

Reconstructing Children's Rights

An online institute about dismantling racism, neo-colonialism,
and patriarchy in humanitarian and development efforts to
protect children and support families

MAY 2021

Ghazal Keshavarzian and Mark Canavera





Conversation #3:

Confronting Colonialism, Racism, and Patriarchy in the Children and Youth Rights Funding Ecosystem

"The power lies in the hands of the giver and right now the giver is white and elite."¹

Angela Bruce-Raeburn — Regional Advocacy Director for Africa at the Global Health Advocacy Incubator

"Power is the capacity of individuals or groups to decide who gets what, who does what, who decides what, and in international development, [the] majority of the power is concentrated with international organizations and professionals who are far removed from the contextual realities of communities."²

Srilatha Batliwala

Introduction

One of the ways that systematic racism, power imbalances, neo-colonialism, and patriarchy underpin the development and humanitarian aid architecture is through funding policies, decision-making mechanisms, and structures.³ The funding ecosystem for the humanitarian and development industries is far from neutral; rather, it is imbalanced, bureaucratic, and technocratic, skewing power towards those who already hold it and who are enabled to act in self-interest. Characteristics of imperialist and white supremacy culture, such as dominance and control, defensiveness, perfectionism, gradualism and paternalism, are evident in the way that funding is collected, disbursed, and accounted.⁴ In this respect, the fields of children and youth rights and child protection are no different from the larger development and humanitarian ecosystem in which they are situated.

Structural Power Imbalances in the Children and Youth Rights Funding Ecosystem

Within The children and youth rights funding ecosystem, power and resources are overwhelmingly consolidated in the hands of bilateral and multilateral donors (or international

-
1. [Devex Articles by Angela Bruce-Raeburn](#), Regional Advocacy Director for Africa at the Global Health Advocacy Incubator, International Development Has a Race Problem (17 May 2019).
 2. Srilantha Batliwala, All About Power: Understanding Social Power and Power Structures (CREA). Available [here](#).
 3. Lisa Cornish, "Q&A: Degan Ali on the systematic racism impacting humanitarian responses," [Devex](#), June 20, 2019. Refer to Reference List for additional resources.
 4. Edgar Villanueva, "Decolonizing Wealth: Indigenous Wisdom to Heal Divides and Restore Balance (16 October 2018). See Catherine Lizette Gonzalez (23 October 2018). "Decolonizing Wealth Addresses Philanthropy's White Supremacy Problem, Offers Solutions. ColorLines. Available [here](#). See also "PhilanthropySoWhite: An Urgent Conversation on Whiteness in Philanthropy [Panel Webinar](#) (February 19, 2021).

development agencies)⁵ and philanthropic foundations residing in North America, Europe, and other high-income countries, far removed from local communities. Analysis of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN OCHA) Financial Tracking Service of child protection in humanitarian settings found that national governments located in the Global North were the source of 51.5% of child protection funding in 2019. The main “contributing” governments were the United States, Sweden, Australia, Switzerland, and Germany.⁶ To acknowledge these governments as “contributors” whitewashes the imbalanced ways in which governments in the Global North exploit resources from the Global South, a historical reality that continues to predominate through processes including resource extraction, loans, corporate globalization, and others. It is also clear that donor funding follows post-colonial and geo-political trends.⁷

The resources flow from the international development agencies down to the large international child-focused non-governmental organizations (INGOs) and the United Nations (primarily the United Nations Children’s Emergency Fund, UNICEF) which manage and have access to resources and hold the levers of power. While there are numerous well-positioned, well-regarded locally-led civil society organizations (CSOs) and community-based organizations in settings throughout the world, they continue to receive miniscule portions of funds and play a secondary role in the global funding ecosystem. While these CSOs are far more nimble and have intimate knowledge of the community needs, these organizations are often positioned at the end of the funding chain, rather than playing a central role within it.⁸ This profound power imbalance creates a dynamic in which outsiders are perceived to know what is best for the local communities, or “beneficiaries,” even on topics as sensitive as child protection, children’s rights, child development, and family welfare.⁹

For example, analysis of the UN OCHA Financial Tracking Service of child protection in humanitarian settings found that UN agencies were the source of 18.1% of humanitarian child protection funding in 2019. Among these, UNICEF, at 95%, was overwhelmingly the principal “donor.” At the same time, the analysis of the OCHA data also found that UN agencies were

-
5. Bilateral funding is money that is given out by a single government, usually managed by national development agencies. Multilateral funding comes from numerous governments and organizations (including from multiple bilateral funders) and is usually arranged by an international organization such as the World Bank or the UN. These entities are considered mechanisms to coordinate and streamline aid from multiple sources. These definitions are referenced in AWID, *Toward a Feminist Funding Ecosystem: A Framework and Practical Guide* (September 2019) Available [here](#).
 6. Margaret Thierry (2020), *Still Unprotected: Crisis in Humanitarian Funding for Child Protection* (Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action, CP AOR Child Protection Area of Responsibility, Save the Children International), p 14. Available [here](#). Certain quotation marks were added by the briefing note authors to highlight problematic, revealing and unhelpful framing or terminology.
 7. Bernhard Reinsberg, “Do Countries Use Foreign Aid to Buy Geopolitical Influence? Evidence from Donor Campaigns for Temporary UN Security Council Seats.” *Aid Impact and Effectiveness*. Vol 7. No. 2 (2019). See also *Geopolitics of Foreign Aid* (2013). Edited by Helen V. Milner and Dustin Tingley.
 8. This has been noted by numerous scholars and academics, including Degan Ali (refer to reference above) and Jason Hart (refer to Conversation #2 reference list).
 9. Srilantha Batliwala, *All About Power: Understanding Social Power and Power Structures* (CREA). Available [here](#).

the recipients of 64.3% of estimated humanitarian child protection funding in 2019.¹⁰ Within UN agencies, UNICEF is the main recipient, “with 98.5% of the funding going to UN agencies and an equivalent of 63.4% of all funding for child protection.”¹¹ As the same report highlights: “It is interesting to note that US\$27 million is recorded as both sourced from UNICEF and received by UNICEF. It is unfortunately not possible to examine how funds received by UNICEF are then disbursed to other implementing partners, however UNICEF is a significant donor for national and local NGOs.”¹² The second largest recipients are international NGOs (INGOs), which receive 29.5% of humanitarian child protection funding. Two INGOs account for the bulk of child protection funding to NGOs: Save the Children (47%) and Terre des Hommes – Lausanne (10.5%). The same analysis found that national and local NGOs were recipients of a measly 3% of humanitarian child protection funding in 2019.¹³

Bilateral and multilateral agencies rely on implementation partnerships to distribute funds to UNICEF and INGOs as partners that promote the respective agencies’ child protection and children rights goals. The large INGOs or UN agencies, who act as government contractors, may then re-grant to smaller local or community-based organizations to carry out the goals. But there is very little accountability and transparency with these partnerships as the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and other bilateral donors do not systematically track how these large government contractors partner with their sub-grantees.¹⁴ While there may be some alignment with the local partners’ goals and projects, the local partners are not fully defining the programs and needs of the community, a misalignment that has been documented extensively.¹⁵ And, a recent survey of 35 international development CSOs, found that more than two-thirds of the CSOs were regularly removed from promised work that was awarded to the government contractors.¹⁶ Donors’ increasingly restrictive compliance and due diligence requirements may also be extremely difficult or in some cases impossible for local organizations, to uphold, particularly those that want to remain organic and unregistered entities.¹⁷ The increasingly narrow remits around bilateral and multilateral funding and grants, including the lack of funding for core operations, results in fewer opportunities and limits the scope for organizations to exercise creativity and generate innovation.¹⁸

10. Thierry (2020), p 15

11. *Ibid.*

12. *Ibid.*

13. *Ibid.*

14. Walker Kerr and Maya Guzdar, “USAID’s Big Contracts Don’t Pay Off: American foreign aid needs to go smaller, smarter deals,” *Foreign Policy* (May 18, 2021). Available [here](#).

15. Bill Cooke & Uma Kothari (2001), *Participation: The New Tyranny*. Available [here](#).

16. Walker Kerr and Maya Guzdar (2021).

17. Elevate Children Funders Group Secretariat, Keshavarzian. G., Carrol. A. (2019). Pulling Back the Curtain: What Do Non-Funders Think are the Key Challenges, Needs, Gaps and Opportunities in Supporting Children and Young People Facing Adversity? Available [here](#). See also AWID 2019 for similar findings in the women’s rights ecosystem.

18. Elevate Children Funders Group Secretariat, Keshavarzian. G., Carrol. A. (2019). Pulling Back the Curtain: What Do Non-Funders Think are the Key Challenges, Needs, Gaps and Opportunities in Supporting Children and Young People Facing Adversity? Available [here](#).

In general, institutional funders promote funding mechanisms and modalities that are restrictive in form—including reporting and accounting requirements unattainable for many organizations—and in function, especially those that are linked either explicitly or implicitly to various nations’ geopolitical interests. Funding is rooted in power rather than trust, ultimately not reaching the needs of the communities and not reaching the local organizations doing the work. Donors and policymakers continue to fail to prioritize long-term investments to achieve better outcomes for children and young people.

Recent reports have flagged the deficiencies and ineffectiveness of the bilateral aid system. For example, in a 2019 report, the Office of Inspector General of USAID found that over a three-year period only 43% of USAID’s awards achieved approximately half of their projected results. The report called for USAID to reform its business model.¹⁹ As a recent article highlighted, “To right the ship, USAID needs a procurement renaissance. It must break its dependence on large and inefficient government contractors, increase its use of pay-for-results programs, and scale up initiatives that make it easier for small and medium-sized enterprises and organizations based in low- and middle-income countries to do business with the world’s largest development organizations.”²⁰ In the face of such proposed reforms, large government contractors have unsurprisingly obstructed reforms over the years, and change remains slow and halting.²¹

The power imbalances are further exacerbated within the children rights funding ecosystem since the funders (donor governments and philanthropy) tend to take assistencialist, adultist, charity-based, service-oriented and siloed approaches.²² Funding is generally allocated across different silos and focused on single issues, vertical programming or pet projects, rather than community-based, holistic, long-term, systems-focused, and intersectional approaches. Funding is allocated along short-term timelines and project cycles. Children’s funders “still behave like charity, giving aid to symptomatic issues, rather than acting as a force for addressing and unpacking the systematic cause of social, cultural, creative and environmental ills.”²³ Similar to the women’s rights funding ecosystem, “funding structures keep... programs isolated from any possibility of collective political action.”²⁴ The children’s rights field has “largely avoided investing in children’s power or in the justice work required to make many children’s rights real”²⁵ and ignored taking an intersectional approach to racial justice, social justice, and children’s and youth’s rights. All of these limitations have further depoliticized the children’s rights space and stripped children, families, and communities of their respective agency and

19. Office of Inspector General U.S. Agency for Inspector General, “USAID’s Award Oversight is Insufficient to Hold Implementers Accountable for Achieving Results.” Audit report 9-000-19-006-P (September 25, 2019).

20. Walker Kerr and Maya Guzdar (2021).

21. *Ibid.*

22. Gomez, et al. (2021). *Shifting the Field: Philanthropy’s role in strengthening child- and youth-led community rooted groups*. [Elevate Children Funders Group \(ECFG\)](#). *Ibid.*

23. Lani Evans (2015) *Participatory Philanthropy: A Report for the Winston Churchill*. Available [here](#).

24. Kate Cronin-Furman, Nimmi Gowrinathan, and Rafia Zakaria, “Emissaries of Empowerment” White Paper (The City College of New York: September 2017)

25. Ramatu Bangura, “Children’s Rights Work Often Fails to Address Racism and other Root Causes. A New Fund Aims to Change That.” [Perspectives by Tides](#), March 9, 2021.

decision-making power. While this approach in funding may provide short-term relief –that is band-aid solutions – they generally do not provide long-term, sustainable solutions and instead perpetuate a culture of dependency.²⁶

The private sector is a relatively new, but rapidly rising actor in the funding ecosystem. Venture capitalists and private sector companies have a growing role and interest in children's rights and investments with UNICEF and international child-focused NGOs.²⁷ Corporate donors are playing a problematic role in the children's and youth's rights space due to their sources of revenue (including petroleum and other fossil fuels, alcohol, pharmaceuticals and junk food) and potential adverse impacts on children and the communities they live in. These corporations use and legitimize their power through their philanthropic giving and partnerships.²⁸ Hence, some corporations are simultaneously fueling a detrimental public health, social and environmental impact on children and communities while promoting "corporate social responsibility" initiatives to boost their public images. Investments for children can often serve as a smokescreen for the real long-term damage that such corporations are doing. "Due diligence" initiatives for resource extraction companies that are purported to reduce child labor do not actually examine the entire supply chain and have a spotty history of reducing child labor. Again, much of the work is promoting the visibility of having done something; rather than structural work at critical junctures along the supply chain.²⁹

*"There's a weird way in which power operates among white leaders in philanthropy. Because it's a paradox. On the one hand, there's quite a bit of power and the exercising of it. But there's this sort of fragility when it comes to exercising power in the direction of structural change in our sector. Where you have folks that are sitting right next to the lever of incredible resources and decision-making power and could transform it... and feel kind of impotent or somehow unable to use it or make a decision not to use it. I think that folks need to step up to use it and start using it and getting comfortable with discomfort."*³⁰

Vanessa Daniel, Executive Director of Groundswell Fund

26. ECFG 2019, p14.

27. Joachim Theis (2018), The State of International Children's Rights (CPC Learning Network). Available [here](#).

28. Jason Hart (4 April 2016), TedTalk: Reclaiming Compassion, Rethinking Aid. Available [here](#). Also refer to the Institute's Conversation #2.

29. Danny Zane, Julie Irwin and Rebecca Walker Reczek, "Why Companies are Blind to Child Labor," [Harvard Business Review](#) (January 28, 2016). See also Laurie Sadler Lawrence, "The Spoiled Supply Chain of Child Labor," *The Palgrave International Handbook of Human Trafficking*, pp 371-382 (31 October 2019). Available [here](#). Ambika Zutshi, Andrew Creed, Amrik Sohal, "Child Labor and Supply Chain: Profitability or (Mis)management," *European Business Review* (16 January 2009).

30. This is quote is in response to the question - What advice she would give to white leaders in philanthropy? - during [#PhilanthropySoWhite](#) panel discussion. Cited in AWID, *Toward a Feminist Funding Ecosystem: A Framework and Practical Guide* (September 2019), p.12-13. Available [here](#).

Reforming the Structural Power Imbalances in the Children and Youth Rights Funding Ecosystem

Recognizing these inequities and power imbalances in the system, there has been a small but growing chorus of activists and scholars calling for reforming the international funding aid structures, to localize and shift resources and power into the hands of the communities, including children and young people.³¹

For example, in 2016, as part of the Grand Bargain promise, international donors and large humanitarian aid organizations committed to directly sending 25% of humanitarian aid funding to local and national organizations by 2020. However, the international community has failed to uphold this promise, and rather than increasing direct funding to local organizations, the funding has declined from 3.5% in 2016 to 2.1% in 2020.³² While the Grand Bargain called for 25% of local funding to go to local organizations, only 3% of humanitarian child protection funding goes down to the local level, as discussed above.³³ Many have noted that localization has failed due to the fact that those situated in the Global North continued to control the aid structures and objectives and did not allow for the recipients to take control of their own agenda. Hence, the international organizations continue to hold decision-making power rooted in their culture of power and dominance, rather than reflecting the different ways that local groups wanted to organize to respond to the needs that they had determined as priorities. Rather than using power to lift other organizations up and reconstruct the children and youth rights funding ecosystem, power is used to keep the system in place and to continue to dictate, rather than listen to local organizations and communities, including children and young people.³⁴

In philanthropy, there has been an increased awareness and a push by private foundations to diversify their organizations and decolonize their funding mechanisms, by giving more funding and power to local, grassroots organizations, activists, and movements.³⁵ Over the last decade, there has been a growth in intermediary organizations³⁶ and innovative funding mechanisms, which are rooted in new forms of leadership, trust-based participatory grant-making, and more

31. Edgar Villanueva, "Decolonizing Wealth: Indigenous Wisdom to Heal Divides and Restore Balance (16 October 2018). Lisa Cornish, "Q&A: Degan Ali on the systematic racism impacting humanitarian responses," [Devex](#), June 20, 2019. Refer to Reference List for additional resources.

32. The Editorial Board, "[Foreign Aid is Having a Reckoning](#)," New York Times (February 13, 2021).

33. Thierry (2020), p 15.

34. Themrise Khan, "Who Speaks for the Global South Recipients of Aid? [Global Dashboard](#) (7 July 2020); Hugo Slim, "Is racism part of our reluctance to localise humanitarian action?" [Humanitarian Practice Network](#) (June 5, 2020); "PhilanthropySoWhite: An Urgent Conversation on Whiteness in Philanthropy [Panel Webinar](#) (February 19, 2021).

35. "PhilanthropySoWhite: An Urgent Conversation on Whiteness in Philanthropy [Panel Webinar](#) (February 19, 2021).

36. The term "intermediary organization" has no single, accepted definition in international philanthropy. Some grant-makers prefer "funding partner," or simply "partner," to reflect the importance of collaboration in the relationship. Grant Craft defines "intermediary" as an organization (not an individual) that provides specialized expertise to foundations and other donors, in particular through the regranteeing of funds to organizations and projects. For more information visit these articles: <https://grantcraft.org/content/case-studies/working-with-intermediaries/> or <https://www.philanthropy-impact.org/article/what-philanthropic-intermediaries-bring-table>

flexible funding procedures (e.g., Purposeful, Children's Rights Innovation Fund, Children's Rights and Violence Prevention Fund, Youth, Peace and Security Fund). Rather than framing children and communities as passive beneficiaries, these new funding mechanisms are making them the agents of change and amplifying the work and activism of children, young people, families, and communities. While there have been some incremental promising changes, such as the abovementioned funds, systematic change in donor giving continues to be slow and poorly resourced, and positive examples of drastic change are scarce.

This session's speakers will discuss the funding ecosystem's challenges and barriers and highlight examples of how innovative funding mechanisms are reinventing donor giving by shifting resources and power closer to the children, young people, families, and communities they are meant to support. This session will look back at what has gone wrong but, more importantly, will look forward by giving us solutions and hope for change.



Speaker Biographies

Dr. Ramatu Bangura is leading the design and inception of the [Children's Rights Innovation Fund](#) (CRIF). Prior to CRIF, Ramatu previously served as a Program Officer for the NoVo Foundation's Advancing Adolescent Girls' Rights initiative, where she co-led strategy development and grant-making to advance philanthropy's largest portfolio working to advance the rights, leadership and well-being of adolescent girls in the United States and in the Global South. Ramatu has spent the last 25 years working with and on behalf of adolescent girls in New York City, Washington DC, and as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Costa Rica. She has engaged in organizing, advocacy and research on a host of issues impacting transnational girls, including early and forced marriage, sexual violence, trafficking, commercial sexual exploitation, and educational access for English Language Learners. Ramatu earned both a Masters of Education (EdM) and Doctorate of Education (EdD) in International and Transcultural Studies at Teachers College, Columbia University. Her dissertation, *In Pursuit of Success: The Educational Identities and Decision-making of African Girls with Limited Formal Schooling*, utilized African feminism to examine how immigrant girls with limited formal schooling navigate American schools, and make decisions about college and marriage. Ramatu is committed to decolonizing philanthropic practices to ensure that those most impacted by structural violence and oppression are afforded the tools to create a world where all are safe, seen and celebrated.





Speaker Biographies

Fassil W. Marriam has more than 20 years of experience working with disadvantaged children, youth, families, and communities. He is the founder and executive director of the [Children's Rights and Violence Prevention Fund \(CRVPF\)](#), a newly established regional intermediary organization based in Kampala, Uganda. CRVPF provides grants and technical supports to Community Organizations and local NGOs to prevent violence and build adolescent girls' power in Uganda, Tanzania, Kenya, and Ethiopia. Before CRVPF, Fassil initiated the Oak Foundation's East Africa grant-making program and managed a multimillion-dollar funding portfolio across diverse development programs. Fassil also co-founded and was the director of Forum for Sustainable Child Development (FSCE), a local NGO working with vulnerable children and their families in Ethiopia. He also works as the Save the Children-US Urban and Street Children Project manager in Addis Abeba, Ethiopia. Fassil is a firm believer in the power of positive thinking and open and straightforward communication in the workplace. Fassil has a BA degree in Social Work and a Master's degree in Organization Leadership.





Speaker Biographies

Lakshitha Saji Prelis is the Co-Chair, Global Coalition on Youth, Peace and Security and the Director, Children and Youth Programs, Search for Common Ground. Saji has over twenty years of experience working with youth movements and youth-focused organizations in conflict and transition environments in over 35 countries throughout the world. In 2010 he co-founded and has been co-chairing the first UN-CSO-Donor [working group](#) (Global Coalition on Youth, Peace and Security) that helped successfully advocate for the historic UN Security Council [Resolution 2250](#) (2015) [Res 2419](#) (2018) and [Resolution 2535](#) (2020).



Saji is also the director of children and youth programs at Search for Common Ground (SFCG), an international conflict transformation organization. Prior to joining SFCG, Saji was the founding director of the Peacebuilding & Development Institute at American University in Washington, DC. Over eleven years at the university resulted in him co-developing over 100 training curricula exploring the nexus of peace building with development. Saji received the distinguished [Luxembourg Peace Prize](#) for his Outstanding Achievements in Peace Support. Saji obtained his Master's Degree in International Peace and Conflict Resolution with a Concentration in International Law from American University in Washington, DC.

REFERENCE LIST

The following is a brief list of resources by academics, practitioners and activists critically examining power imbalances, colonialism, and racism in funding. Please refer to the [Institute's Master Reference List](#) for a complete list of resources.

| Power Imbalances in the Humanitarian Economy

- Bennett, C., Foley, M., Pantuliano, S. & Sturridge, S. (2016). Time to let go: Remaking humanitarian action for the modern era. Overseas Development Institute: London, UK. Available [here](#).
- Local to Global Protection has undertaken in-depth research and analysis of how funding flows through the international humanitarian system with a particular focus on how much – or how little – is available for local and national humanitarian actors. All papers are available [here](#).

| Power, Racism, Colonialism, Patriarchy in Philanthropy

- Alternative Narratives on Philanthropy, Agency and Power in Africa - Reflecting on a Series of Consultations - Ford Foundation Office for Southern Africa, The Mott Foundation (South Africa) and Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace. Available [here](#).
- Catherine Lizette Gonzalez (23 October 2018). "Decolonizing Wealth Addresses Philanthropy's White Supremacy Problem, Offers Solutions. ColorLines. Available [here](#).
- Emerging Practitioners in Philanthropy Report: The Next Generation Speaks – What Emerging Leaders of Color in Philanthropy Think about Race (2013). Available [here](#).
- Uzodinma Isweala (13 November 2017). "Reparations as Philanthropy: Radically Rethinking Giving in Africa," *LeMonde*. Available [here](#).
- Louise Lief (12 February 2020). "Social Justice Philanthropy Restructures Focus on Power," *Inside Philanthropy*.
- *The Philanthropy Workshop: Race, Equity and Justice in Philanthropy: From Reflection to Action with Stephanie Kimou, Brianna Suarez, and Danielle Thomas* (30 June 2020). Available [here](#).
- "PhilanthropySoWhite: An Urgent Conversation on Whiteness in Philanthropy [Panel Webinar](#) (February 19, 2021)

- #PhilanthropySoWhite: Challenging Structural Racism as White Leaders in Philanthropy [Panel Webinar](#) (September 18, 2018)
- Edgar Villanueva, "Decolonizing Wealth: Indigenous Wisdom to Heal Divides and Restore Balance (16 October 2018)
- Vu, Le, "Have nonprofit and philanthropies become the "white moderate" that Dr. King warned us about?" Nonprofit AF (1 June 2020). Nonprofit AF is Vu Le's blog and he has written extensively on these issues. Visit the [blog](#) for more information.
- Darren Walker, "Are You Willing to Give Up your Privilege?" [New York Times](#) (June 25, 2020)

| Funding Architecture: Shifting the Power

- AWID (2019) [Toward a Feminist Funding Ecosystem: A Framework and Practical Guide](#) (2019)
- Djordjevic, J., Johnson R. (October 29, 2018). Why Let Go of Power? [Grant Craft](#).
- Lani Evans (2015). [Participatory Philanthropy: A Report for the Winston Churchill Fellowship](#).
- C. Gibson. (2018). Deciding together: Shifting power and resources through participatory grantmaking. [Grantcraft, Foundation Centre](#).
- Walker Kerr and Maya Guzdar, "USAID's Big Contracts Don't Pay Off: American foreign aid needs to go smaller, smarter deals," Foreign Policy (May 18, 2021). Available [here](#)
- Milligan, K., Pearson, K., & Zimmer, K. (2020). Righting the power imbalance between funders and NGOs. [World Economic Forum](#).
- Peace Direct and Riva Kantowitz (2020) [Radical Flexibility: Strategic Funding for the Age of Local Activism](#). The Radical Flexibility Fund is building a resource library related to financing for locally-led social change, visit the library [here](#).

| Children and Youth Rights Funding Architecture

- CPC Learning Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR) and CPC Learning Network (2020) *Envisioning the Grand Bargain: Documenting the Child Protection Area of Responsibility's Approach to Localisation from 2017-2019*.
- Ramatu Bangura, "Children's Rights Work Often Fails to Address Racism and other Root Causes. A New Fund Aims to Change That." [Perspectives by Tides](#), March 9, 2021.

- Elevate Children Funders Group Secretariat, Keshavarzian. G., Carrol. A. (2019). [Pulling back the curtain: What Do Non-Funders Think Are the Key Challenges, Needs, Gaps and Opportunities in Supporting Children and Young People Facing Adversity?](#)
- Elevate Children Funders Group (2020). [Participatory Philanthropy: Six Foundations' Journeys.](#)
- Elevate Children Funders Group, Global Philanthropy Project and Sentiido (2021) [Manufacturing Moral Panic: Weaponizing Children to Undermine Gender Justice and Human Rights](#)
- Gomez, et al. (2021). *Shifting the Field: Philanthropy's role in strengthening child- and youth-led community rooted groups.* [Elevate Children Funders Group \(ECFG\).](#)
- Youth, Peace and Security (2018), [The Missing Peace: Independent Progress Study on Youth, Peace and Security](#)

The artwork for the Institute has been created by
Galuh Indri Wiyarti

Graphic design by
Rec Design





Reconstructing **Children's Rights**

