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I am pleased and honored to present you with the second annual *Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy 2015: Data to Drive Decisions*.

Our purpose in preparing this report is to inspire and motivate. We hope this report will inspire you and your organization to do more: to think more about disasters and give more to disaster-related activities. We also want to motivate you to make your giving more effective: to include disaster-related giving within your grantmaking programs and to think long-term about the full life cycle of disasters, not limiting your participation to solely reactive, immediate responses.

This second report includes many new sources of data that were not in last year’s issue, including smaller foundations, FEMA, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN OCHA), corporate support, and some individual giving. We have made substantial progress in adding new data sources, but we still have a long way to go. We welcome your participation in sharing new data sources with us and making our next report even better and more comprehensive.

As we continue to add more data, it is already clear that preparing and responding to disasters is an enormously challenging task that no single organization or sector can accomplish on its own. We know that foundation giving is generous and growing. Although vitally essential, it pales in comparison to the amounts given by governments and multilateral organizations around the world. Foundations need to carefully understand where their contributions fit within this mosaic of funding in order to maximize their impact and avoid duplication and imbalances. Giving to disaster-related activities needs close consultation and cooperation among the various parties to ensure the greatest impact among those most in need of help.

A report of the magnitude and complexity of this one includes a great deal of hard work and a team of talented individuals. We are grateful to our colleagues at Foundation Center for their many skills and commitment to producing this groundbreaking report. A special thanks to Seema Shah, Larry McGill, and Grace Sato, who headed up Foundation Center’s team. We wish to also thank Lori J. Bertman, president of the Irene W. and C. B. Pennington Foundation, for her visionary leadership and the support of the Foundation. Our Project Advisory Committee provided advice and feedback that made this a much better report. Finally, thanks to Regine A. Webster, who led the Center for Disaster Philanthropy team.

We hope this report will inform, stimulate, provoke, and inspire you to join us at CDP in transforming disaster philanthropy and better serving the millions of people worldwide who rely on our support. We look forward to your comments and suggestions on this year’s report and how to make next year’s even better.
Executive Summary

Jointly produced by Foundation Center and the Center for Disaster Philanthropy, Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy 2015: Data to Drive Decisions analyzes funding trends for disasters and humanitarian crises in 2013. In addition to examining U.S. foundation funding, this second annual report integrates other disaster-related funding data, including bilateral and multilateral aid, corporate giving, and online giving, to paint a more detailed picture of how institutional philanthropy is situated within the broader disaster funding landscape.

This year’s report lives online at disasterphilanthropy.org. The Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy Dashboard allows funders, practitioners, policymakers, and other stakeholders to interact with the 2013 data and home in on their specific areas of interest. Visitors to the dashboard can view giving from multiple data sources and filter the information by disaster type, disaster assistance strategy, and geographic area.

While the dashboard presents aggregated data on disaster-related giving, users can view the Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy Mapping Platform for more granular information from each of these data sources. The mapping platform features data from 2011 to the present and allows users to drill down to grant- and project-level information.

Key findings from our 2013 analysis include the following:

- Looking across seven data sources, we documented $27.6 billion for disasters and humanitarian crises. This figure is not comprehensive, but it provides a starting point for understanding the scale of global disaster-related philanthropy.

- Grants awarded by the top 1,000 U.S. foundations totaled $116.9 million. In addition, a review of Foundation Center’s broader database identified an additional $60.1 million in funding by smaller foundations, public charities, and international foundations.

- Storms drew the most investments from U.S. foundations (46 percent of all funding) and the largest proportion of giving was for response and relief (42 percent), while 19 percent of funding targeted reconstruction and recovery efforts.
• As with most issue areas, government donors provided the largest sources of aid. Indeed, FEMA alone distributed more than $11 billion in grants and assistance in 2013.

• Outside of the U.S., aid from the 29 members of OECD’s Development Assistance Committee (DAC) totaled $13.6 billion, while non-DAC donors and multilateral organizations accounted for at least another $2.3 billion.

• Although reliable estimates for corporate giving are hard to come by, available data show corporations donated at least $179 million to disasters and humanitarian crises.

• Totals for both online and individual giving are also difficult to determine. We obtained data from two online platforms for illustrative purposes. Network for Good collected $27.5 million for disasters, mostly from individual donors, averaging $104 per donor. GlobalGiving raised another $3.6 million, representing a mix of individual and organizational donors.

• Across data sources, the majority of funding targeted relief efforts. It is more challenging to parse out the flow of dollars for preparedness and long-term recovery efforts, given the lack of clear, high-quality information from donors for these disaster assistance strategies. Better data about assistance strategies can help donors and practitioners alike understand the extent to which investments are addressing the full life cycle of disasters.

Collectively, this report, along with the dashboard and mapping platform, provides donors, practitioners, and other stakeholders with in-depth information on funding flows for disasters and humanitarian crises. In the coming years, Foundation Center and the Center for Disaster Philanthropy will work with a host of partners to make these tools more robust. Over time, we expect to improve the quality and quantity of funding data and to work with field partners to use these tools to inform strategic decision making and, ultimately, to increase the effectiveness of disaster-related giving.

To get involved with these efforts, visit disasterphilanthropy.org for additional information.
In December 2014, the Center for Disaster Philanthropy and Foundation Center jointly released *Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy 2014: Data to Drive Decisions*, the first annual report focused on analyzing U.S. foundation funding for disasters and complex humanitarian emergencies. This report took an important step in documenting philanthropic funding, while also establishing partnerships and processes for more comprehensive reports in the future.

In this second annual report, we build on our initial research, not only analyzing U.S. foundation giving trends for 2013 (the most recent year for which comprehensive data are available), but also integrating other disaster-related funding data from 2013, including bilateral and multilateral aid, corporate giving, and online giving, to paint a more detailed picture of how institutional philanthropy is situated within the broader disaster funding landscape.

This year’s report lives online at disasterphilanthropy.org. The Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy Dashboard allows funders, practitioners, policymakers, and other stakeholders to interact with the data and home in on their specific areas of interest. Visitors to the dashboard can view giving from multiple data sources and filter the information by disaster type, disaster assistance strategy, and geographic area.

While the dashboard presents aggregated data on disaster-related giving, users can view more granular information from each of these data sources through the Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy Mapping Platform. The mapping platform features data from 2011 to the present and allows users to drill down to grant- and project-level information.

This companion print publication provides a high-level summary of this year’s findings.
Disaster Taxonomy

At the inception of this project in 2014, in consultation with an expert technical advisory committee, Foundation Center developed a taxonomy to classify giving by both disaster assistance strategy and type of disaster. To facilitate comparisons among different sources of disaster-related data, this taxonomy was applied to all data analyzed for this project.

In this taxonomy, types of disasters fall into four broad buckets: natural disasters, man-made accidents, complex humanitarian emergencies, and disasters—general (funding for unspecified disasters or multiple, disparate disasters).

The taxonomy related to disaster assistance strategies lifts up the disaster life cycle, highlighting points of intervention before, during, and after disasters. Although much attention is focused on communities in the immediate aftermath of disasters, there is growing recognition that more attention needs to be paid to resilience, mitigation, and preparedness efforts that help minimize the economic, social, and human consequences of disaster. Likewise, the disaster life cycle lifts up the importance of investing in longer-term recovery efforts to ensure that communities rebuild with an eye toward being able to withstand the impact of disasters more fully.

1 For a detailed description of the project taxonomy, see Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy 2014: Data to Drive Decisions, p. 15.
The world saw a variety of disasters and humanitarian crises in 2013. More than 300 country-level disasters occurred, affecting 109 countries and 96 million people, killing more than 22,000 people, and resulting in economic damages of $118 billion.²

Domestically, tornados in Oklahoma resulted in an estimated $2 billion in damages, and catastrophic floods in Colorado damaged nearly 19,000 homes. Internationally, more than 6,300 fatalities resulted from Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines, one of the worst tropical cyclones in recorded history. In China, an earthquake registering 7.0 on the Richter scale hit Lushan County in Sichuan Province. In the realm of humanitarian crises, by the end of 2013, there were more than two million Syrian refugees fleeing civil unrest. Nearly two years later, that number has more than doubled.

How did donors respond to these disasters and humanitarian crises? And to what extent did their responses go beyond immediate relief efforts? This report examines giving from foundation, government, corporate, and individual donors. Drawing upon seven data sources, we documented $27.6 billion for disaster assistance in 2013. Though the data are not comprehensive, they provide an emerging picture of disaster-related philanthropy.

² EM-DAT (March 2014): The OFDA/CRED - International Disaster Database www.emdat.be
In 2013, the largest U.S. foundations awarded 906 disaster-related grants totaling $116.9 million. This represents a slight increase from $111.4 million in funding the previous year. Storms drew the most investments (46 percent of all funding) and the largest proportion of giving was for response and relief (42 percent), while 19 percent of funding targeted reconstruction and recovery efforts. About half of funding (54 percent) was for North America, largely because of assistance for Superstorm Sandy. As in 2012, the top recipient of grant dollars was the American Red Cross, and the top funder was the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

3 Includes all grants of $10,000 or more reported by 1,000 of the largest U.S. foundations. The dataset accounts for approximately half of the total grant dollars awarded by the universe of independent, corporate, community, and grantmaking operating foundations. The data do not include gifts by corporate giving programs or public charities. The data also exclude grants, fellowships, or awards directly to individuals; grants paid by private foundations to U.S. community foundations (to avoid double counting of dollars); and loans or program-related investments.
# Foundation Funding by Disaster Assistance Strategy, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Giving</th>
<th>% of Grants</th>
<th>No. of Disbursements</th>
<th>% of Giving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience, Risk Reduction, and Mitigation</td>
<td>$10,018,555</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>32 grants</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>$4,881,582</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>50 grants</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response and Relief</td>
<td>$49,419,709</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>495 grants</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction and Recovery</td>
<td>$21,855,522</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>166 grants</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Strategies</td>
<td>$13,294,516</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>67 grants</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>$9,849,467</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>73 grants</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$7,599,511</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>23 grants</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$116,918,892</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>906</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A view of a residential area flooded by heavy rains, with some areas receiving as much as 18 inches in a 24-hour period in Boulder, Colorado, Sept. 14, 2013. Credit: U.S. Army photo by Staff Sgt. Wallace Bonner/Released.
Beyond the Largest Foundations

In times of disasters, local and regional foundations are often the most engaged. While an analysis of the largest 1,000 foundations allows us to gain insights about broader funding trends, the database for this project also includes additional grants from smaller foundations, public charities, and foundations outside of the U.S. Though these data are not comprehensive, an examination of giving beyond the largest U.S. foundations offers a glimpse of the substantial contributions made by these entities.

In 2013, Foundation Center’s database included an additional 686 grants totaling $60.1 million for disaster-related giving. The Kevin Durant Family Foundation in Oklahoma City, for example, gave $1 million to the American Red Cross for tornado relief. The North Star Fund in New York gave 29 grants, most under $10,000, to grassroots organizations to help address the impacts of Hurricane Sandy. Outside of the U.S., the Stichting IKEA Foundation awarded $2.6 million to UNICEF to support Typhoon Haiyan relief efforts.

In coming years, the Center for Disaster Philanthropy and Foundation Center will work with regional associations and other partners to expand its database of disaster-related grantmaking. To view all foundation grants currently in the database, visit the Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy Mapping Platform.
FOUNDATION FUNDING BY REGION, 2013

53.7% NORTH AMERICA
$ 62,745,663
658 grants

0.5% CARIBBEAN
$ 571,000
13 grants

2.7% LATIN AMERICA AND MEXICO
$ 3,137,071
12 grants

0.6% EUROPE AND RUSSIA
$ 754,103
7 grants

23.4% ASIA, MIDDLE EAST, AND THE PACIFIC
$ 27,353,747
172 grants

15.4% AFRICA
$ 17,955,060
21 grants

An additional $12 million in grants went to programs providing a global benefit.
The largest flows of aid for disasters and humanitarian crises come from bilateral and multilateral donors. Much of the bilateral government funding comes from members of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC). The DAC consists of 29 members, including the United States, European Union institutions, and Japan. These members report their official development assistance, which includes humanitarian aid, according to established definitions.

UN OCHA, through its Financial Tracking System (FTS), also collects information on humanitarian aid from both DAC and non-DAC donors, as well as multilateral contributions. For this analysis, we used the OECD database to examine funding from DAC donors, complementing that with data from FTS to understand giving by non-DAC donors.

In 2013, disbursements from DAC donors for disasters and humanitarian crises totaled $13.6 billion, with 56 percent of funding directed towards disasters-general and 36 percent of funding allocated for complex humanitarian emergencies. Aid from the United States totaled $5 billion. Top recipient countries included Syria, Sudan, South Sudan, and Afghanistan.

Through FTS, an additional $2.4 billion in contributions by non-DAC donors and multilateral organizations was documented, with the vast majority of funding (93 percent) designated for complex humanitarian emergencies. Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria were among the top countries where aid was directed.

* For a full list of DAC members, visit [www.oecd.org/dac/dacmembers.htm](http://www.oecd.org/dac/dacmembers.htm).
* Analysis of funding by DAC donors derived from data in OECD’s Creditor Reporting System.
* Analysis of FTS data excludes contributions from DAC donors and U.S. foundations (to avoid double counting), unspecified private contributions, and in-kind donations with $0 value.
# OECD DAC Funding by Disaster Assistance Strategy, 2013

## Top 10 OECD DAC Donors, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Disbursements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>$5,048,368,936</td>
<td>2,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>EU Institutions</td>
<td>$2,022,242,920</td>
<td>3,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>$1,404,463,716</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>$1,031,093,571</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>$691,452,258</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>$637,897,521</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>$480,572,165</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>$470,531,398</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>$381,074,886</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>$309,579,246</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Other OECD DAC Donors</td>
<td>$1,129,467,136</td>
<td>1,893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Top 10 Recipient Countries, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Recipient Country</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Disbursements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>$2,135,560,336</td>
<td>1,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>$1,647,550,354</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>$652,551,492</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>$616,188,680</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>$511,196,352</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>West Bank and Gaza Strip</td>
<td>$466,761,071</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>$437,256,691</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>$426,966,130</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Dem Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>$421,899,352</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Middle East Region</td>
<td>$394,394,780</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Other Recipient Countries</td>
<td>$5,896,418,515</td>
<td>7,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OECD DAC FUNDING BY REGION, 2013

16.1%
DEVELOPING COUNTRIES
$2,193,495,825
1,236 disbursements

1.8%
CARIBBEAN
$251,353,338
457 disbursements

1.5%
LATIN AMERICA AND MEXICO
$201,083,300
696 disbursements

1.2%
EUROPE AND RUSSIA
$163,163,451
192 disbursements

43.5%
ASIA, MIDDLE EAST, AND THE PACIFIC
$5,924,708,937
4,117 disbursements

35.8%
AFRICA
$4,872,938,902
4,098 disbursements

Global Humanitarian Assistance Report

Each year, Development Initiatives publishes the Global Humanitarian Assistance Report. For a richly detailed description of humanitarian funding flows, visit globalhumanitarianassistance.org.8

September 2013, Katanga, Democratic Republic of the Congo. A Red Cross volunteer squirts a few drops of chlorine into containers of cholera-tainted water, making it safe to drink. An outbreak of the waterborne illness a few months prior claimed 257 lives. Credit: OCHA/Gemma Cortes

8 There may be some discrepancies with our analysis due to differing methodological decisions.
UN OCHA, Non-DAC Donors

NON-DAC FUNDING BY DISASTER TYPE, 2013

93.1%
COMPLEX HUMANITARIAN EMERGENCIES
$ 2,200,843,417
1,036 contributions

5.6%
DISASTERS—GENERAL
$ 133,246,649
164 contributions

1.2%
NATURAL DISASTERS
$ 29,227,955
80 contributions

- STORM
$ 15,082,337
47 contributions

- EPIDEMIC
$ 8,302,138
10 contributions

- FLOOD
$ 2,473,314
11 contributions

- DROUGHT
$ 2,160,267
6 contributions

- EXTREME TEMPERATURE
$ 1,051,239
4 contributions

- WILDFIRE
$ 108,660
1 contribution

- EARTHQUAKE
$ 50,000
1 contribution

TOTAL GIVING
$ 2,363,318,021
1,280 contributions

NON-DAC FUNDING BY REGION, 2013

16.7%
MULTIPLE COUNTRIES/UNSPECIFIED
$ 395,373,467
84 contributions

1.5%
CARIBBEAN
$ 35,846,693
17 contributions

0.3%
LATIN AMERICA AND MEXICO
$ 6,680,301
13 contributions

0.7%
GLOBAL PROGRAMS
$ 15,381,504
93 contributions

< 0.1%
EUROPE AND RUSSIA
$ 156,167
3 contributions

41.0%
ASIA, MIDDLE EAST, AND THE PACIFIC
$ 968,816,865
637 contributions

39.8%
AFRICA
$ 941,063,024
433 contributions
### NON-DAC FUNDING BY DISASTER ASSISTANCE STRATEGY, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>% of Giving</th>
<th>% of Contributions</th>
<th>Contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience, Risk Reduction, and Mitigation</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>$6,460,775</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>$817,404</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response and Relief</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>$16,806,175</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction and Recovery</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>$58,558,178</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Strategies</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>$16,806,175</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOP 10 NON-DAC DONORS, 2013

1. Carry-Over (Donors Not Specified) $589,895,110 | 61 contributions
2. Kuwait $326,807,835 | 110 contributions
3. Various Donors (Details not provided) $316,006,376 | 107 contributions
4. Saudi Arabia $236,783,956 | 80 contributions
5. Allocation of Unearmarked Funds by the World Food Programme $190,696,036 | 44 contributions
6. Qatar $108,711,194 | 51 contributions
7. United Arab Emirates $90,136,466 | 75 contributions
8. Qatar Charity $52,114,778 | 37 contributions
9. Common Humanitarian Fund $45,286,816 | 92 contributions
10. Sheikh Thani bin Abdullah Foundation for Humanitarian Services $41,344,167 | 52 contributions

### TOP 10 RECIPIENT COUNTRIES, 2013

1. Multiple Countries/Unspecified $395,373,467 | 84 contributions
2. Jordan $239,397,645 | 124 contributions
3. Lebanon $222,753,013 | 130 contributions
4. Syria $171,869,695 | 120 contributions
5. Somalia $150,729,460 | 132 contributions
6. Democratic Republic of the Congo $142,605,703 | 16 contributions
7. South Sudan $129,389,205 | 55 contributions
8. Chad $107,732,617 | 18 contributions
9. Sudan $87,541,432 | 43 contributions
10. Kenya $86,103,654 | 21 contributions
President Jimmy Carter signed an executive order in 1979 creating the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Currently housed within the Department of Homeland Security, FEMA coordinates the U.S. government’s role in preparing for, preventing, mitigating the effects of, responding to, and recovering from all domestic disasters, whether natural or man-made, including acts of terror.

In 2013, FEMA distributed more than $11 billion in grants and assistance, with the largest proportion (84 percent) designated to storms. Due in large part to grants supporting relief and recovery efforts in the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy, New York ($7.2 billion) and New Jersey ($1.6 billion) were the top two states receiving FEMA grants. An additional $496 million was awarded to Colorado to address severe flooding in the state that destroyed thousands of homes.9

---

**FEMA Grants by Disaster Type, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaster Type</th>
<th>Total Giving</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Disasters</td>
<td>$11,131,809,066</td>
<td>12,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disasters-General</td>
<td>$86,387,530</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Giving</td>
<td>$11,218,196,596</td>
<td>12,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FEMA Grants by Disaster Assistance Strategy, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>% of Giving</th>
<th>% of Grants</th>
<th>Total Giving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience, Risk Reduction, and Mitigation</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>$547,008,294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Strategies</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>$10,828,607,719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top 10 Recipient States for FEMA Grants, 2013**

1. New York $7,212,537,954 | 1,404 grants
2. New Jersey $1,611,610,984 | 1,382 grants
3. Colorado $496,187,740 | 551 grants
4. Illinois $385,851,515 | 1,462 grants
5. Oklahoma $142,973,528 | 353 grants
6. Florida $131,805,747 | 168 grants
7. California $123,873,191 | 140 grants
8. Connecticut $101,209,244 | 561 grants
9. Massachusetts $82,306,216 | 684 grants
10. Texas $61,233,315 | 89 grants

All Other States/Territories $868,607,162 | 5,404 grants

All 50 states, plus Guam and the District of Columbia, received FEMA grants in 2013.
Corporate Giving

Corporations play a vital role in providing support for disasters and humanitarian crises. In addition to cash donations, corporations frequently make in-kind donations of their products and professional services to help address disaster-related needs. While it can be difficult to assign a monetary value to these in-kind donations and pro bono services, these contributions can be significant. For example, the United Parcel Service (UPS) has used its expertise in supply chain management and logistics to increase efficiencies in preparedness, relief, and recovery efforts.

In making cash contributions, corporations can give through a corporate foundation, directly through company accounts (corporate giving), or both. While data on corporate foundation giving is readily available due to IRS reporting requirements, data on corporate giving programs is harder to parse together in a reliable manner. Much of what is known about disaster-related corporate giving trends comes via the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation Corporate Citizenship Center’s Corporate Aid Tracker and Foundation Center, both of which track corporate giving for select disasters.

In 2013, Foundation Center and the Chamber collectively identified 532 pledges totaling $179.2 million through corporate giving programs.11 This figure includes cash contributions and in-kind contributions that had a dollar value assigned to them. (This is in addition to the $30.4 million awarded via corporate foundations.) Almost all of this corporate giving focused on natural disasters (99.6 percent) and the largest proportion of this funding (62 percent) focused on response and relief efforts. Six percent of corporate giving was specifically designated for reconstruction and recovery efforts.

In 2013, the top disaster supported by corporate giving dollars was the Chinese earthquake. Of the $66.7 million documented, $9.7 million came from the Samsung Group and an additional $8 million came from Apple. Typhoon Haiyan ($45.2 million), the Oklahoma tornadoes ($26.3 million), and the floods in India ($21.1 million) also received substantial support from corporate giving programs.

The numbers presented here are likely to represent only a small portion of overall corporate giving for disasters. To improve our understanding of how corporations are contributing to this work, Foundation Center and the Center for Disaster Philanthropy are partnering with the Chamber’s Corporate Citizenship Center to develop more systematic methods of data collection that can be incorporated into future reports.

Corporate Giving Resources

Although comprehensive information on corporate giving is limited, ongoing efforts to document and support corporate giving efforts include the following:

- The annual *Giving in Numbers* report, developed by the Committee Encouraging Corporate Philanthropy (CECP), in association with The Conference Board, provides trend data on corporate philanthropy and employee engagement, including data on disaster-related giving. In 2013, based on the 261 companies that responded to the project survey, 3 percent of corporate donations (both cash and in-kind) were directed toward disaster relief.

- The U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation Disaster Corporate Aid Tracker allows companies to share real-time information about their disaster-related contributions.

- In addition, the Chamber’s Preparedness, Response, and Recovery Issue Network helps to improve the efficacy of business philanthropy in disasters, facilitating information sharing and coordination between sectors.

---

11 Because there is currently no comprehensive method to track corporate giving, the figures presented in this report are for descriptive purposes only and do not represent trends or totals for corporate giving at large. Rather, these figures represent information available from press releases, websites, and voluntary reporting by corporations themselves. When possible, Foundation Center verifies that pledged commitments were paid, but much of the data are based on self-report by corporations and difficult to verify independently.
Online Giving

Online giving occurs through a wide range of platforms, including the websites of charitable organizations, dedicated charitable giving platforms, and social media sites. Given the plethora of platforms at the disposal of donors, it is challenging to provide a comprehensive tally of online giving for disasters. A recent study by Network for Good, however, suggests that online donations spike during large-scale disasters and that donors appreciate the convenience of online giving and are especially motivated to give when the online experience feels intimate and emotionally coherent.12

To get a flavor of online giving trends, we acquired data from two organizations: GlobalGiving and Network for Good.

GlobalGiving

Founded in 2002, GlobalGiving is the first and largest global crowdfunding community for nonprofits. Since its inception, GlobalGiving has raised more than $193 million for projects across the globe. In their own words, GlobalGiving enables donors to “fund the underdog,” featuring smaller or local projects and organizations that might not be funded through more mainstream channels. To give donors confidence that their giving will result in the desired impact, GlobalGiving vets these organizations to ensure that they comply with international guidelines for philanthropy and have a track record of solid outcomes.

In 2013, GlobalGiving collected nearly $3.6 million for disaster-related giving, supporting 99 projects by 63 organizations. About two-thirds of this funding ($2.4 million, 66 percent) supported projects in the Philippines, mainly to alleviate the impact of Typhoon Haiyan.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBALGIVING PROJECTS BY DISASTER TYPE, 2013</th>
<th>GLOBALGIVING PROJECTS BY DISASTER ASSISTANCE STRATEGY, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>94.3% NATURAL DISASTERS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PREPAREDNESS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 3,374,742</td>
<td>0.1% $ 3,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 projects</td>
<td>5.1% 5 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.3% DISASTERS–GENERAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>RESPONSE AND RELIEF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 11,445</td>
<td>31.5% $ 1,127,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 projects</td>
<td>42.4% 42 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.4% COMPLEX HUMANITARIAN EMERGENCIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECONSTRUCTION AND RECOVERY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 193,087</td>
<td>8.1% $ 289,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 projects</td>
<td>30.3% 30 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GIVING</strong></td>
<td><strong>MULTIPLE STRATEGIES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 3,579,274</td>
<td>60.3% $ 2,158,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 projects</td>
<td><strong>UNSPECIFIED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STORM</strong></td>
<td>&lt;0.1% $ 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 2,624,194</td>
<td>1.0% 1 project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 projects</td>
<td><strong>EARTHQUAKE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 669,364</td>
<td>21.2% 21 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 projects</td>
<td><strong>FLOOD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 80,099</td>
<td><strong>WILDFIRE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,085</td>
<td>5.4% 5 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 project</td>
<td>0.3% 4 projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

94.3% of Giving, 84% of Projects

13 GlobalGiving shares data about its project and partner organizations in IATI (International Aid Transparency Initiative) standard format.
GlobalGiving raises money for its own disaster relief funds, which are disbursed to partner organizations in affected regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Super Typhoon Haiyan Relief Fund GlobalGiving</td>
<td>$1,618,423</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support Students Affected by China’s Earthquake China Youth Development Foundation</td>
<td>$382,985</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Oklahoma Tornado Relief Fund GlobalGiving</td>
<td>$229,044</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School of Fun for Children in Fukushima Academy Camp</td>
<td>$86,850</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Responding to Medical Needs After Typhoon Haiyan Doctors Without Borders</td>
<td>$79,356</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Typhoon Haiyan Children’s Relief Fund Save the Children Federation</td>
<td>$70,933</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Low-cost Sanitation For Typhoon Haiyan Survivors Water, Agroforestry, Nutrition and Development Foundation</td>
<td>$60,955</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Syrian Refugee Relief Fund GlobalGiving</td>
<td>$59,813</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Yolanda (Haiyan) Relief and Rehabilitation Efforts De La Salle University</td>
<td>$52,640</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Network for Good

Created in 2001 by America Online, Cisco Systems, and Yahoo!, Network for Good has worked with more than 100,000 nonprofits to raise more than a billion dollars. Network for Good provides nonprofits and other organizations with fundraising software for use on their websites. In addition, donors can also contribute to organizations and causes through Network for Good’s website, particularly in times of crisis.

Aggregated data made available to Foundation Center by Network for Good show that in 2013, Network for Good helped funnel $27.5 million to address disasters and humanitarian crises with an average donation amount of $104 per donor. Though more detailed information about the nature of these contributions is limited, these data highlight the collective power of individual donors and the potential to reach donors through online platforms.

Network for Good raises money for its own disaster relief funds, which are disbursed to partner organizations in affected regions.
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Conclusion

Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy is a multi-year, multi-faceted project that documents philanthropic giving for disasters and humanitarian crises with the aim of using these data to catalyze more effective grantmaking—in particular, encouraging donors to allocate their funds across the full disaster life cycle.

Indeed, as we enter the second year of our research, it is clear that institutional philanthropy brings substantial resources to the table. At the same time, the work of foundations sits within a larger network of government, individual, and corporate donors. Governments and multilaterals, such as UN agencies, contribute the largest share of dollars to disasters and humanitarian crises. While foundations cannot match those dollars, they can partner with these entities to maximize the impact of limited dollars and fill gaps and needs that other donors have not been able to address. Likewise, tapping into the possibilities of partnerships with corporations and taking advantage of the reach of online platforms are ways that foundations can expand their reach and leverage their funding.

In conversations with various stakeholders, it is clear that donors are attentive to the full life cycle of disasters and that they understand the importance of supporting preparedness as well as recovery efforts. Yet our analysis of where the dollars go indicates that it can be challenging, due to lack of detailed information, to identify the disaster assistance strategies prioritized by funding. Indeed, a substantial portion of funding—across the different sources—described multiple strategies or no assistance strategy at all. To the extent that disaster assistance strategies are identified by donors, the majority of grants address immediate relief efforts.

The Center for Disaster Philanthropy’s Playbook offers donors, particularly foundation donors, valuable guidance on how to amplify the impact of their grantmaking to focus on the full life cycle of disasters. The Disaster Playbook is a comprehensive resource of best practices and innovative approaches to guide the philanthropy community’s response to disasters, whether local, national, or international. This online resource will highlight the role of philanthropic organizations in...
helping communities respond to natural disasters, plan for an efficient recovery, and develop resiliency in the aftermath of a disaster.

The ongoing work of the Measuring the State of Disaster Philanthropy project will continue to track funding over time so stakeholders have a better understanding of funding flows and priorities. The online interactive dashboard and the mapping platform, launched in tandem with this year’s report, are especially useful resources designed to identify funding gaps, minimize duplication of effort, and catalyze fruitful collaborations.

In the coming years, Foundation Center and the Center for Disaster Philanthropy will be working with a host of partners to make these tools more robust. Over time, we expect to improve the quality and quantity of funding data and to work with field partners to use these tools to inform strategic decision making and, ultimately, to increase the effectiveness of disaster-related giving.

As the State of Disaster Philanthropy project moves forward, Foundation Center and the Center for Disaster Philanthropy are working hard to get both more data and better-quality data on disaster-related giving to paint the most comprehensive picture possible of funding flows. But we need YOUR help! Donors are encouraged to share their data for this project. For more information, visit disasterphilanthropy.org.
ABOUT FOUNDATION CENTER
Established in 1956, Foundation Center is the leading source of information about philanthropy worldwide. Through data, analysis, and training, it connects people who want to change the world to the resources they need to succeed. Foundation Center maintains the most comprehensive database on U.S. and, increasingly, global grantmakers and their grants—a robust, accessible knowledge bank for the sector. It also operates research, education, and training programs designed to advance knowledge of philanthropy at every level. Thousands of people visit Foundation Center’s website each day and are served in its five library/learning centers and at more than 450 Funding Information Network locations nationwide and around the world.

ABOUT THE IRENE W. & C.B. PENNINGTON FOUNDATION
The Irene W. and C.B. Pennington Foundation is a private family foundation striving to enhance communities across Louisiana, focused in the Greater Baton Rouge area and surrounding parishes. The Foundation’s focus is in the areas of human services, health and chronic diseases, the arts, public safety/community development, disasters/community resilience, and the environment. The Foundation funds organizations at all stages of maturity and values projects that are innovative and leverage resources in new ways.

ABOUT THE CENTER FOR DISASTER PHILANTHROPY
CDP’s mission is to transform disaster giving by providing timely and thoughtful strategies to increase donors’ impact during domestic and international disasters. With an emphasis on recovery and disaster risk reduction, CDP aims to: increase the effectiveness of contributions given to disasters; bring greater attention to the life cycle of disasters, from preparedness and planning, to relief, to rebuilding and recovery efforts; provide timely and relevant advice from experts with deep knowledge of disaster philanthropy; conduct due diligence so donors can give with confidence; and create plans for informed giving for individuals, corporations and foundations.