

**Philanthropic Grant-making for Disaster Management:
Trend Analysis and Recommended Improvements**

Authors: Susan Forbes Martin, Patricia Weiss Fagen, Alice
Poole and Sabrina Karim
*Institute for the Study of International Migration,
Georgetown University*

July 2006

Acknowledgements

We thank the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for the generous support provided for this project. We also thank all of the people who agreed to be interviewed for the project who liberally gave up their valuable time, and who provided useful insights into the process of disaster management. We would also like to thank Shirley Easton in the Institute for the Study of International Migration for her co-ordination support.

Executive Summary

- Brief summary of area of work, scope of exercise
- Key messages

Project Summary

The following study has been conducted by the Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University and supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. It is a review of grant making related to natural disasters and complex humanitarian emergencies over the last decade, but is focused primarily on the years following September 11th 2001. Over a five-month period in 2006, the ISIM research team conducted over 25 interviews and collected and analyzed information on a range of different types of natural disasters and humanitarian emergencies. This report elaborates the general findings, makes recommendations and reflects on what appear to be best practice for improving the effectiveness of funding for disaster relief, management, prevention and mitigation.

Project Objectives

The objectives of the project were:

1. To review the current processes and trends for disaster grant making.
2. To analyze gaps between current practice and recommended good practice and/or observable needs in the field.
3. To make recommendations to strengthen grant making in the disaster management arena.
4. To make recommendations to strengthen the capability of grant recipients in the disaster management arena.

Categories of Disasters

The Department for International Development in Great Britain describes disasters succinctly as:

A severe disruption to a community's survival and livelihood systems, resulting from people's vulnerability to hazard impacts and involving loss of life and/or property on a scale that overwhelms their capacity to cope unaided.¹

In practice, the term 'disaster' is widely applied to natural and human made crises. Natural disasters encompass acute events such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, fires, floods and hurricanes, e.g. Hurricane Katrina and the Asian Tsunami. Natural disasters can also include slow-onset emergencies caused by drought, desertification and similar environmental impacts. Complex humanitarian emergencies encompass famine, civil conflict and terrorist activity that produce widespread human suffering, e.g. Darfur, the Niger famine, and September 11th 2001. The factors responsible for natural disasters and human caused disasters overlap, but donors usually maintain the distinctions for purposes of programming.

This study focused on all types of disasters. The team captured preliminary grant maker information on both natural and humanitarian disasters in America and internationally, using the following matrix which encompasses four different disaster scenarios.

¹ Department for International Development, "Disaster risk reduction: a development concern", 2005.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>American natural disasters</p> <p>Hurricane Rita Hurricane Katrina</p> | <p>American humanitarian emergencies</p> <p>September 11th, 2001</p> |
| <p>International natural disasters</p> <p>Asian Tsunami Pakistan Earthquake</p> | <p>International humanitarian emergencies</p> <p>Niger Famine Darfur</p> |

Project Methodology

The first stage of the project involved gathering publicly available information and analyzing activity in the disaster management field. The team surveyed a number of sources, including media coverage, the websites of relevant organizations, and the Foundation Center and Council of Foundations. In preparation for the interviews, the team reviewed guidelines and recommendations on disaster grant making, some of which are cited in this report.

Publicly-available information about philanthropic giving varies significantly by organization. It was often easier to access information about corporate giving than other types of donor support because corporations tend to issue press releases when they provide support. However, corporate foundations rarely have user-friendly web pages with detailed information on grant-making for disasters. Private foundations are more impenetrable still as they rarely publicize their giving through press releases. In addition to our survey of websites, we made liberal use of information collected by others, including the Foundation Center, the Independent Sector, and the Chronicle of Philanthropy.

Grant information was displayed by means of a spreadsheet of philanthropic donations over the last 5-10 years. The spreadsheet included grants made by private foundations, family and community foundations, corporate foundations and corporations. Information on the particular disaster covered, the amount of funding, and the recipient organizations were presented for each foundation. The spreadsheet covered the activities of 718 funders.

The second step was to select the organizations with which in depth interviews would be sought. The objective here was to consult corporations and foundations that varied in resources, areas of activity, longevity of operations and organizational form. The interview selection was based upon four key components:

- Size of grant-maker contributions (both in cash and in-kind terms)
- Number and range of disasters supported
- Evidence of support for activities beyond immediate disaster relief
- Organizations with a particularly interesting giving process.

For example, not every organization providing funds to both Katrina and to the Tsunami in the time period we studied met the criteria. However, insofar as organization’s donations were very

sizeable, or the donations were in the context of a longer history of granting funds, the organization would be considered to be substantially active in disaster management and appropriate for interviewing. Some grant makers have been very long-standing donors to disaster relief, providing donations over decades. Others have a more recent history of donating funds to disasters. As will be described below, most grant makers support relief efforts and some targeted recovery/reconstruction activity.

The team contacted the organizations that we wished to interview, often multiple times using a combination of email and telephone. We requested interviews with presidents of foundations, directors of corporate funds, and development officers. Where these people were unable to assist because of time commitments, we interviewed other staff members.

We also interviewed representatives of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that receive grants for their disaster management activities. In choosing the NGOs, we also looked at a range of factors, with particular focus on the number of disasters in which they offer assistance and the variety of grants obtained for their programs. To round out our understanding of grantmaking, we also interviewed representatives of government donor agencies and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance. A full list of interview subjects is included in Appendix One.

Most of the interviews were conducted by telephone, and lasted between 30 to 60 minutes. The questions were designed to extract information on the following aspects of philanthropic giving:

- i. Aims and objectives of the organization in terms of their philanthropic activities.
- ii. The decision-making process used for determining what to support and by what means.
- iii. Extent to which support incorporated emergency relief; disaster prevention, mitigation and preparedness; capacity building of humanitarian organizations, and development.
- iv. Reporting requirements from donors and monitoring and communication efforts from recipients to their donors.
- v. Areas for further research.
- vi. Recommendations for improved disaster management.

Background

Since the 1960s, there have been dramatic increases in the recorded number of disasters, the number of people affected and the amount of property lost. The last decade showed a particular increase. According to the World Disasters Report 2004, issued by the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, “From 1994 to 1998, reported disasters averaged 428 per year - from 1999 to 2003, this figure shot up by two-thirds to an average 707 disasters each year. The biggest rise was in countries of low human development, which suffered an increase of 142 per cent.”²

The Department for International Development (DfID) in Great Britain, launched an important report entitled “Disaster risk reduction: a development concern” in March 2005,³ which underscores the link between disasters and poverty. The report shows how the increasing numbers and seriousness of disasters in the world disproportionately affect the world’s poor countries and communities. In an average year, DfID notes, over 60,000 people will be killed by disasters and a further quarter of a billion affected. Vulnerable people and communities are the most likely to be killed by disasters; over half of disaster-related deaths occur in low human development countries, although only 11% of people exposed to hazards live in these countries. Disasters strike rich and poor countries alike, but the latter experience higher economic losses to their GDP than the former.

DfID rejects the notion that natural disasters are usually exogenous and uncontrollable events. Landslides, for example, are caused or exacerbated by deforestation. Disasters can be reduced and in some circumstances prevented by supporting people’s ability to withstand the impacts, for example, by constructing buildings that are seismically resistant. Disaster management requires comprehensive management across all sectors: i.e. risk reduction and prevention, emergency relief, ongoing development, and more sustainable solutions to deal with disasters. In this context, disaster response requires recognizing the vulnerability and susceptibility of different individuals, communities and countries.

On the other side of the poverty-disaster linkage, disasters affect productivity, growth and macroeconomic performance over the long term. Macroeconomic losses, (physical damage, loss of productive capital and stocks) from disasters then result in lower tax revenue and divert scarce state resources into disaster response. Following disasters, social services usually decline, food prices often increase, and the poor are left with fewer resources for the next emergency. The negative impacts are exacerbated by the fact that both governments and donors are likely to fund disaster relief and rehabilitation by reallocating resources away from development programs.

In fact, responses to disasters generally involve an overwhelming emphasis on emergency humanitarian relief. Resources are spent primarily on emergency food, shelter, water, sanitation and health care. The relief response paradigm is predicated on the assumptions that the effects of a disaster will only be temporary and that the need for international assistance will be brief. While this may be true in some cases, all too often the effects of disasters, particularly complex

² International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, World Disasters Report 2004: Focusing on Community Resilience, chapter 8 (<http://www.ifrc.org/publicat/wdr2004/chapter8.asp>).

³ Department for International Development, “Disaster risk reduction: a development concern”, 2005.

humanitarian emergencies, are prolonged, with continuing dislocations and difficulties in returning to normal life.

The emergency paradigm may save lives in the short term, but it has several negative implications, particularly for protracted humanitarian crises. Emergency relief is most often criticized for its tendency to create a dependency-syndrome among its recipients. For various reasons, displaced and vulnerable communities are perceived as utter victims and unable to survive without external help. Humanitarian relief is predominately internationally-based. Staff, resources, and even food are imported from developing countries in order to respond to crises, both at the on-set of conflict and over the longer term.

In addition, the emergency orientation obstructs the possibility of natural and necessary structural changes. The rapid and then continuing influx of external resources has the negative impact of creating a false economy, a gap between local absorptive capacity and assistance provided, and disparity between local and displaced populations welfare (which can increase tensions between host and displaced populations).

Best Practices in Disaster Grantmaking

Both natural and humanitarian emergencies tend to be episodic, but they are also recurrent. Consequently, many corporations, private and corporate foundations have repeatedly donated their resources to disaster relief operations internationally and domestically without having established clear policies or priorities for so doing. Recognizing the phenomenon, the Council on Foundations and European Foundation Centre organized a workshop to develop recommendations on grant making for disasters that included grant makers, aid agencies, businesses, multilateral organizations and governments. Work was undertaken in 2000-1 and a report was published of the findings shortly after September 11th entitled “Disaster Grantmaking: A Practical Guide for Foundations and Corporations”.

The Council’s report highlighted a number of important strengths that grant makers bring to the disaster field. It urged the private sector grant makers to fill “critical gaps in under-funded areas like disaster rehabilitation, prevention, research and education activities.”⁴ In summary, the strengths reported were the following:

- A mission to serve the public good in diverse ways.
- Ongoing relationships with local organizations.
- A long-term perspective, often five to ten years or more.
- An ability to convene key actors across sectors and to serve as a catalyst for cross-sector collaboration.
- A capacity to call attention to political, economic and social policies that exacerbate the vulnerability of populations to hazards.
- Experience supporting research and disseminating results to interested parties.
- Programmatic flexibility that permits creative and strategic response.
- Administrative flexibility that permits timely action.

⁴ European Foundation Centre and the Council on Foundations, “Disaster Grantmaking: A Practical Guide for Foundations and Corporations”, 2001.

Acknowledging the contributions that grant makers have made in support of disaster management, the report notes the problems that arise when grant makers are deluged with requests in times of disasters:

Decisions about disaster funding often fall outside a grantmaker's regular program areas, with typically limited or absent in-house expertise on the complexities of disaster issues. Moreover, disaster grant decisions can be subject to emotional appeals and are often made quickly under perceived time pressures.

The report also articulated eight principles of disaster grant making:

1. First, do no harm.
2. Stop, look and listen before taking action.
3. Don't act in isolation.
4. Think beyond the immediate crisis to the long-term.
5. Bear in mind the expertise of local organizations.
6. Find out how prospective grantees operate.
7. Be accountable to those you are trying to help.
8. Communicate your work widely, and use it as an educational tool.

This was followed by a set of nine good practice tips to grant makers to enable decision-making that would adhere to these principles:

1. Developing an internal plan for handling disaster requests.
2. Learning about the disaster situation before responding.
3. Thinking about when to make a disaster grant.
4. Deciding whether to provide cash assistance, or goods and services.
5. Looking at the disaster management picture.
6. Choosing a grantee.
7. Coordinating your disaster grants with others.
8. Monitoring and evaluating disaster grants.
9. Enhancing understanding of disasters.

The report emphasized the importance of addressing all phases of disaster management rather than responding solely to the immediate needs of emergency relief. In particular, it recommends that grant makers:

- Think about making disaster prevention or preparedness grants, to enable communities regularly hit by floods, earthquakes, and other disasters, to develop disaster plans, raise public awareness about disaster preparedness, and to train local response teams for the next emergency.
- Fill important gaps between relief and long-term development, such as rebuilding damaged schools and health clinics or restarting agricultural production with seeds and tools.

Since the publication of this report six years' ago, the philanthropic community has responded generously not only in the aftermath of September 11th, but also to relief and recovery efforts for

Hurricanes Rita and Katrina, the Pakistan Earthquake, and the Tsunami to name but a few of the disasters. There is evidence from the ISIM interviews that the past couple of years of particularly intense and destructive disasters have led several foundations to engage in serious discussions aimed at making their support more effective.

These recommendations are consistent with current thinking in the principal donor governments. For example, DfID's primary recommendation is for "disaster-proofing" development, which transforms "vicious spirals" of failed development, risk accumulation and disaster losses into 'virtuous spirals' of development, risk reduction and effective disaster response." Promoting disaster risk reduction is deemed essential to achieving Millennium Development Goals of economic, political and human development. Doing so, however, involves sizeable resource investments from NGOs and other delivery agents. Moreover, risk reduction is a long-term process with low visibility, with no guarantee of tangible return.

Specific recommendations put forward by the DfID report include:

- Establishing appropriate institutional arrangements for promoting disaster risk reduction within donor organizations, improving cross-sectoral communication and understanding, and drawing up new ways of working at the humanitarian-development interface.
- Creating operational guidelines and establishing training that leads to up to date assessment of disaster risk for countries and their main regions.
- Promoting risk reduction at a national level, including improving political will, looking especially at "weak and failing states", involving the media and funding research and education in disaster risk reduction.
- Evaluating progress in mainstreaming disaster risk reduction within both humanitarian and development policies and programs.

With a similar purpose, USAID uses the term "Developmental Relief" to establish the links between disaster management and its longer term consequences. The Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) in USAID has disseminated a set of eight guidelines for its programs. In summary, the points are:

- Enhance collaboration and coordination in order to avoid gaps and overlapping actions, and to use information effectively.
- Design programs that are appropriate to local conditions and respect local decision making. Promote training and capacity building.
- Recognize that it is essential for victims to restore and protect their livelihoods and to resume their capacity to generate income.
- Focus on prevention, mitigation and preparedness, which will have the effect of reducing the incidence and impact of disasters, and lesson dependence on external relief.
- Promote international standards and guidelines in disaster response and mitigation actions.
- Gather information in systematic and replicable ways so that results can be compared and be used as the bases for new strategies and needs assessments.
- Prioritize training and capacity building for local staff, NGOs, community groups and national entities.

- Incorporate local skills and capacities and utilize local experience and opinions.⁵

In addition, the United Nations is also taking a role in disaster management. In its role as a global UN system platform for disaster-related learning, the UN Disaster Management Training Program (UN DMTP) has launched the Rethinking Capacity Development for Disaster Risk Reduction Initiative. DMTP's primary project partners include UNDP's Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR), the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) and the UN System Staff College (UNSSC). It is anticipated that the initiative will run for a decade, 2005-2015. Its purpose is to identify what works and is needed for "how to" develop capacity for disaster risk reduction and convert that into common practice.

⁵ US Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, Guidelines for Proposals and Reporting, Washington, DC: OFDA, November 2004, pp. 11-13.

Key Findings

Genuine interest and commitment to disaster response among grantmakers has been prominent since September 11th 2001 and has grown stronger due to the frequency and intensity of recent disasters in the US and internationally. As noted, many of the organizations surveyed are in process of reviewing the mechanisms of funding, prioritization and decision making. We have detailed the major findings gleaned from interviews with grant makers, other donors, and grant recipients.

1. Overall value of foundation funding

Foundation and corporate grants appear to have a number of advantages over government and individual donations. The grant recipients we interviewed confirmed that they appreciated private philanthropy for many of the reasons highlighted in the Disaster Grantmaking guide of 2001: speed of funds, access to decision-makers, lighter bureaucracy and reporting requirements, and provision of multi-year funding.

In particular, foundation funds are appreciated because they are allocated in a timely way. Grantees often told us that foundations provided the first infusion of funds after a major disaster and allowed the agency to set up operations. Foundations also support disaster management projects of longer duration, of 18 to 24 months rather than the typical 6 –12 months of governmental/ international institution grants. The grants tend to be more flexible than is the case with government funding, allowing the recipient organizations to fill gaps. Foundation donors have a clearer understanding than individual donors of the need to fund indirect costs such as training, recruitment, and monitoring and evaluation.

Moreover, decisions by foundations are less subject to political and media pressures (although these and other considerations do affect decision making, as elaborated below). Foundations have provided support towards relief operations in some largely forgotten emergencies in countries that receive little attention from government donors.

2. Grant making planning and priority setting

Decision-making process varies substantially

The decision-making processes for determining which disaster to support, the level of funding to provide, and the delivery mechanism to use are, by and large, ad hoc. The grant-makers think seriously about the issues, make an effort to gather information about the situations, call on disaster expertise and display high levels of commitment to the disaster relief area. Nevertheless, while they are keen to use money effectively, few have — or wish to establish — standard procedures for determining what they will do and under what conditions they will or will not take action. One foundation executive expressed his organization's interest in developing a rating system to test the magnitude of a particular emergency, but eventually concluded that it did not wish to be locked into a grid-system of funding. Very few foundations have explicit disaster or humanitarian assistance programs, but some have decided to make the process of disaster grantmaking more systematic because requests for funding are made intermittently, though regularly. In most cases, however, decisions tend to be made on a case by case basis.

Decisions by corporate foundations reflect a mixture of corporate aims, client bases, strategic importance of the disaster location, and employees' concerns. Corporate foundations are much more likely to support disasters which occur in regions where the companies operate (either from the production and/or the sales side), where they have clients and, especially where employees and partners have been directly affected. Corporations often match their employee contributions to relief operations. In some cases, corporations match funds spent by their customers. At the time of the Tsunami, Starbucks was about to launch a campaign for Sumatra coffee. The corporation promised that for every pound of Sumatra coffee purchased, Starbucks would donate \$2 to Indonesia relief. The funds supported programs at CARE for water purification, which was an immediate need. In order to address longer term rebuilding, Starbucks asked patrons if they wanted to give money for the Tsunami by paying extra for the food and drink they were consuming.

Corporate foundations also support activities that are close to their own areas of expertise. In addition, corporations are more likely than foundations or institutional donors to require direct involvement in the use of their funds: although they may donate staff or expertise over and above monetary resources to support this process. Some funders assess whether a disaster exceeds the normal coping capacity of the government and other responders. In effect, they tend to fund only when there is a catastrophic event.

Examples of the funding process include:

- A regional office in which a disaster has occurred assesses the disaster requirements and requests funding from the head office.
- A CEO/President personally decides to release funding for disasters (for example, for sums less than \$250,000 the president of a major private foundation can allocate funds; sums larger than this would go to the Board but could be organized quickly by telephone.)
- A small working group within a foundation or corporation decides to recommend funding a disaster, which then may require Board/ Executive approval if it is a substantial donation and/or for a less popular disaster.
- The employees of a corporation ask the corporate foundation to match funds they donate to disaster relief, triggering the corporate foundation's funding (which may be broader than the match.)
- A foundation responds to specific requests from relief and other NGOs that have established working relationships with the donor.
- A foundation provides multi-year disaster giving to a specific NGO.
- A foundation that does not generally respond to disasters provides funding in highly exceptional disasters –e.g. the Tsunami – in part because of peer pressure. The widespread outpouring of funds in general from individuals, governments and other foundations lead organizations that would not ordinarily engage in disaster related philanthropy to respond exceptionally.

The scale of the emergencies over the last five years (including September 11th, Hurricane Katrina and the Tsunami) has prompted people to generate new responses to fundraising, including establishing new funds. One such fund is the Bush-Clinton Katrina fund, established by former Presidents Bush and Clinton in Fall 2005. The fund was set up with very clear

objectives, to fund three states – Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi – to rebuild higher education colleges, houses of worship, and state capacity. Over \$128 million of funds were raised by the time of interview, exceeding the \$100 million fundraising target. It is unusual in a number of ways: not merely the size and speed of its fundraising, but also because 45% of the funds came from 10 donations, including \$25m from the Government of Kuwait and \$15 m from the Wal-Mart Corporation. In addition, its structure is unusual as it lies somewhere on a spectrum between recipients and grantmakers, as it both raises and disperses funds, and does not implement its own projects. Even more atypical, the fund is expected to close after a year, or by early 2007 at the latest, reflecting the presidents’ belief that the organization should only be a short-term solution to prompt recovery in the three states.

In another example of innovative funding, the Van Leer Foundation has established a trust fund through For Your Child, located in Tamil Nadu which is a disaster prone area. That trust fund earns interest, and the interest can be used for direct assistance to children affected by HIV/AIDS or affected by disaster. For Your Child has asked permission from the Foundation to use interest from the trust fund for training in disaster management and preparation, and for building a model for disaster preparedness.

Giving is substantial in both cash and in-kind terms

Philanthropic giving for disasters is substantial, both in terms of absolute sums given and in terms of the frequency of allocation. The spreadsheet collated for the project included over \$1.1 billion given in cash to disasters, another \$70 million in employee matching contributions and millions more in in-kind contributions. Frequently, substantial in-kind contributions were made in addition to cash contributions. In-kind contributions included \$45 million in pharmaceuticals from Pfizer for the Tsunami, and \$10 million from the Grocery Manufacturers Association in food products to supplement a \$14 million cash donation in response to Hurricane Katrina. Corporations also contribute indirectly. For example, after the Gujarat earthquake, Citigroup waived all fees in remitting funds from diaspora Indians to relief agencies.

Decision on recipients is largely driven by established relationships

Most foundations donated money to organizations with which they already had an established working relationship or to an organization, such as the Red Cross, with a great deal of public visibility. A number of grantmakers will only fund organizations that already have a presence in the disaster-affected areas. In other cases, the foundation initiates funding for a particular disaster because the work of existing grantees has been affected by the crisis. In effect, the foundation is protecting its investment by providing disaster relief. Once an NGO grantee had established a relationship with a donor built upon reliable performance and trust, the foundation is likely to channel resources to that organization. The NGOs are then prized advisers for the philanthropy officers, alerting them to crises, specifying the needs, and identifying local partners in the field. Established relationships have been established between Amgen and Direct Relief, Citigroup and the Pan American Development Foundation, Kresge Foundation and CARE, Starbucks and CARE, Mercy Corps and the Red Cross for example.

The Red Cross receives major funding from foundations for both international and domestic emergencies, but some interviewees expressed their disenchantment with its recent performance.

There has been an effort to revitalize the Corporate Advisory Council to the American Red Cross to promote improved dialogue between corporations and the Red Cross, particularly so corporations can share their human resources with the Red Cross societies at the local level. One corporate foundation leader expressed the view that the Red Cross also needs to establish formal relationships with other NGOs and religious organizations since the Red Cross has not had the capacity to respond effectively through its own chapters to emergencies throughout the country. He referenced the large number of chapters in Ohio relative to the very few on the Gulf Coast. When an organization relies on volunteers, and those volunteers are not available, he concluded, “Everything breaks down.”

For the Tsunami, organizations tended to split their donations among four or five major international relief agencies, most of which contracted out services to smaller, localized NGOs. Another observable trend for the Tsunami was support for a major international relief NGO, supplemented with support for a number of regional or local NGOs.

None of the donors interviewed spoke of systematically reviewing the qualifications of a wide range of agencies in selecting where to channel their funds so long as their normal partners seemed to be performing well. From the perspective of humanitarian and disaster management agencies seeking support, but lacking corporate contacts, the system can seem quite closed. Indeed one agency noted that it had hired a staff member specifically tasked to build funding networks with corporations.

The absorptive capacity of NGOs is a further consideration in funding decisions. Some foundations slowed down the allocation of funds for Tsunami relief because they determined that the agencies to receive the funds would not be able to spend all of the funding for the original purposes. The reserved funds would be spent on reconstruction when the immediate relief needs were addressed. Also fearing that they would not be able to absorb all of the available funds for Tsunami relief, some NGOs asked donors to contribute to other emergencies.

For their part, grant recipients sometimes prefer sourcing funds from smaller private and corporate foundations rather than large private foundations because of ease of access to decision-makers and the minimal administrative processes required to receive funding. Some NGOs make a point of building relationships with foundations in their own geographic region. For example, World Vision focuses attention on foundations in the Pacific Northwest, building on its own location in Seattle. Some recipients observed, however, that funding from major foundations – such as the Gates Foundation – allows them to leverage grants. Smaller foundations tend to follow the lead assuming that the major foundation has done the pre-requisite due diligence.

Recipients also favor working in partnership with a core portfolio of foundations, and most of these contacts are at the headquarters level rather than a regional or local level. This enables flexibility, improves the speed of generating funds, and raising funds for ‘forgotten’ disasters. For example, the IRC note that the Star Foundation and the Gates Foundation have especially provided funds for regions or programs where there are funding gaps. Once donors provide initial funding for a specific disaster, it is also easier to secure secondary funding for the same emergency, which could incorporate reconstruction. In certain disasters, many of these partner organizations will automatically approach the NGO, which minimizes staff time required for fundraising.

Less Visible Disasters and Longer Term Commitments

Complex humanitarian disasters have been less amply funded than natural disasters. Corporate foundations appear particularly reluctant to commit their funds to manmade disasters, particularly when conflict and political instability are key causes of the emergency. A number of factors appear to contribute to this: the politicization of various complex humanitarian emergencies, the lack of a client base or business presence in those locations, and concern about the long-term intractable nature of some of these events. Another possible explanation is the perception that governments rather than private sector donors should attend to conflict-related humanitarian emergencies. Although private foundations are less constrained by political or client considerations in this context, they too appear to be wary of funding long-term humanitarian emergencies on the same scale as natural emergencies.

To be sure, there are exceptions to these trends: the Gates Foundation routinely provides funding in complex humanitarian emergencies. Boeing Corporation has funded a number of humanitarian emergencies, including the Niger famine, post-terrorist activities of 9/11, Madrid and Bali; Sudan and Northern Uganda. Altria Group has a humanitarian giving category that allows it the flexibility to fund disasters such as Darfur. Several private foundations made a point of funding humanitarian operations in Darfur and the Democratic Republic of Congo when it appeared that tsunami relief funding might divert funding from these long-suffering hot spots.

Recipients counter donor emphasis on natural disasters by working closely with trusted corporate and foundation partners, raising awareness of projects that are under-funded and which do not benefit from media attention. However, some grantees pointed out that the type of disaster matters less than whether any given disaster is seen as a 'crisis'. As a crisis is a trigger point for funding, it is easier to raise funds in the acute stage of an emergency than in longer-term protracted emergencies.

Some efforts have also been made to avoid possible donor fatigue setting in when there are recurrent crises. After the sizeable outpouring for the Tsunami and Hurricanes Katrina/Rita, there were concerns that insufficient attention would be paid to the earthquake in Pakistan. Corporate attention to the earthquake materialized thanks to a request made at the very highest level: In this instance, funding was raised primarily through the President's Relief Fund. This initiative warrants attention as an effective mechanism and possible precedent for other responses:

In November 2005, following the October earthquake in Pakistan/India, the Bush administration announced the creation of a South Asia Earthquake Fund, under the leadership of five corporate CEOs: General Electric, UPS, Pfizer, Xerox and Citigroup. Rather than creating a new 501c3, these CEOs decided to operate under the umbrella of the Committee to Encourage Corporate Philanthropy, CECF. The corporate partners took responsibility for paying administrative and other costs associated with the effort. The CEOs devoted considerable time to consultation, coordination efforts and mobilizing funds from other corporations. In the end about 55 companies contributed to relief funds, in many instances going over their budget allocations in so doing.

There is little doubt that the project brought in many times the funds that otherwise would have been forthcoming for Pakistan earthquake victims. This was not an area with which US-based

enterprises have had large business interests. Beginning with \$4.5 million for immediate disaster relief distributed by five international NGOs with experience working in Pakistan, the same corporations then channeled some \$12 million for reconstruction of educational and health facilities. These funds went primarily to a Pakistani poverty alleviation fund.⁶ The corporate leaders have been coordinating their actions with each other and in cooperation with both the US government and the government of Pakistan. The project will encompass two years of on-the-ground monitoring of outcomes and impacts, to be overseen by the Bechtel Corporation.

A few of the private foundations have made it a priority to use funds for filling gaps in disaster management support. The Hewlett Foundation focuses on what it describes as semi-forgotten disasters such as malaria epidemics; the Ford Foundation has supported assistance in humanitarian disasters such as Bosnia and Darfur; and the Gates Foundation has consistently provided funding in largely forgotten emergencies and those taking place in unpopular countries (for example, North Korea and Iran). Kresge Foundation funded inland projects after the Tsunami after concluding that most funding was going to coastline areas. The MacArthur Foundation, following advice from its major recipient partner, CARE, made grants to the Democratic Republic of Congo and to Darfur at a time when most giving was directed to the Tsunami. After September 11th, it provided funding to ACLU for civil rights support, to Human Rights Watch for its work uncovering terrorism and US anti-terrorism and so on. The Kellogg Foundation initiated consultations with the service organizations it had funded for Hurricane Katrina relief about the need to promote more effective grass roots leadership, a perceived gap during and following the Hurricane. Enlisting community foundations in this effort, Kellogg hopes the process will lead to new ideas about health and educational services in the region.

Disaster management rarely a core part of organization's philanthropic activity

As noted above, disasters are episodic, albeit persistent. For this reason, grant-makers do not usually consider disaster management to be a core part of their philanthropic activity and this reinforces the tendency toward *ad hoc* decision making. Corporate and private foundation officers interviewed expressed interest in linking their support for disasters to their other philanthropic interests. The Packard Foundation, for example, provided substantial funding to a consortium of NGOs to respond to reproductive health needs in emergencies via their ongoing population program. Several corporate leaders noted that they have established disaster response teams to help their own staff in case of emergencies, and they saw these teams as having expertise that could be shared with disaster relief agencies. Nevertheless, disaster philanthropy tends to be treated as a one-off relief effort unconnected to other organization activities. This being the case, the foundation staff note they have a hard time justifying a longer-term comprehensive view of disaster management, which would incorporate capacity building and disaster mitigation.

3. Funding patterns: relief, prevention, reconstruction and capacity building.

The vast majority of disaster management funding goes to emergency relief. Reconstruction receives generous funding but, for the most part, it is channeled to those entities with which the grant makers have been working, so that these entities will be able continue their previous work.

⁶ CECF Press release July, 2006, "South Asia Earthquake Relief Fund."

Foundation spokespersons indicated there could be more scope for disaster mitigation and preparedness given the intensity of disasters in the recent past. A representative of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) summarized the overall state of grantmaking, observing that both humanitarian and natural disasters are funded much less systematically than development. This causes substantial unpredictability of funds for NGOs and others working in the disaster management arena. This problem is compounded by extensive variation in philanthropic giving trends over a comparatively short period of time. For example, the need for protection has been recognized over recent years, whilst shelter, a major component of disaster management, has been seriously neglected for over twenty years. Likewise, certain countries or regions that are well-funded in one year frequently fail to receive adequate funding in subsequent years even if the need continues.

Emergency relief is the grant-maker priority, especially for corporations

Emergency relief receives the bulk of grant-making funds. Corporations and foundations frequently support disaster relief efforts even in instances where there are no evident links to the foundation or corporation. The best example of this was the widespread support for Tsunami relief from organizations that had neither a client base nor any existing programs in the affected areas.

Funding can be generous and swift, with substantial donations mobilized within 24 hours at times. This is particularly likely when there is substantial media coverage, as in Hurricane Katrina and the Tsunami. While some corporate and foundation officers interviewed undertook needs assessment prior to launching a disaster response (as recommended in “Disaster Grant making: A Practical Guide for Foundations and Corporations.”⁷) and investigated what other agencies were already doing, the majority acknowledged doing relatively little to assess specific disaster needs or ongoing responses prior to making their donations. As noted above, the common practice is to rely on advice from preferred partners or to regularly support the work of the Red Cross and other major relief networks.

According to grantees, the foundation funding for emergency relief operations is particularly useful because of the timeliness of the grants. In many high profile emergencies, foundation funds are allocated and distributed within days, whereas government funds may not be disbursed for months. The foundation funding allows NGOs to set up operations, hire staff, buy and ship supplies and undertake other life-saving activities. Grantees uniformly stated that having access to such funding in less visible, but often equally urgent, disasters would be one of the most important contributions that foundations could make to disaster management. Several NGOs recommended that foundations establish accounts from which the relief organizations could draw down in the initial emergency so that they would not have to request separate funding in each instance. AT&T Foundation funds such a multi year disaster fund set up by the American Red Cross to enable local chapters to draw down from central funds rather than have to raise money to respond to local disasters. Vodafone has provided multi year funding to the International Federation of the Red Cross.

⁷ European Foundation Centre and the Council on Foundations, “Disaster Grantmaking: A Practical Guide for Foundations and Corporations”, 2001.

As mentioned above, contributions are usually in cash, and cash is viewed to be the most useful for local disaster response. However, in some circumstances, in-kind contributions from companies prove invaluable – e.g. telephones and computers, food, medicines. This also provides an opportunity for certain organizations to link their disaster response to their overall company mission in a very tangible way.

Disaster prevention, mitigation and emergency preparedness are under-funded

NGO respondents repeatedly emphasized the need for more attention to disaster risk reduction activities. They reported, however, that it is hard to persuade donors – corporate, corporate or private foundations – to fund prevention work. In part, this is a terminology problem – both Oxfam and Concern raised the issue that grant-makers do not always understand what ‘prevention’ and ‘mitigation’ actually mean in concrete terms.

In fact, the research team found few examples of corporate funding for disaster prevention and risk reduction, and relatively little awareness of the benefits of these activities in the general public. The grantees appeared correct in stating that disaster prevention and mitigation are not well-understood and have remained substantially under-funded despite cost-benefit analyses that show disaster prevention to be cost efficient and important in reducing serious human suffering and economic loss.

This leads to a ‘vicious spiral’: because funds for prevention cannot be raised easily, NGOs do not operate enough in this area, therefore there are fewer successful case stories to act as leverage for funding. This perpetuates the cycle of under-funding. Recipients find this frustrating and wasteful of monetary and human resources: Concern calculated that it would have taken 1 US dollar per person to avoid malnutrition in Niger; instead it cost 80 US dollars per person to deal with the problem which is clearly expensive in monetary and human terms.

Some traditional development agencies also see the need for greater emphasis on prevention and mitigation. Habitat for Humanity, for example, is increasing its work in this area as it believes it is strategically important to do so, pointing out that there is little logic in rebuilding homes in disaster-prone areas without ensuring longer-term sustainability of communities and infrastructure. Since the Tsunami, they note that disaster mitigation efforts have escalated, especially in India. However, in spite of increased donor interest in the area, this has not been matched by substantive amounts of new funding or new projects in the field.

Experts interviewed for the project also pointed out the need for expanded focus on disaster preparedness. The Fritz Institute, for example, pointed out that emergency preparedness includes, but is much wider than, stockpiling supplies and should be an important area for foundation funding. More systematic needs assessment than is currently undertaken is required to manage emergencies effectively and with minimum loss of life.

Some donors do focus on disaster preparedness. At least one foundation executive was emphatic in stating that grantmakers should re-focus on preparedness because their resources were not sufficient to make a large difference in relief activities, but they could help establish capacities to respond more effectively. A corporate foundation supports pre-positioning of core supplies needed to address disasters throughout Latin America. The warehouse has tents, cots, water, etc. When the supplies are depleted, the corporation replenishes the warehouse. The standby capacity

proved very effective in responding to Hurricane Mitch. The same foundation funded rebuilding of schools in a way that would allow them to withstand future hurricanes and serve as shelters if an evacuation was needed. The foundation decided, however, that mandating preparedness/mitigation in the Tsunami context didn't seem appropriate because it was unlikely there would be another tsunami of that magnitude in those areas for decades if not centuries.

One grantee has received yearly funding from several foundations in support of its Emergency Response Team (ERT), which is a standby capacity to respond quickly to acute disasters. The piece that is often missing, though, is support for planning, training and coordination—what is needed to make sure that the ERT is able to function effectively. According to the NGO, it is difficult for donors to grasp the need for regular training and backstopping of the ERT members and other standby personnel. They assume that the staff members already are doing jobs that should prepare them for the emergency response, whereas it is necessary to have them train together and hone their skills.

In some cases, corporate foundations have used their own crisis management models to help them identify how best to help others cope with a disaster. During the immediate aftermath of the Tsunami, British Petroleum established a London-based crisis team to assess what was needed and do some out of the box thinking about how BP could be useful to the relief effort. The team had representatives from various regional offices as well as two crisis management people based in London. The team included staff who are on call to deal with internal crises—oil spills, refinery fires, etc. and they used these skills to assess the Tsunami's impact. A similar model was used when Hurricanes Katrina and Rita hit the Gulf Coast.

Capacity building of humanitarian organizations

Few donors prioritize capacity building of humanitarian organizations, in part because it is viewed as supporting the internal management costs of NGOs. By contrast, grantees gave very high priority to capacity building as an area in which foundations could make a difference. In reality, NGOs suffer from lack of capacity in many areas, as has been made evident in the aftermath of the Tsunami and in the US in the Gulf Area. Even large NGOs cannot easily recruit sufficient numbers of the engineers, logistic managers, water specialists, health specialists likely to be needed in particular disaster situations. For local organizations, the gaps are wider still.

NGOs report different approaches in terms of capacity building. First, in some cases, capacity building activities, such as training, are separately funded and organized as specific projects. In other cases, capacity building components are included within the overall disaster project, as an integral part of relief or recovery activities. Many international NGOs work with community-based groups to build local capacity, using local affiliated networks where appropriate.

It is worth noting that some corporations and foundations are more sympathetic than individual donors to the need for building effective capacity and expanding staff expertise capabilities. Individual donors often insist upon low overhead costs, as measured by magazine indexes, sometimes to the detriment of the programs being undertaken. One foundation executive stated that he prefers to provide general support to NGOs undertaking relief operations, rather than earmarking funds for direct services to beneficiaries. In this way, the foundation funding can cover essential activities, such as staff recruitment and training, assessment and evaluation, which are not supported by governments and individual donors. Another foundation has a

commitment to training NGOs in organizational management and fund raising. Vodaphone has provided capacity building grants to Telecoms sans Frontieres, MapAction and Oxfam, in addition to its multi year support for the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

The Lilly Endowment allocated \$4.6 million for training of staff and volunteers in such NGOs as the Salvation Army. The funds were used to develop materials, guidelines and to encourage co-operation, and brought the Red Cross, United Way and FEMA into the plan. It has also provided funds to Red Cross for the establishment of a web-based platform which can be mobilized in case of disaster and allow victims to input needs and personal information, The data would be available to all assistance agencies, which would note the assistance provided and to whom. The aim is to prevent duplication and cover people who otherwise might fall between the cracks.

Bristol Myers Squibb, through its HIV/AIDS programs, combines distribution of medicines with extensive training for NGOs, local universities and community groups. Resource strapped health officials have been taught to manufacture essential HIV/AIDS drugs at a fraction of what is normally charged by Bristol Myers Squibb. Such pro bono work buttresses corporate images in affected communities. Corporations could have a particularly important role in transferring to local NGOs some in-house skills related to logistics management.

Grantees often mentioned their need for better data, research and analysis to improve disaster management. They also noted the need for better trained personnel, often lacking in a field that relies on volunteers but faces recurrent problems that require professional responses. The Mellon Foundation had been a principal supporter of education, training and research on refugee and humanitarian emergencies but its program has come to an end, leaving a gap that a number of grantees cited. The NGOs stated that they had benefited from collaborations with universities and research programs that helped the practitioners to assess needs, monitor progress in addressing the needs, evaluate the impact of programs, and bring new perspectives and information to the attention of those working on disaster management.

While the capacity of international NGOs needs to be expanded, even greater problems face local relief organizations. In a previous assessment that the authors undertook for the Gates Foundation, we identified a number of priorities for local capacity building in developing countries:

- The importance of providing education for and training of developing country personnel in NGOs and government agencies to engage in disaster relief activities, including developing management expertise to guide institutions engaged in disaster responses.
- The need for early warning of humanitarian emergencies, coupled with existing emergency preparedness to enable local organizations to respond as swiftly and effectively as possible.
- The need for disaster mitigation strategies and behavioral changes to reduce the likelihood of high mortality and morbidity during humanitarian emergencies.
- Optimal cooperation and coordination of relief and development agencies to ensure a smooth transition from disaster responses to longer-term reconstruction and development.
- Monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of services provided during various stages of disaster responses.
- Raising and managing funds required to engage in timely and effective disaster relief activities.

- Establishing partnerships between developing and developed country non-governmental and academic institutions to promote greater capacity in developing countries.

Reconstruction and development

The transition from relief to reconstruction is an important phase of disaster management, but it is one that presents great challenges. While some NGOs engage in both relief and recovery activities, others focus on reconstruction (and the transition to development) and therefore enter the disaster management spectrum at a later point in time. Money can be difficult to raise for reconstruction projects, particularly when the donor community is focusing on this year's crisis and has lost sight of the longer term needs of those affected by last year's emergency. There is often a shortfall unless so much funding is raised, as in the case of the Tsunami, that there are resources left over when the relief phase is over. In most cases, institutional funding – especially government and UN funding – is a critical source of backstopping to top-up reconstruction projects. This is an anomaly when compared with other trends in philanthropic giving, where longer-term work such as microfinance, gender development, education and health infrastructure is being funded.

A number of foundations do emphasize support for post-disaster reconstruction. The Kresge Foundation, for example, provides grants for housing, roads, recapture of agricultural lands and similar aims. After Hurricane Mitch, Kresge funded rebuilding of water systems in Central America, which included elements of disaster proofing with programs to cap wells to be able to withstand future hurricanes. Citigroup devotes major funding to rebuilding, including schools, community centers and housing. The Kellogg Foundation takes a pragmatic view of reconstruction, declaring its willingness to rebuild damaged structures and replace lost property of organizations and individuals with which it has established a prior relationship through its core programs. This, according to Kellogg, is a way of protecting the foundation's investment.

British Petroleum made a strategic decision to hold back some of its pledged funding in order to cover post-relief needs. Out of what ended up being a total fund of \$9 million for the Tsunami, for example, BP set aside \$2 million for future needs. BP has not yet spent all of it and it is assessing the best uses. BP followed the same patterns in funding for Hurricanes Katrina/Rita. BP committed \$12 million total, and set aside \$4 million for longer term needs.

4. Monitoring and evaluation

Virtually none of the donors interviewed took the view that detailed monitoring and evaluation were important where disaster relief funding is concerned. Instead, most grant makers opted for channeling large sums of money through the agencies whose work they trusted and asked these agencies for minimal information: how much money was spent, how, over what time period, etc. Both grantmakers and recipients attempt to maintain the appropriate balance between providing valuable information and minimizing excessive administrative costs or over-burdening local staff in the field with requests, which would limit their capacity to be effective in delivery. Most donors are also comfortable with receiving email and website updates, which are quicker and cheaper for recipients to provide, which can be supplemented by reports at agreed time intervals.

Requirements are likely to be more stringent for reconstruction projects and disaster prevention projects than for relief. Most donors recognize that it is important to receive information without

adding unduly to the administrative burden of recipients, or to take resource away from more important priorities in managing disasters. However, this can vary significantly: different organizations may have very different expectations of the frequency, depth and mechanisms of reporting. In general, corporations tend to require the least amount of information, followed by foundations whereas governments and other institutional donors have the most rigorous reporting requirements.

It is challenging to evaluate impacts and effectiveness of disaster response because of the urgency, the time constraints and frequent lack of control mechanisms. For different reasons, it is also difficult to evaluate the benefits of disaster mitigation because organizations must prove a counter-factual—what would have occurred in the absence of the prevention activities. Grant recipients, however, concurred that more needs to be done to evaluate the comparative costs and benefits of each, including the costs in human terms.

Moreover, the lack of integration and collaboration between NGOs affects monitoring in particular: information is rarely systematically collected in disaster sites for use by all NGOs. This means that there is duplication of effort and, worse, in duplication of funding for certain disaster components at the expense of other needs or locations.

5. Information Exchange and Collaboration

Corporations and foundations share information about disasters in a variety of ways and are concerned to learn what each other are doing. More often than not they communicate informally through telephone calls or email exchanges with peers in different organizations. But, more formal networking also takes place through the Chamber of Commerce sessions on disaster management and the Council on Foundations.

Internally, corporate donor programs and corporate foundations are strongly linked to their parent organizations and tend to provide regular updates to their employees about disaster giving. Employees may be given updates in the course of staff meetings where the NGOs and other grantees are invited to describe how they have used corporate funds. It is also noteworthy that publicity is important for corporations, as they need to satisfy employees, their clients, and protect their reputation as good corporate citizens. Recipients recognize this element, even if they do not always like it. Corporations in particular tend to publicize their philanthropic activities through their own channels, but may also require additional publicity from the recipients.

Grantees play a major role in communicating about disasters: they send briefings from the disaster zones to donors, governments and the general public, using website updates and the media. A major strength of the recipient communication is their ability to create ‘stories’ which bring the disaster to life for donors, making it more human and tangible. The speed of information may also be very quick, especially if recipients have global reach, using established networks of affiliated partners in disaster-prone areas. Yet grantees note that it is challenging to provide good quality information about emergencies in the first few hours or days: they would appreciate more flexibility in funding, and more trust from the donors to spend money wisely. As well as emergencies, recipients also work with the media to promote ‘forgotten’ disasters where possible.

However, a weakness overall in the grant recipients' communication strategy is their lack of collaboration with each other. This is understandable to some degree as NGOs frequently compete for funding from similar pools of funds. However, this lack of collaboration undermines the overall effectiveness of the assessment of disasters. This can result in patchy aid allocation, with over and under provision of aid.

Nevertheless, there was a high level of interest among both grantmakers and grantees in improving communications and cooperation. Virtually all interviewees not only wanted to receive the report, but also were interested if there were to be any follow-up activity in this area. There was an interest in creating a more systematic and more collaborative mechanism of supporting disasters.

6. Research

Many foundations and corporations use the research and good practice guides that exist in the field extensively. In addition, or instead of this, many donor organizations do their own research, including reading about the subject, talking to experts and to peers, and listening to employees' and donors' advice. In spite of this, there is a lack of systematic research into certain areas of disaster management, especially disaster prevention and capacity building. This is problematic: without empirical data, or at least reliable case studies, to demonstrate the benefits of funding these areas, they are likely to remain under-funded. It would be useful to conduct more research into this area, and especially to use forms of results-based analysis that corporations are familiar with: cost-benefit analysis is an obvious example.

Recommendations

Currently, most funding is made available for disaster relief over a comparatively short period of time and, even in the relief phase, invariably fails to cover the full range of needs, as the project team has heard from grant recipients and major disaster response agencies across the board. Sometimes the response varies by region, and assistance fails to reach specific regions or social sectors. Sometimes basic infrastructure is restored but victims lack the wherewithal to rebuild homes and livelihoods; i.e. restoring of livelihoods requires replacing tools, animals, merchandise, etc. In virtually all cases, too little attention is paid to disaster prevention and mitigation, leaving communities vulnerable to future crises.

1. Take a comprehensive approach to disaster grantmaking to focus on prevention, response and recovery

Disaster management comprises many phases and virtually everyone working in the field urges a more comprehensive approach. Corporations and foundations can play an important role in providing funds to improve prevention, response and recovery. Without diminishing the willingness of so many corporations and foundations to respond to the urgent needs of victims of disasters in a timely and generous manner, it is also very important to buttress support for disaster management beyond relief. Disaster prevention and mitigation activities can reduce the vulnerability of communities and individuals to the great harm presented by natural and manmade disasters. Disaster risk reduction includes early warning, emergency preparedness, contingency planning if regular coping mechanisms fail, land use planning, disaster-proof construction, and financial and social safety nets. In the aftermath of natural disasters and complex humanitarian emergencies, communities need extensive assistance to rebuild infrastructure, homes, businesses, and health and education facilities. Equally important are programs to help individuals and families cope with the tremendous personal losses that often accompany disasters. Natural and manmade disasters often provoke large-scale displacement as well, requiring programs for reintegration of those forced to flee or their resettlement in new locations if conditions do not permit return.

2. Support the building of capacity in humanitarian and development organizations to respond more effectively at each stage of disaster management

Grantmakers can provide critical support for capacity building activities, including needs assessments, information sharing, strategic planning, training, monitoring, assessment, and evaluation. Such capacity building is needed in the large international NGOs that respond regularly to natural disasters and complex humanitarian emergencies. Virtually all studies have underscored the importance of building capacities in disaster prone regions as well so that risks are identified, responses are appropriately targeted, affected communities are organized, and longer term measures are taken. Corporate staff located in disaster prone regions could become part of this process. Universities and research centers could be supported to expand information gathering, maintenance of up to date data bases, and country and regional analyses related to disasters and emergencies. Grantmakers should encourage collaboration between practitioners and researchers in order to strengthen disaster management.

3. Build on current collaborations among grantmakers to broaden the scope of disaster grantmaking

The need for more comprehensive approaches to disaster grantmaking suggests the need for mechanisms for collective thinking, planning and communication among donors that continue throughout the process. There is clear support among grantmakers for broader means of communication and possible cooperation among the foundations and corporations contributing to disaster response and management. There are some venues where this is already taking place as, for example, Chambers of Commerce special sessions. The South Asia Earthquake Relief Fund is an example of the effectiveness of a collective approach and long range commitment. Leadership in creating other, more inclusive venues would be welcomed. Also, bringing together donors and grantees who are presently involved in different phases of disaster management to explore criteria for involvement, appropriate partners, and the implications of commitments could spur new thinking about disaster grantmaking.

4. Expand disaster grantmaking to include complex humanitarian emergencies

The potential contributions corporations and foundations can make to complex humanitarian emergencies has scarcely been tapped. It is important to examine the reasons for bypassing opportunities to ease human suffering in these instances, and to ascertain whether resistance to giving can be addressed.

5. Adopt more transparent mechanisms to identify and assess potential grantees

Although it appears that corporations and foundations have identified partners and recipients with whom they are satisfied and whose programs they trust, it is nonetheless advisable to be able to evaluate the outcomes and impacts of the very large sums of money that are donated. It is also useful to facilitate broader contacts between appropriate potential grantees and grant recipients as yet unknown to the corporate and foundation donors.

6. Develop greater in-house knowledge and capacity about disaster management priorities and capabilities

At present, several corporations make available technologies, material and in-kind relief donations, which have been of great utility in disaster situations. Several corporations and foundations also have staff members with significant expertise that could be related to disaster prevention, response and mitigation. A few corporations are tapping into this expertise, but much more could be done. The employees of several corporations have been enthusiastic supporters of corporate donations in disasters and have contributed from their own resources. These employees would benefit from workshops, in which the challenges and opportunities of disaster management are explained.

Appendix One: Interview list

Appendix Two: Risk Spirals, DfID, 2005

Taken out so can send for now... will add in later