronger field wide strategies.”

This emphasis was echoed by participants who saw the need for funding to be less project-specific, contributing to the sustainability of communities and their multifaceted needs. As one participant said:

We believe in the power of wraparound support. It is not just grants. When we support a community, we support it from every angle possible [...] It's wrap-around support. It is not just grant making. It's tons of technical support, tons of emotional support, and solidarity around us and the issues that Indigenous communities are facing. (Interview Participant)

This is highlighted in various secondary sources related to philanthropy in Indigenous communities through those who identify the lack of general operational or piecemeal funding to be a major barrier to the sustainability of Indigenous-led projects. Philanthropic funding has historically funded cultural, social, and educational needs, leading to a “projectification” of Indigenous movements. Projectification refers to the phenomenon that funds often are short-term and project-based instead of long-term and operational, leaving little room for governance-related work.

1.2 Holistic Indigenous Worldviews

To me, it is a community who must decide what they want to work on. But what we get from funders is that they are very restrictive. Like, okay, we got brought this pool of money to support arts and culture, we got this pool of money support like languages to pull that money to support biodiversity, land, defense climate solutions. And so that is how we form our areas of focus within the funds. But Indigenous life is not segmented, it is not siloed. (Galina Angarova, Buyrat, Interview Participant)

Indigenous Peoples are holistic in how they view the world, often regarding different aspects of life as well as humans and the natural world as interconnected (International Funders for Indigenous Peoples, *A Funders Toolkit*, 2014). Many participants identified the importance of supporting holistic Indigenous worldviews in funding practices. This includes supporting Indigenous language and cultural revitalization, which are at the root of Indigenous ways of knowing (epistemologies) and ways of being (ontologies).

One participant explained the centrality of language: “I think language revitalization is central to everything and supporting Indigenous Peoples identity. In supporting the self-determination of Indigenous communities, language revitalization is central.” Another participant noted that cultural education was important for the general wellbeing of Indigenous communities:

You’ve got to invest in [...] education as a key step, as a key investment that brings parents, traditional leaders, traditional assemblies, together all with the common goal of raising your children correctly, and not losing the language. And for that, they can form that base, they can deal with a lot of things that they never could deal with before. (Interview Participant)

Respecting holistic Indigenous worldviews also means seeing different funding areas as interconnected; for example, conservation and cultural revitalization are intertwined. Participants noted, however, that current funding practices that allocate funding to particular identity groups or through distinct program areas do not always incorporate holistic approaches.

1.3 Intersectionality and Diversity in Holistic Funding Approaches

And then we have identities which we are funding - it’s like an abstract division, because what I want to say is all these issues cross categories [...] So, we are moving from only thinking about identities, like Indigenous women, or Afro-Mexican women, to the identity lived in a context; [...] we are trying to be intersectional. So, we can use the money that we are receiving [to] fund Indigenous communities who has LGBT rights also [...] then migration, we have a lot of struggles in Indigenous communities because of displacement. (Tania Turner, Interview Participant)

The participant perspective above emphasizes the complexity of overlapping and multilayered Indigenous identities in funding approaches. In a few short sentences, the speaker broaches Indigenous identity broadly, Afro-Mexican diasporic identities, gender identity, 2SLGBTQQIA+ rights, migration, and displacement. Holistic worldviews incorporate and embrace complexity.



A number of participants expressed the importance of understanding intersectionality and the diverse contexts of Indigenous identities to better support Indigenous Peoples. Intersectionality is a term commonly used within equity work and is rooted in Black feminist scholarship. It allows for an approach that considers the multiple oppressions that an individual might be facing based on different aspects of their identities.

For example, an Indigenous person from the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community might face both racial discrimination and homophobia, and both these struggles are essential to address. This approach recognizes and respects the multifaceted and multidimensional nature of diverse individuals being affected by Indigenous funding.

Another frequently mentioned example from the participant interviews is the dual oppression faced by Indigenous women, who face both misogyny and anti-Indigenous racism, and often multiple barriers to accessing philanthropic funding. Indigenous women often have their important roles ignored or undervalued. Furthermore, Indigenous Peoples with disabilities face unique challenges as they undergo the deleterious legacies and ongoing realities of colonialism, compounding by navigating ableist spaces both within and outside of Indigenous communities.

Another participant noted, however, that an emphasis on intersectionality, though important, should not ignore the risk of identity fraud in Indigenous funding, whereby individuals or groups who are not Indigenous claim to be so in order to access targeted funds.

1.4 Global, Collaborative Approaches Respecting Indigenous Nationhood

It's important for us to work regionally, nationally, and internationally, to connect with other Indigenous funders of Indigenous people to see how we can move together, the Indigenous communities around the world. (Marama Takao, Māori, Interview Participant)

The importance of working globally and collaboratively in ways that respect Indigenous nationhood was noted by interview participants. One participant spoke to their collaborative approaches, stating “while we did get charitable status [...] we are still all Indigenous Peoples. So, when we invited people, we don't ever use their western titles. We use, if we know, their nation, or their clan [...] that's what we use. [...] When you are invited to come, as a person of your nation, you have a responsibility to that [...] I have a responsibility to act in a certain way.”

The call for connection was also echoed in secondary research (International Funders for Indigenous Peoples, *A Funders Toolkit*, 2014), and includes collaboration among funders, which participants suggested would be helpful for advancing Indigenous communities generally. Such approaches also incorporate how Indigenous communities can engage with funders, with participants suggesting that it is important to develop more holistic systems of philanthropy that connect to Indigenous communities and other stakeholders and facilitate Indigenous participation in these systems.

Theme 2: Relationship-Building in Indigenous Communities

2.1 Long-Term Relationships on Indigenous Timelines and Terms

It's about relationships, all of our relationships. We see the effort as holistic, really interconnected, interdependent, in a way that honors life as a dynamic, complex web. (Interview Participant)

Participants emphasized the importance of building long-term relationships between Indigenous communities and funders. For these relationships to be mutually respectful and beneficial, they must be founded on trust. These relationships take time to develop. One participant explained, “We need more time to develop relationships, find the group [...] and then get to understand what the community needs, what groups need, before entering in partnership.”

To many participants, reciprocity underpins successful partnerships. One participant emphasized,

Reciprocity [...] is of extreme importance to understand [...] both within the relationship of the funder to the community or person, but also just the larger idea of reciprocity seems to be at least in our experience, a real through line that all Indigenous communities that we've worked with have an idea of reciprocity, being at the root of their kind of cultural values. (Interview Participant)

Effective long-term relationships also generally involve more than “one-off” grants; they entail genuine reciprocal support offered on an ongoing basis. In philanthropic terms, this may look like ongoing, renewable funding. This conceptualization and practice of relationship building incorporates Indigenous worldviews that likewise value reciprocity and interdependence.

Additionally, participants shared important reflections on the potential mismatch between the timelines of funders and recipients. Indigenous communities may be focused on slower, long-term timelines and working to enact changes that take many years to implement. As one participant shared:

The real challenge for us is to convey long-term and deep processes within the communities to look at internal and external threats. So, to convey that to funder set on her grant cycles is hard, and even sophisticated funders sometimes make major errors of judgment, not harmful, necessarily, but they can get misdirected quite easily. Because it is complicated, and it is long term. I think one of the biggest conflicts is the question between the long-term needs and the short-term funding cycles. (Interview Participant)

These long-term timelines can conflict with shorter grant cycles set by funders that do not offer continual, ongoing funding. Participants wanted funders to work at the same pace as the communities they partner with. At the time, participants also noted longer-duration projects have challenges in terms of sustaining support within communities over time when new and competing issues or needs arise in the meantime.

2.2 Direct Relationships


The importance of working and in greater partnership with Indigenous Peoples communities, organizations directly, as opposed to going through intermediary organizations who may or may not have a good track record with the communities they partner with on. I think in the US in particular, that's been true, especially in the conservation movement. I think in the climate justice movement it's there. I feel like climate funding is still really focused on emissions and carbon dioxide reductions and less on relationships, and really building capacity on the ground, or just fostering agency and voices of Indigenous peoples. (Interview Participant)

Throughout the interviews, participants emphasized the importance of direct relationships between funders and Indigenous communities. Direct relationships are most important for their ability to support Indigenous agency and self-determination; without intermediaries, Indigenous communities can ensure their voices are heard and funding reaches their priority areas of need. In turn, this increases the capacity of Indigenous communities and their engagement with funding systems.

Participants additionally noted that direct relationships can bolster funders' support for Indigenous communities because of the meaningful and experiential dimensions of these relationships. By gaining knowledge and understanding "on the ground," funders can better understand how their resources can serve Indigenous communities in potentially profound ways, which increases "buy-in" regarding funding targeted to Indigenous Peoples Organizations.

2.3 Dialogue in Applications, Granting, and Reporting

We don't even have an application process – what we have is a dialogue. [Our] team then actually writes the proposal to the board of why we should be funding someone, we then continue that relationship. And typically, there would be monthly meetings with the organizations that we're working with just a general catch up, it's not reporting, it's just a general catch up. So, we can check, they can feed back their successes or sad stories, we can actually feed into them...Because we have that trust-based relationship, we do not get surprises. (Adrian Appo, Gooreng Gooreng, Interview Participant)



Participants shared the importance of facilitating open dialogue between funders and Indigenous communities throughout the funding process, including application and reporting. One participant shared that dialogue has replaced both the application and reporting processes in their organization. This funder holds regular meetings with organizations they work with where the organizations share updates, successes, and challenges; the funder reports back to the board to determine funding allocations instead of organizations submitting applications for funding and reporting on funding received. As this example suggests and other participants echoed, organizations often prefer open conversation over written reporting.

For dialogue to be beneficial, it needs to be founded on humility, trust, and respect. As one participant articulated:

[We are] always driven by the values of respect, reciprocity, relationships, trust, [and] humility. A huge part [of] grant making is like: you are not the smartest person in the room [...] That is, how we go by: stay with humility. When you speak to Elders [...] they carry so much knowledge and we come with a little bit of westernized concepts. (Interview Participant)

Funders should assume that the Indigenous Peoples Organizations and communities they are in dialogue with are experts in their own lived experience and know best how to meet their needs. This helps to ensure that dialogue uplifts Indigenous self-determination and leads to better outcomes. Understanding the limitations of westernized approaches, such as human-centric approach that emphasizes individualism versus relations, is also an act of humility and respect for Indigenous ways of knowing and living.

Theme 3: Barriers and Gaps in the Funding Landscape

3.1 Moving Away from Deficiency Approach

Money, the term money, and the use of the term money, funding grants or contributions, has been a tool, a tool of oppression, generally by governments [...] We, as Indigenous Peoples it's utilized [against us] as a weapon that there is not enough money, and [...] I'm not going to say there is because there isn't [...] there's relationships and treaties and all of that. But if our focus has only ever been on what, outward there is not enough, after a while [...] from a psychology mindset, we believe and so does the rest of society believe that we are a deficit society, that we somehow are in deficit. (Interview Participant)

Participants frequently spoke out against deficiency approaches to funding Indigenous communities. Deficiency approaches tend to focus on what communities are lacking and require funding applicants to disclose and explain their shortcomings. Below, a participant shares their insight on the limits of a deficiency approach:

I feel like Indigenous Peoples for the longest time, the only way we have had access to funding has been if we only focus on the things that have been really bad in our community ... and there is a lot and there are times when we really need to do that. Because there are so many people that do not know the story. But at the same time, it feels like after a while, like that is all we ever do. And we do not get to tell the beauty. And we do not get to tell what lights us up as a community. So, making space for the communities [...] Let us tell you all these beautiful things about our culture, let us tell you how our community has really taken something and run with it. (Interview Participant)

While it is true that funding may be used to alleviate challenges faced by Indigenous communities, participants insisted on the importance of highlighting Indigenous creativity, strength, and ingenuity. As participants explained, Indigenous communities have immense social, cultural, and material resources and strengths that are used to benefit and advance their communities which should be a target of funding. A strengths-based approach more accurately reflects the reality and potential of Indigenous communities.

3.2 Racism and Prejudice

It's either: you hear all the good things about Indigenous Peoples, or you hear all the bad things about Indigenous Peoples. It's just always, one extreme to the next. There's no real middle. (Interview Participant)

Many funding organizations worldwide are led and staffed by non-Indigenous Peoples. This can be a barrier to Indigenous funding because of the limitations of non-Indigenous worldviews. Participants spoke of how non-Indigenous Peoples may not understand Indigenous ways of understanding the world and governance processes including those functioning within Indigenous Peoples Organizations. This can be a barrier to building relationships between funders and Indigenous communities where these differences can lead certain projects and organizations to be excluded from funding.

Participants also shared experiences where non-Indigenous staff and leadership within philanthropy demonstrated a lack of knowledge about Indigenous Peoples. These experiences perpetuate stereotypes and racist perspectives related to Indigenous Peoples. One participant shared:



[There is] just sheer ignorance; board members telling a Native American person that they speak English really well. You know, this kind of really basic stuff that I would attribute to just ignorance and stereotyping... but also [some of the] mentalities are the jaw dropping ones where everyone's like, Oh, I can't believe that happened. That's mortifying, but those are easier to get over. Because I think then that's in the open, but more insidious, [are] the ideas of who matters and what is a value? What is quality? What's worth putting money into and who? I think some of those issues are under the surface and cause people to question [the] cause. (Interview Participant)

Participants suggested that having Indigenous Peoples in leadership positions within funding organizations—including serving as adjudicators for funding applications—is an important way of combatting this lack of knowledge and representation that moves towards representing more inclusive worldviews. At the same time, however, participants also noted there is a risk of tokenism when Indigenous Peoples are invited into funding organizations, but institutions do not take the steps to be inclusive or do not commit to systemic change to advance equity.


3.3 Unethical Origins of Some Philanthropic Wealth

Within philanthropy [...] wealth is generated on often very colonialist practices, and so there actually is a duty to support Indigenous Peoples who have been really receiving the impacts and been receiving the short end of the stick. [Colonial practices] has allowed this wealth to amass for many of these foundations, who can trace their roots back to extractive industries and corporate entities, even finance that has supported the taking of lands and resources. (Interview Participant)

Interview participants expressed concerns that the sources of philanthropic wealth may be unethical. Every participant shared perspectives that philanthropic wealth has often been built through colonization, Indigenous dispossession, and racism.

This can be a barrier to Indigenous funding because some communities may be hesitant to access funds whose source wealth may be unethical or even directly tied to their community's history. Some participants suggested that acknowledging and reflecting on the potentially unethical sources of philanthropic wealth could also help to reframe philanthropy. As one participant articulated:





Another real challenge as an Indigenous person in philanthropy is that this money that we're giving to communities, the whole irony of it is, it's money that was acquired on dispossession of lands and genocide, that's why for me the biggest challenge is working with what we know are contradictions in philanthropy, and every day I have to think about what I am doing. (Interview Participant)

Further, interview participant Tania Turner shared:

We have been extracting resources, knowledge, life from Indigenous communities; this is the time to pay. So, it is not about providing funding and asking for reporting, so I know and supervise what you're doing. It's that we owe them.

Reframing philanthropy can be a step towards redistribution of these resources to communities that have been affected by dispossession. This could inspire enduring and long-term community funding.

3.4 Indigenous Hesitance, Burnout, and Fatigue

One of the challenges is that a lot of the work is put on one person. And just myself in this organization, we're the only group like this [...] But all that's on me, I'm just one employee. So, I think the reality of that is a lot is being asked of one Indigenous person, and burnout is real. And then us not understanding our worth and being okay with being underpaid. (Liz Liske, Yellowknives Dene First Nation, Interview Participant)

Capacity limitations of Indigenous Peoples Organizations was identified as a barrier to Indigenous funding. Many participants shared experiences of working within Indigenous Peoples Organizations where staffing capacity was low due to limited resources and burnout very high as a result. The risk of burnout can be compounded for Indigenous staff when they work within sectors related to challenges and trauma faced by Indigenous communities. As one participant shared:

A lot of our people bring a lot of trauma into the workplace. It burns people out, it's hard for employers to figure out how to handle some of that kind of thing. And oftentimes, we have environments that don't support long term and sustainable pathways for talent from our communities. (Interview Participant)

Relatedly, Indigenous communities often have negative and harmful experiences working with non-Indigenous institutions, including funders, which may make them hesitant in wanting to build partnerships within philanthropy; as one participant noted, "A lot of [Indigenous Peoples Organizations] are very right to be skeptical of the people coming out and saying, I am here to help, I am here with the money." This participant suggested that funders and donors should practice self-reflection and transparency to help mediate this skepticism: "The funders also must realize, though, 'I got to be clear with what my agenda is, why I am here' [...]" We cannot expect Indigenous Peoples Organizations to be doing all this work."



3.5 Inaccessibility of Application Requirements

So many times I've had to adjust and adapt to funders, rather than have the funders adapt to communities. (Interview Participant)

Inaccessibility is a major barrier to Indigenous Peoples and organizations benefiting from philanthropic grants, including lack of visibility of funding opportunities, exclusionary application requirements and burdensome reporting processes. Elaborating on such barriers, one participant explained how the linguistic requirements of applications can be a major barrier: "Everything is asked for in English. And it doesn't allow for the multiplicity of languages, both oral and written, that Indigenous communities operate in." This same participant explained that requirements for applications to be written is also a barrier: "Very few funders allow for applications to be submitted via video, or via some kind of audio recording or other format that's more accessible to them because it's not as easy for the funder." Both application and reporting processes were described as being administratively onerous.

The limited visibility of funding opportunities for Indigenous communities as well as difficulties on the part of funders in finding Indigenous Peoples Organizations that could use support means that funders often end up supporting the same organizations. One participant explained: "I don't even know how you go about finding funding, or how would you ever make your way to the attention in the notice of a big foundation?" In acknowledging the barrier of invisibility, participants called to increase awareness of Indigenous Peoples Organizations. As one participant shared:

One kind of barrier that's just ubiquitous is just lack of visibility. I think Indigenous [organizations] and communities and the fact that they have assets and can do things on the ground and have impact need to be elevated. Because unless they [are] funders will always go the usual suspects and you'll always be brokering with some other group that purports to have relationships. So I think raising the visibility of [Indigenous] organizations and work that's happening on the ground is, is an opportunity. (Interview Participant)

These barriers are exacerbated for Indigenous Peoples Organizations that may already be overextended and have limited capacity to complete the administrative labour required by funders or to research funding opportunities. Participants suggested that funders can play important roles in increasing visibility of funding opportunities, networking between Indigenous Peoples Organizations and funders, and navigating bureaucratic processes.

Theme 4: Innovative Application and Reporting Processes

4.1 Innovative Application Processes

At the very minimum, in terms of Indigenous Peoples, we need to look at very radically different grant making paradigms and practices that are far more responsive and have meaningful impact for Indigenous communities. And the other part of that is, that is making sure Indigenous peoples are at the table, they're holding these positions. (Interview Participant)

Recognizing some of the barriers to existing funding applications for Indigenous Peoples Organizations, some funders have implemented innovate application processes that are more inclusive of Indigenous Peoples Organizations' needs. For example, as interview participant Annie Hillar, pointed to application processes that allow for submissions in multiple languages and in forms other than writing:

In terms of the kinds of applications [to] offer [...] do it in multiple languages written, as well as offering groups to submit applications through audio recordings, or video recordings, or just having a call and having the application process happen via a call. And, not only asking, self-educating themselves on those communities and how they work, and so instead of asking them to have articles of association, and an audited set of accounts, and all of these sort of checklist items that demonstrate their credibility, and that they're able to manage money, to find other ways that are more aligned with the cosmology that these groups might be operating with. (Interview Participant)

These changes in application processes are supporting by learning on the part of funders about the governance structures and worldviews of Indigenous Peoples Organizations who may be potential recipients of funding; one participant stated that their organization helps funders “redesign their grantmaking structures and processes as well as provide training to board, senior leadership teams, and grant adjudication committees so that they're more grounded in Indigenous worldviews related to philanthropy.”





4.2 Innovative Reporting Processes

We've just gotten rid of reports, unless there is a legal reason that we have to accept a report, we do most of our reports by just doing verbal check ins periodically and letting people tell their story. And then saying that if someone has something they want to send, of course, to send it at any time. But we have gotten rid of the reporting. Our proposals now are basically just one narrative question, and then whatever financial or legal documents are required. So really trying to take the administrative burden off and allow a place of trust. (Victoria Sweet, Anishinaabe, Interview Participant)

Innovative reporting processes discussed by interview participants centered around reducing the administrative burden of conventional reporting requirements. Instead of requiring written reports, funders have asked for verbal updates that allow “people [to] tell their story.” Other organizations have shifted to using video as a way of reporting. Another participant shared that their funding organization pays for funding recipients to visit them for time to socialize together with organizational staff and trustees and share about what they are doing with the funding; they describe this time together of “hearing people and feeling that there is something significant” as “magical.”

4.3 Engaging Cultural Ambassadors and Advocates

We are trying to think a lot about what the funding mechanisms are to get grants directly or via culturally appropriate intermediaries based in country. (Interview Participant)

Community ambassadors can play an important role in helping to deliver local funding when they are culturally appropriate. Ambassadors should understand the language, worldviews, and contexts of the communities they work with. Ambassadors can help to make sure communities get funding and can help when governments have restrictions on outside funding.

One participant described using community advocates to help understand the needs of local communities and to ensure funds are going where they are most needed. Using advocates from funded communities also helps to mitigate the risk that funders may undermine Indigenous self-determination. Another participant shared:

We require contact with community advocates, who helped us understand the people's needs a little bit better, and it also makes sure that they're connected to somebody on the ground. [...] So that was kind of a decision we made to address possible fraud. (Interview Participant)

Culturally appropriate ambassadors and advocates can be particularly effective when they belong to the community receiving or applying for funding. As the above quotation indicates, they can be used to address some of the fiduciary concerns that motivate grant reporting.

Theme 5: Recommendations for Non-Indigenous Philanthropists

You talk [Indigenous] definition of success to a non-[Indigenous] person, and it is worlds apart. (Adrian Appo, Gooreng Gooreng, Interview Participant)

5.1 Learning and Training for Non-Indigenous Philanthropy Sector

Building genuine relationships between funders and Indigenous communities often requires learning and training on the part of funders, who themselves are often not Indigenous people. This may include learning about how philanthropic wealth has commonly been built from colonial exploitation and Indigenous dispossession, as the majority of interview participants discussed. One participant shared:

We have two primary member audiences, the settler philanthropic sector, that's how we identify the philanthropic organizations and institutions whose wealth was created on stolen land and on the backs of Indigenous, enslaved, and other Black and racialized people globally, and our other member audience is Indigenous communities, grassroots movements, nations, and organizations, whether they're charitable, nonprofit, incorporated, etc. We support these two member audiences in both relational and technical skill building. (Interview Participant)

Genuine relationships may also entail understanding how philanthropy continues to uphold uneven power relationships between funders, donors, and recipients, as well as between non-Indigenous and Indigenous People even when funders are well-intended.

Participants suggested that funding organizations must also increase their awareness about Indigenous cultures, needs, governance structures, and worldviews. While Indigenous Peoples Organizations may have practices and values different than funders', this diversity should shape funding practices rather than serve as exclusionary criteria. Doing so will facilitate better relationships between funders and Indigenous communities.

This participant shared insights to how some organizations approach relationship building and education:

We do have some organizers that are doing things that donors, that non-Indigenous People, can participate in, medicine walks and workshops and things like that, that they can attend. And so, we're going to start working on making those things available to donors. Because we do want to build those relationships, which is also another reason why we're focusing more on individual donors. Because we do want to start building relationships between the people that are spending money and the people that are donating the money, to build accomplices or interns. I don't like allies, but I do like the idea of interning, like an intern with an [Indigenous] community for a little while, kind of learn how to be good neighbors. (Interview Participant)

To engage in relationship building with funders, Indigenous communities may also benefit from training such as technical skill-building. An environmental of shared learning and knowledge mobilization between and among Indigenous communities and funders will serve both of these groups.

5.2 Self-Reflection and Challenging Privilege

I think you have to feel, you have to feel that you are willing to lose your job or your reputation or whatever, to say, hey, we've been doing things wrong [...] And ideally, you're all taking risks together, spreading risk, learning from each other and forming deep relationships that last. (Interview Participant)


When speaking of changes they would like to see within philanthropy related to Indigenous funding, participants suggested that it was important for non-Indigenous funders to practice self-reflection. Funders must work to “recognize and name and articulate who they are,” including examining where their wealth comes from (including if it comes from potentially unethical sources), rethinking the values that guide their work, their institutional and personal agendas, and their funding practices. One participant summarized that funders need to “decolonize ourselves.” Participants urged non-Indigenous funders and those working within philanthropy to not be afraid of this critical examination, but rather to approach it with the understanding that it will lead to better relationships between funders and Indigenous communities. As one participant highlighted:

The change has to be about philanthropic institutional change in its philosophies, and in its practices and values. And most of these funders of Indigenous peoples also fund other initiatives, social justice initiatives, and so forth. The groups of people, the contexts might be different but at the end of the day, it's really looking at how we treat other human beings and other diverse groups of human beings and what has been that historical experience that current lived experience that has not served these communities. Part of that institutional change is to look at the core of all of this, it's racism and greed, and they need to come to terms with their racism and greed. The challenge [is that] so many people go to work for institutions, and are aware of all of this, or on some level they are, but sort of feel powerless to make the change themselves. (Interview Participant)

Participants also suggested that many within philanthropy likely already have a sense of some of the issues that need to be resolved and approaching this work together—with humility—can be more effective and less risky for individuals.

5.3 Trusting Indigenous-led Processes

I think every foundation should be having the conversations of how you adjust things to make it so that Indigenous people can step up, lead out, and share the gifts and the things that we have to offer to the world. (Victoria Sweet, Anishinaabe, Interview Participant)



Building trust in relationships between non-Indigenous funders and Indigenous Peoples, organizations, and communities must go both ways, with non-Indigenous funders assuming the value and competency of their Indigenous staff and partners. Participants spoke at length about the important perspectives and experiences that Indigenous communities can bring to philanthropy. One participant shared:

What would I like to see? More Indigenous representation for sure. I would like to see more practice of trust-based philanthropy. And then more unrestricted funding, and probably more understanding of what Indigenous people are being called to do, but they are not giving the means or the resources or the capacity to allow them to do that work in a good way, in their way. (Interview Participant)

Listening to and affirming Indigenous knowledge within philanthropy helps to make space within Indigenous funding for Indigenous leadership and influence and will ensure funding practices are responsive to the needs of diverse Indigenous communities.

5.4 Coordination Roles

Participants suggested that coordinated approaches within Indigenous funding are important for building partnerships between and among Indigenous Peoples Organizations and funding bodies. Funders can play a crucial role in coordinating Indigenous-oriented funding and establishing networks among themselves to share progress. This collaboration enhances the visibility of Indigenous Peoples Organizations and communities in need of support. One participant shared, “IFIP can serve as a central organization, or mechanism for helping better coordinate these donors on the need to support Indigenous Peoples’ needs, and to help foster partnerships amongst the different donors to better support movements.” This coordination work can help to strengthen philanthropic infrastructure and ensure funds reach those who are making change in community.






5.5 Reframing Charity Paradigm as Justice, Redistribution, and Reparation

Much more funding needs to be directed to Indigenous communities, if we look at how wealth is acquired, this is another huge contradiction, because it's so transactional to me anyway. And it is so based on a concept of money, but nonetheless, we're contemporary 'Indigenous Peoples', and in reality, we need employment, we need jobs, we need incomes. At the same time, we're very concerned with maintaining our cultural and spiritual practices. That money that's been acquired off of Indigenous lands, a significant amount of money needs to come back into Indigenous initiatives. (Interview Participant)

Building from the critiques of deficiency approaches to Indigenous funding outlined in section 3.1, participants suggested that funders can play an important role in reframing the values that guide philanthropy. Namely, participants wanted to see the “charity” paradigm underlying philanthropy, where funds are given to those in need out of a feeling of “goodness,” toward frameworks of justice, redistribution, and reparation:

That's also working through all kinds of assumptions and the stereotypes people hold about Indigenous people 'they don't know what they need', or 'they can't handle a \$500,000 grant, they don't have the capacity'. We have to get beyond that thinking. I see in the future is philanthropy changing itself, engaging change processes and Indigenous communities receiving a far more significant portion of the funding. And then [...] honoring and respect of sovereignty and self-determination and rights. (Interview Participant)

As participants explained, Non-Indigenous Organizations, institutions, and individuals benefit from historic and ongoing Indigenous dispossession. In the interest of advancing equity, non-Indigenous funders have a responsibility to redistribute their wealth in an ongoing basis to marginalized communities so they can enjoy the same quality of life and self-determination as those in dominant positions.





Theme 6: Indigenous Leadership and Control

6.1 Community-Led Initiatives

The work that I believe that Indigenous Peoples do in and around philanthropy is, we focus on the brilliance and ingenuity that exists in community being in service of community, serving community better. (Wanda Brascoupe, Citizen of the Tuscarora Nation & Member of Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg, Interview Participant)

Participants expressed that a key priority for Indigenous funding is community leadership defining the priorities of work happening in their communities. This is because community-based organizations tend to be more effective in understanding and responding to the needs of communities. Community-based organizations also have built-in structures of accountability that help to foster trust and healthy, sustainable relationships, which are key to implementing changes and programming. As one participant shared:



So we built a principle of grant making, it's on our website that's built on sort of concentric circles, centering at the very core, grassroots Indigenous communities engaged in different forms of cultural continuity, cultural survival, alternative economic development, land acquisition, land rights, just about any kind of work that really supports the community at that level, then each concentric circle expands out and then begins to look at what is the next range of organizations, very close to communities that are supporting that core work of a community. And then each circle kind of moves out as an organization may be further removed. But we drive the majority of our funding by 80% of our funding to the grassroots. (Interview Participant)

Participants thus called on funders to focus on supporting the incredible work already happening in Indigenous communities rather than imposing their own agendas and priorities. Supporting community-led initiatives is an important way of enhancing Indigenous control of funding practices.

6.2 Affirming Indigenous Self-Determination within Funding Processes

We really allow our grantees to kind of shape how our funds are used in respect to self-determination. I think that's something that is absolutely fundamental when supporting Indigenous Peoples and philanthropy, for various different reasons, is going to have challenges around supporting self-determination in the most flexible way possible, because it all can look very different in different communities because each community is facing different realities, different challenges, different opportunities. We support a lot of policymaking processes. We support a lot of Indigenous led funds, which are great mechanisms to kind of give the control of the wealth over to Indigenous peoples and allow them to be granted out themselves if they would like to and then we also just flexibly support the general operations of Indigenous organizations and governance structures. (Casey Box, Interview Participant)

Affirming and strengthening Indigenous self-determination is critical to enhancing Indigenous funding practices. As one participant shared:

I would like to see philanthropy uphold Indigenous Peoples right to free, prior, and informed consent. When talking with Indigenous folks and working with Indigenous folks, I think we must respect their traditional governance systems, their languages, etc. as we try and as we're interested in partnering with Indigenous communities. (Interview Participant)

This was emphasized by participants across geographical regions, funding sectors, and roles within philanthropy (i.e., donors, funders, intermediaries, and recipients). What it means to respect Indigenous self-determination may vary. As one participant explained, it is essential to “[support] self-determination in the most flexible way possible, because it all can look very different in different communities because each community is facing different realities, different challenges, different opportunities.” In general, however, participants expressed that upholding Indigenous self-determination means allowing Indigenous Peoples Organizations and communities to shape the funding process—including application and reporting processes, governance structures, and funding priorities—rather than having to shape their practices to fit the agenda of funders.

6.3 Indigenous Leadership and Representation within Funding Organizations

When I was hired to serve as the Executive Director, I made it clear: I'm willing to take this position if I can change how we do grant making in working with Indigenous communities. Because I'm Indigenous, I bring my whole identity into this position. The work has to be based on Indigenous values and principles. We also need to figure out how to be very responsive to Indigenous communities in ways that honors their sovereignty, their self-determination. That our work focusses at the very grassroots level and driving funding directly into Indigenous communities at the very core. (Interview Participant)

Increasing representation of Indigenous Peoples within the philanthropic sector was frequently named as a pathway to improving Indigenous funding processes. As one participant shared:

It's important that we began to see [...] more Indigenous leaders as CEOs of foundations, and to really give them the power to decide what they want to do with the money...And we have been struggling, how we redistribute the money [...] we're thinking about providing funding, but what about providing the power to provide themselves the money they need? I don't see enough Indigenous Peoples in the leadership roles of the foundations. [Indigenous Peoples] have a lot of organization and grassroots organizations, that's good. Why are they not also deciding about whom to give the money, how much money? They're not there. Why? And that's something that we have to also ask: how many foundations are led by Indigenous Peoples? (Interview Participant)

Having Indigenous Peoples in positions of leadership within funding organizations is especially important in expanding the worldviews, values, and practices of such organizations to be more inclusive and affirming of Indigenous self-determination. Participants also shared that it was important that Indigenous Peoples be part of the adjudication processes of funding organizations. For Indigenous Peoples to succeed working within the philanthropic sector, they must be offered appropriate workplace supports, and their presence in positions of influence should be just one part of broader processes of institutional change to avoid the risk of "tokenism."





Theme 7: Climate and Environment

7.1 Humans as Part of Ecology, Land as a Living Agent in Philanthropy

When we go into Indigenous communities with conservation or environmental goals, we need to make sure that Indigenous Peoples' rights are front and center in all of those conversations. All too often, unfortunately, some environmental and conservation funders see Indigenous Peoples as a means to an end, or as I like to say, "a chess piece in a larger conservation game." It's time that we really realize and respect Indigenous Peoples rights, and that larger conversation. We need to recognize that when supporting self-determination, you are protecting cultures, supporting the next generation of leaders, the protection of lands and territories that have ecosystems and biodiversity that we all care about. (Casey Box, Interview Participant)

Grounding approaches to funding for climate and environment in Indigenous worldviews and practices both enhances the effectiveness of such programs and the wellbeing of local Indigenous communities. As explained in Theme 1 on holistic approaches to funding, many Indigenous Peoples view humans and nature as interconnected and land as a living agent that must be respected and cared for, just as it sustains human life. As Liz Liske shared, "everything [is] connected but settler philanthropy likes to categorize thing[s]."

Integrating this worldview into funding practices means taking a people-centered approach to conservation and climate action, which takes into account the well-being of the people living on the land. One participant summarized this approach as "fostering living landscapes with people who reside in them." This approach may also look like supporting Indigenous communities' culture, language, and governance, with the understanding that Indigenous practices related to the land produce healthier and more sustainable environmental outcomes.

Participants shared important insights on the importance of integrating the defence of Indigenous rights and environmental conservation. As this participant articulated:

All of the group, they're working on climate justice issues, with traditional knowledge, the ways in which Indigenous communities are the traditional knowledge [holders] in terms of health care and the ways in which they're taking care of the environment. And also advocating for more resources, especially economic resources, and the participation of Indigenous communities in the political, in the public sphere [...] Indigenous communities, they tend to be put at the margins. (Interview Participant)

This is important for upholding Indigenous self-determination as well as respecting the longstanding knowledge of Indigenous communities concerning the protection of and care for their lands. Conservation, ecological justice, and the economic and political power of Indigenous communities are not antithetical or contradictory, but intimately intertwined.

Participants urged funders to recognize that supporting Indigenous rights is deeply connected with the protection of lands and territories; they are part of the same project and mutually supportive. One participant expressed that it is important for funders to sustain their support for Indigenous communities, not to merely use Indigenous Peoples as token “environmental heroes,” and then follow their own agendas.

What are the interviews telling us?

This section has provided insights across seven themes and a variety of subthemes from qualitative interviews with 29 subject matter experts and sector leaders in the field of Indigenous philanthropy. These interview results complement the data gathered in the survey and serve to contextualize within broader systemic issues the funding gaps and disproportionalities outlined in the Funding Scan above. From these seven themes—Holistic Approaches to Funding, Relationship Building in Indigenous Communities, Barriers and Gaps in Funding Landscape, Innovative Application and Reporting Processes, Recommendations for Non-Indigenous Philanthropists, Indigenous Leadership and Control, Climate and the Environment—as well as data from the previous sections of this report, we have distilled the twenty recommendations outlined in the next section.

Future Action: 20 Recommendations to Advance Indigenous Philanthropy



According to this research, a mere 0.6% of grants are directed towards benefiting Indigenous Peoples, a starkly inadequate figure when compared to the actual Indigenous population and their pressing needs. The disparity underscores an urgent need for a fundamental shift in philanthropic practices to rectify this imbalance. This research has yielded 20 crucial recommendations, serving as a tool for funders genuinely committed to dismantling power asymmetries in philanthropy. These recommendations center on prioritizing Indigenous rights and leadership, dismantling barriers to funding for Indigenous Peoples, and embodying the core values of Indigenous Philanthropy as encapsulated by the 5Rs – Respect, Reciprocity, Responsibility, Redistribution, and Relationships.

IFIP'5 R's of Indigenous Philanthropy



Recognize and respect Indigenous Peoples rights, and worldviews. Seek to uphold the principles articulated in the UN Declaration of Rights for Indigenous People (UNDRIP). Work directly with Indigenous communities to advance these principles and to gain understanding about their aspirations, solutions and initiatives.

THEME

1. Centre Indigenous self-determination

Strengthen Indigenous self-determination through philanthropy by allowing Indigenous Peoples Organizations and communities to shape the funding process—including application and reporting processes, governance structures, and funding priorities—rather than having to shape their practices to fit the agenda of funders.

2. Honor Indigenous worldviews in philanthropy

The importance of working globally and collaboratively in ways that respect Indigenous nationhood was noted by interview participants. This call for connection was echoed in secondary research (International Funders for Indigenous Peoples 2014b), and includes collaboration among funders, which participants suggested would be helpful for advancing Indigenous communities generally. Such approaches also incorporate how Indigenous communities can engage with funders, with participants suggesting that it is important to develop more holistic systems of philanthropy that connect to Indigenous communities and other stakeholders and facilitate Indigenous participation in these systems.

3. No ecological justice without Indigenous participation

It is important that philanthropic activities on the subject of ecological justice or conservation taking place anywhere within the territories or regions inhabited by Indigenous People substantively include them. The defence of Indigenous rights must go hand in hand with environmental conservation. It is inadvisable that any conservation, climate change, or ecology project in lands, oceans, and territories inhabited by, or belonging to, Indigenous Peoples take place without their input nor in violation of their rights.

IFIP's 5 R's of Indigenous Philanthropy



Engage directly with Indigenous communities by understanding the nature of their relationships with Mother Earth, their culture, traditions and spirituality. Build and nurture relationships based on mutual respect and trust that eliminate the tendency to exert power over another through building long-term commitments and mutual learning.

THEME

4. Engage cultural ambassadors and advocates able to liaise between funders and communities

We recommend the increased engagement of Indigenous cultural ambassadors and advocates to liaise between funders and communities. These individuals can play an important role in helping to deliver local funding in ways that are culturally appropriate. This means that they should either be from funded communities and/or should understand the language, worldviews, and contexts of the Indigenous communities with whom they work.

5. Addressing regional funding discrepancies across the globe

The vast majority funding for Indigenous Peoples is spent by philanthropic organizations in North America. Though these North American funding levels should be maintained and even increased, it is also essential to ensure that the proportion spent in other regions is increased to match North American levels. Funders have a responsibility to expand its relationship to build more partnerships with Indigenous Peoples Organizations around the world.

6. Rigorous training for non-Indigenous Individuals and organizations working in the area of Indigenous philanthropy.

We strongly recommend a rigorous program of cultural humility and historical legacies trainings for non-Indigenous funders such as IFIP's Indigenous Philanthropy Institute. Building genuine relationships between funders and Indigenous communities requires learning and training, especially given the colonial origins of much philanthropy work (see recommendations 16 and 18 below).

7. Coordinating funding sources for Indigenous Peoples

We recommend the continued expansion of the work of IFIP and similar organizations taking coordinated approaches to Indigenous funding. This will allow for building partnerships between and among Indigenous Peoples Organizations and funding bodies and allow these organizations to serve as nodes for access to funding by Indigenous Peoples.

IFIP'5 R's of Indigenous Philanthropy



Be accountable and transparent in ensuring the effective, meaningful and intersectional representation and participation of Indigenous Peoples where critical decisions that affect them are made. Use funding processes and approaches that are accessible, adaptable, flexible, transparent, and accountable.

THEME

Address systemic barriers

8. Favour general and long-term funding instead of “projectification”

Indigenous communities face a growing need for general operating funding and wraparound support to overcome the piecemeal funding that is a major barrier to the sustainability of Indigenous-led projects and leads to a “projectification” of Indigenous movements. Projectification refers to the phenomenon that funds often are short-term and project-based instead of long-term and operational, leaving little room for longer-term work.

9. Innovative approaches to applications

It is important to implement innovative approaches to application requirements that are more inclusive of Indigenous Peoples Organizations’ needs. These include processes that allow for submissions in multiple languages and in forms other than writing (such as videos). They also include placing value on lived experience, traditional and Indigenous knowledge, and other qualifications when evaluating proposals.

10. Innovative approaches to reporting

We recommend the continued implementation and expansion of innovative reporting processes that reduce the administrative burden of conventional reporting requirements. Instead of requiring written reports, funders can ask for relationship-building meetings or oral updates that allow for funded communities to tell their stories.

Strengthen data infrastructure

11. Move away from imposed timelines

Move away from the imposition of predetermined and strict timelines on communities. There is a frequent potential mismatch between the timeline expectations of funders and recipients, especially when funders are non-Indigenous and recipients are Indigenous. Indigenous communities may be focused on slower, long-term timelines and working to enact changes that take many years to implement.

IFIP'5 R's of Indigenous Philanthropy

12. Implement Indigenous data standards and recommended practices


Data standards can inform the practices of existing open data repositories to ensure their datasets are relevant and accurately reflect Indigenous Peoples. Data repositories use a series of concepts, definitions, and filters to ensure data is accurate and accessible. Data standards defined by Indigenous Peoples will ensure repository practices are equitable and inclusive.

13. Collect demographic data

Funders should collect and use demographic data on grantee organizations, including leadership, staff, and participants. Existing data on philanthropy provided by funders fails to capture the realities of grantees. Demographic data on grantees provides a fuller picture of inclusive practices and funding access. This data collection should be attuned to intersectional realities and multiple identities, Indigenous women, youth, Elders, people with disabilities, and members of the 2SLGBTQIA+ community.

14. Curated dataset on Indigenous philanthropy

Although data on Indigenous People is available through existing resources, curated datasets can ensure available data is organized, managed, and accessible in a way that Indigenous Peoples can draw insight from the data in a meaningful way. This includes ensuring data is specific to Indigenous Peoples and not grouped with other racialized or marginalized identity communities (except when identifying



IFIP'5 R's of Indigenous Philanthropy



Practice the essence of Indigenous ways of living, giving, and sharing that connect people and their beliefs and actions. Be open to learning, unlearning, and receiving. Giving and receiving from a place of mutual benefit and solidarity is also part of a virtuous circle of healing principles.

THEME

Rethink the power relationship of philanthropy to overcome colonial legacies and mindsets

15. Foster Indigenous leadership

Challenge ongoing colonial assumptions and norms, as well as tokenism, within philanthropy by increasing Indigenous leadership in decision-making processes. Increase representation of Indigenous Peoples within the philanthropic sector, and particularly in positions of leadership within funding organizations. Indigenous Peoples, including Indigenous Women, youth, Elders, Peoples with Disabilities, and members of the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community, should also be part of the adjudication processes of funding organizations.

16. Reckon with colonial roots of philanthropy

Educate foundations and the wider public on the colonial roots of philanthropy. This includes honest self-reflection about how the wealth was accumulated and where and how colonial power dynamics continue to thrive in philanthropy. Furthermore, critical self-reflection is needed to understand where philanthropy can be used as a guise for furthering colonial dispossession of Indigenous Peoples.

17. Fund holistic approaches

Fund programs that prioritize community empowerment and holistic approaches. Throughout this project, research participants have emphasized the need for support that incorporates the holistic approaches common to many Indigenous communities. Respecting holistic Indigenous worldviews also means seeing different funding areas as interconnected; for example, conservation and cultural revitalization are intertwined.

IFIP'5 R's of Indigenous Philanthropy



Practice redistribution based on Indigenous values and ways of living, sharing, and giving to shift towards a just and equitable world. Do this through building trust, ensuring Indigenous Peoples are at the decision-making table and directly funding Indigenous-led solutions, initiatives, and organizations worldwide.

THEME

Re-envisioning the approach

18. Favour transparency

Non-Indigenous Organizations should practice transparency regarding the origins of funds, as not doing so sometimes leads to the alienation of Indigenous Peoples from funds they view as stemming from unethical or unjust sources. All 29 interview participants interviewed by Archipel for this project were unanimous in their shared perspective that philanthropic wealth has often been built through colonization, Indigenous dispossession, and racism. Many communities may be hesitant to access funds from such sources. Increased transparency, including acknowledging and reflecting on the potentially unethical sources of philanthropic wealth could also help to reframe philanthropy to a focus on redistribution and restitution (see recommendation 19 below). This could inspire enduring and long-term community trust.

19. Rethink philanthropy as restitution

We recommend reimagining charitable wealth, including acquisition, meaning, and function, as a form of restitution, reparation, and healing. Organizations should move from the charity paradigm underlying philanthropy, where funds are given to those in need out of a feeling of goodness, toward frameworks of justice, redistribution, and reparation. This is an especially urgent paradigm shift because of the aforementioned unethical origin of some philanthropic wealth (see recommendation 16).

20. Favour Indigenous-Led Funds as partners in philanthropy and distributors of funding

It is essential to support Indigenous-led community-based organizations as principal distributors of funding. Indigenous Led Funds tend to be more effective in understanding and responding to the needs of communities and have built in structures of accountability, which help to foster trust and healthy, sustainable relationships, which are key to implementing changes, addressing Indigenous communities' priorities, and programming.

Appendix A. Methodology

This project relies on a mixed-methods approach, including literature review, interviews, surveys, and a dialogue group. This research technique aims to enhance the validity and reliability of the findings and ensure a fuller understanding of the topic. Once the data collection and analysis were completed individually for each method, the findings were compared and contrasted across the methods. This approach identifies areas of convergence or divergence. The analysis also reveals findings that are consistent across data methods and findings that are unique to the specific methods. This methodology is also informed by four overarching research principles: Etuaptmunk, Intersectionality, Indigenous Methodologies, and the Conversational Method, which are also described below.

This project uses in-depth interviews with Indigenous Peoples and organizations who have a variety of knowledge or experience related to philanthropy and Indigenous communities. To recruit for interviews, IFIP reached out internally to its own members to encourage participation. Archipel also recruited from 20 Indigenous-led governance organizations globally and several Indigenous governing bodies. Overall, 29 interviews were completed, and these interviews provided rich, detailed information about the funding ecosystem around the world.

This project designed and implemented an online survey administered to a sample of the Indigenous philanthropy sector to provide valuable insights on a broader range of issues. Similar to the interviews, IFIP reached out to its members to encourage participation in the survey, and Archipel also promoted the survey to Indigenous Peoples Organizations and governing bodies. Overall, the survey findings can validate the results from the interviews as well as help identify new trends and patterns.

For its quantitative analysis, the project drew primarily on the Candid's grants information database a leading U.S.-based repository for data about foundation giving. The Candid database provides access to a range of current philanthropic information with quality standardized data points. This database aggregates information from voluntary reporting by 1,000 foundations, tax forms filed by 80,000 foundations, and news sources, and organizes the information across a dynamic taxonomy that allows for advanced search filters (see Candid's "[Grants data fact sheet](#)"). For the purposes of this scan, the term *global* refers to international funding as captured by Candid. Although Candid includes 6 global regions, the majority of the data is specific to funding organizations based in North America.

This global scan examined the amount of funding of funds identified as serving Indigenous Peoples and whether this funding was directed to Indigenous Peoples Organizations. The IFIP team over several months reviewed the recipients and descriptions of over 34,000 grants as well as the recipient website, projects, and leadership to identify and categorize the organizations as Indigenous or non-Indigenous. A full description of Indigenous Peoples organizations and Indigenous Led Fund is available in Appendix B.

The main topics of inquiry included: (a) identifying the proportion and distribution of global funding dedicated to Indigenous Peoples and the organizations receiving this funding; (b) comparing funding patterns across years, regions, and subject areas, and subpopulations; and (c) examining the top global and regional funders and recipients.

Research Principles

Etuaptmumk, a Mi'kmaq methodology and framework, is known as Two-Eyed Seeing. Proposed and developed by Mi'kmaq Elders Murdena and Albert Marshall, Two-Eyed Seeing describes a hybrid process of seeing and knowing with the strength of both eyes, with one eye representing Indigenous perspectives and the other Western perspectives. This approach incorporates the depth of Indigenous ways of knowing with the strengths of Western approaches.

Intersectionality, a concept rooted in Black feminist scholarship, recognizes the multiple oppressions individuals experience based on their complex identities and experiences. Intersectionality ensures these multiple struggles are recognized and accounted for throughout the research process.

Indigenous methodologies grounded in consensus decision making are used throughout this research project, meaning our team engages in a consensus building roundtable approach. This ensures the perspectives of our diverse team of Indigenous and non-Indigenous people is integrated in a holistic way.

Indigenous methodologies grounded in consensus decision making are used throughout this research project, meaning our team engages in a consensus building roundtable approach. This ensures the perspectives of our diverse team of Indigenous and non-Indigenous people is integrated in a holistic way.

Data collection based on the *Conversational Method* focuses on gathering knowledge through an oral storytelling tradition in line with an Indigenous paradigm. This method “involves a dialogic participation that holds a deep purpose of sharing story to assist others” (M. Kovach, “Conversational Method in Indigenous Research” [2010], 40). This approach to data collection creates a safe space and enhances relationship-building and participant engagement.

Overall, these four principles interconnectedly inform our research processes and practices. As such, our team recognizes and respects the multifaceted and multidimensional nature of diverse individuals and ensures their perspectives are included in this research.

Throughout the data interpretation process, our team focused on identifying patterns of convergence and divergence across these themes. Funding trends focus on identifying funders, recipients, organizations, priorities, and strategies as well as similarities and differences across these elements. Best practices examine processes and practices that promote and amplify Indigenous leadership and support the self-determination and rights of Indigenous Peoples. Gap analysis maps the funding status, gaps, and challenges that exist in the global funding ecosystem. The last theme focuses on identifying recommendations for moving forward to expand the range of funders, priority areas, collaborative partnerships, and funding efforts to support and advance the needs and priorities of Indigenous Peoples.

Search Strategy and Analysis

Archipel developed a thorough search strategy for Candid database that documents the structure of our search and a record of our search history. This search strategy ensures we identify any information relevant to our research questions. Given the project's research questions specific to global and regional funding for Indigenous Peoples, including levels of investment across funders, sectors, and recipients, we developed a series of keywords, terms, and phrases to guide the database searches. The timeline for this search is 2016 to 2020.

The Candid database typically provides information on funder name, recipient name, geographic region, fiscal year, and grant amount (in US dollars). These limited categories reflect the information available from the data sources used by Candid and any details shared directly by funders. These sources vary in the amount of information available about specific grants and often might not include additional information about the project name and description, grant duration, sector, subject areas, locations served, and other characteristics. Candid data is most comprehensive for the United States as it is based on grant data from the US government. Candid also has comprehensive data on Canadian grantmaking and on mandated corporate social responsibility spending by Indian companies and to a lesser degree data on Australian funders reporting to Candid. Grants from countries other than these are self-reported or contributed by Candid's data partners. As such, information on other countries often is incomplete and it is clear to what extent the reported data reflects a representative proportion of all funding in these regions.

Appendix B.

Indigenous Peoples Organizations and Indigenous Led Funds

The following definition represents a tool to help us differentiate between Indigenous and non-Indigenous organizations and Indigenous Led Funds (ILF's).

Criteria to Identify Indigenous-Led Funds and Indigenous Peoples Organizations

Indigenous Leadership

Self Determination		Indigenous identity is at the center of the organization's core. Leadership is distinct from organizations of mainstream society or culture. At all levels, governance, executive, and staff including senior positions, there are majority Indigenous peoples.
-------------------------------	--	---

5Rs of Indigenous Philanthropy

IFIP's definition

Respect	Recognize and respect Indigenous Peoples' rights, and worldviews. Seek to uphold the principles articulated in the UN Declaration of Rights for Indigenous People (UNDRIP). Work directly with Indigenous communities to advance these principles and to gain understanding about their aspirations, solutions and initiatives.	The organization's values are rooted in Indigenous history and are reflective of Indigenous rights and self-determination.
----------------	---	--

Relationships	Engage directly with Indigenous communities by understanding the nature of their relationships with Mother Earth, their culture, traditions and spirituality. Build and nurture relationships based on mutual respect and trust that eliminate the tendency to exert power over another through building long-term commitments and mutual learning.	The organizations' mission and work is centered on the aspirations and goals of the Indigenous peoples they serve.
Responsibility	Be accountable and transparent in ensuring the effective, meaningful, and intersectional representation and participation of Indigenous Peoples where critical decisions that affect them are made. Use funding processes and approaches that are accessible, adaptable, flexible, transparent, and accountable.	The organization respects collective social and cultural practices of the communities they serve, including ancestral knowledge and is accountable to Indigenous Peoples
Reciprocity	Practice the essence of Indigenous ways of living, giving, and sharing that connect people, their beliefs, and actions. Be open to learning, unlearning, and receiving. Giving and receiving from a place of mutual benefit and solidarity is also part of a virtuous circle of healing principles.	These organizations have a strong commitment to the priorities of Indigenous communities and to the values of giving, sharing, and caring. Their work is informed by reciprocity, mutual responsibility, and respect.

Redistribution	Practice redistribution based on Indigenous Values and ways of living, sharing, and giving to shift towards a just and equitable world. Do this through building trust, ensuring Indigenous Peoples are at the decision-making table and directly funding Indigenous-led solutions, initiatives, and organizations worldwide.	Their mission, programs, and resources explicitly benefit Indigenous communities.
-----------------------	---	---

Indigenous Led Funds - Current definition from Indigenous Led Funds Working Group (see IFIP's website)

Indigenous Led Funds are guided by **Indigenous worldviews and led by and for** Indigenous Peoples. Indigenous Led Funds strengthen self-determination and support a process that empowers the communities, at the local to the global level, to be able to change paradigms and shift power relations addressing the asymmetry of powers and resources to recognition and reciprocity.

ILFs have as primary (or as one of its prominent roles) **to fund Indigenous organizations or community projects. They are guided by the following Indigenous values and protocols** and are accountable to Indigenous communities.

- An indigenous-led fund is an organization, instrument, agency, or other body made up of most Indigenous individuals, that has as primary (or as one of its main roles) to fund Indigenous organizations or community projects and whose mission is for the benefit of Indigenous Peoples.
- Indigenous-Led Funds set up as non-profits or charitable organizations: Organizations seeded by and primarily funded by philanthropy, either created with support of a donor or created by Indigenous peoples. Includes organizations that were initially created by non-Indigenous people but are now led by Indigenous people.
- Indigenous-Led funds set up by Tribal, First Nations, Aboriginal Governments and Councils Organizations created by sovereign first nations (tribal, aboriginal, Indigenous) governments or councils. Funding programs created by regional federations of Indigenous Peoples are also included.
- Indigenous-Led funds set up by donor agencies guided and coordinated by Indigenous Peoples, International bodies, or funding instruments created by multilateral or UN agencies, which administration and decision-making are in the hands of Indigenous Peoples.
- Funds set up by governments with an Indigenous decision-making body; national or regional institutions set up by governments and managed and administered by Indigenous Peoples.

International Funders
IFIP
for Indigenous Peoples



Archipel
Research & Consulting

This work© 2024 by International Funders for Indigenous Peoples is licensed under
CC BY-NC-ND 4.0