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There are an estimated 10 million non-governmental organizations (NGOs) worldwide. If NGOs were a country, they’d have the fifth-largest economy in the world.  

The nonprofit sector in the United States alone contributed more than $930 billion to the economy in 2014. Given the volume and complexity of civil society organizations around the world, a substantial ecosystem of support organizations have emerged over time to enable, strengthen, and evolve their work. These support organizations, also known as “infrastructure organizations,” provide essential services such as strategic planning; evaluation, assessment, and feedback; board and staff development; data and research; legal services; business modeling; and support for diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts. They form a much-needed backbone for work on our most critical global challenges, enabling changemakers to be more effective in their efforts to build a better future.

In 2015, Foundation Center, with support from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, analyzed U.S. foundation funding of these infrastructure organizations. It developed a taxonomy of these organizations and established research criteria for determining which foundation grants should be counted as infrastructure-related. The key findings of this initial research in 2015: U.S. foundation support for nonprofit and philanthropic infrastructure totaled more than $1 billion or 0.6 percent of total giving between 2004 and 2012, based on giving by 1,000 of the country’s largest foundations.

The research—the first of its kind—garnered attention from the field, resulting in valuable feedback that led Foundation Center to substantially modify the taxonomy and research criteria. The study has now been updated to include three more years of data. The result is the present report.

As in the earlier report, the goals of the study included:

- Documenting how funding is distributed among key organization types in the nonprofit and philanthropic infrastructure ecosystem; and
- Tracking funding trends over time, both within the infrastructure ecosystem and compared to U.S. foundation giving overall.

Civil society organizations (including foundations) are working to make our world a better place, and the infrastructure that supports this work exists to continuously improve and strengthen their efforts.

We hope that this analysis is useful for understanding the funding context within which funders and infrastructure organizations operate, that it will inform the funding practices surrounding infrastructure organizations going forward, and that it serves as inspiration for future research on how to better support the pursuit of social good.
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Key Findings

Infrastructure-related giving totaled $1.94 billion over 12 years. This funding supported 511 organizations providing infrastructure services to the social sector in the U.S. and globally over the 12-year period between 2004 and 2015, an average of about $162 million per year.

- While 511 organizations received infrastructure-related grants over this period, no more than 328 received grants in any given year.
- Altogether, 881 funders provided infrastructure grants during this period. The number of funders that contributed in any given year rose from 346 in 2004 to 430 in 2015.

While overall giving by U.S. foundations in the data set grew 66 percent, infrastructure-related giving grew just 25 percent.

- Adjusted for inflation, overall foundation giving grew 35 percent, while infrastructure funding rose just 4 percent (measured in 2015 dollars).
- Infrastructure funding rose from an average of $143 million per year (2004–06) to $179 million per year (2013–15).

Funding for infrastructure accounted for less than 1 percent (0.71 percent) of total giving by U.S. foundations.

- The overall share of giving for infrastructure declined from 0.86 percent of total giving in 2004 to 0.59 percent in 2015.

The vast majority of infrastructure funding (97 percent) went to U.S.-based organizations.

- While funding for infrastructure organizations in general grew 25 percent between 2004 and 2015, funding for non-U.S.-based infrastructure organizations declined 43 percent over that same period—from $6.9 million per year (2004–06) to $3.9 million per year (2013–15).

Twenty-seven foundations gave an average of more than $1 million per year for nonprofit and philanthropic infrastructure.

- Together, these 27 foundations accounted for about 60 percent of all infrastructure funding.
- Three funders—the Ford Foundation, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation—accounted for 24 percent of all infrastructure funding over this period.

Thirty-five infrastructure organizations received an average of at least $1 million per year.

- Together, these 35 organizations received 48 percent of all infrastructure funding.
- The top four recipients—Foundation Center, Bridgespan Group, Independent Sector, and Council on Foundations—each received an average of more than $5 million in funding per year.

Key Findings from 2013–2015

Infrastructure funding reached a new high in 2015, but growth remained slow. In 2012, annual funding for infrastructure reached $189 million, its highest point over the nine-year period from 2004 to 2012. Over the following three years (2013–15), funding declined to $161 million in 2013, rebounded to $183 million in 2014, and reached a new high of $192 million in 2015.

Strong growth for nonprofit-focused infrastructure funding. Funding for nonprofit-focused organizations grew from an average of $71 million per year to $88 million per year, an increase of 24 percent.

Decreased funding for both philanthropy-focused and multi-sector infrastructure organizations. Funding for both philanthropy-focused and multi-sector infrastructure organizations was lower between 2013 and 2015 than it was during the previous three-year period (2010–12). Philanthropy-focused organizations declined from an average of $66 million per year to $63 million per year. Multi-sector organizations fell from an average of $31 million per year to $28 million per year.

Share of total giving continued to decline. As a share of overall foundation funding, support for infrastructure fell to just 0.59 percent in 2015, its lowest point over the 12-year period of the study. It reached a high of 0.90 percent in 2006.

3 These figures are based on three-year averages for the periods 2004–06 and 2013–15. Three-year averages are used to control for random year-to-year fluctuations in funding.

Explore these key findings and other research about support for civil society organizations around the world at infrastructure.foundationcenter.org.
What Is the Nonprofit and Philanthropic Infrastructure?

At present, there is no consensus on how to define which organizations constitute “infrastructure” or precisely what kinds of services constitute “infrastructure support.” This study proposes a classification scheme that will help the field to consistently document the evolution of the nonprofit and philanthropic infrastructure over time.

Infrastructure organizations can be grouped into three main categories, based on the types of audiences they serve:

1. **Philanthropy-focused organizations and associations** provide services primarily in support of the work of foundations and other philanthropic entities.
2. **Nonprofit-focused organizations and associations** provide services in support of the work of nonprofit organizations or the nonprofit sector in general.
3. **Multi-sector infrastructure organizations** provide services in support of the work of organizations both within and beyond the social sector, such as academia, government, and business.

This report examines patterns of foundation funding for each of these types of infrastructure organizations from 2004 through 2015. A total of 511 organizations met study criteria for inclusion in this analysis.

### Infrastructure Taxonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHILANTHROPY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS</th>
<th>NONPROFIT-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS</th>
<th>MULTI-SECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE ORGANIZATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• General</td>
<td>• Nonprofit Associations and Networks</td>
<td>• Academic Research Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Geography (Geo)-focused</td>
<td>• Nonprofit Service Organizations</td>
<td>• Independent Research Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Issue-focused</td>
<td>• Information Service Organizations</td>
<td>• Consulting/Advisory Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Population-focused</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public Policy/Advocacy Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study identified 155 organizations and networks that are exclusively or primarily philanthropy-focused. These include:

- **28 population-focused organizations and associations**, such as Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy, Disability Funders Network, and Women’s Funding Network;
- **34 issue-focused organizations and associations**, such as Environmental Grantmakers Association, Grantmakers in the Arts, and Center for Disaster Philanthropy;
- **40 geography-focused organizations and associations**, such as Council of Michigan Foundations, Philanthropy Northwest, and Southeast Council on Foundations; and
- **53 organizations that support philanthropy in general**, such as Council on Foundations, Grantmakers for Effective Organizations, and Exponent Philanthropy.

The study identified 256 organizations that perform support services for nonprofit organizations or for the social sector in general. These include:

- **21 information service organizations**, such as GuideStar USA, Foundation Center, and Charity Navigator;
- **86 service providers**, such as BoardSource, Network for Good, and Taproot Foundation; and
- **149 associations**, such as the Association of Fundraising Professionals, the Georgia Center for Nonprofits, and Independent Sector.

---

4 Some regional associations of grantmakers—Forefront (IL), for example—also include nonprofit organizations and/or individuals among their membership. We included these organizations in this category.
The study also identified 100 other organizations that, while not primarily focused on providing support services for the social sector, do provide a significant amount of “infrastructure” support for the field. These “multi-sector” organizations include:

- **9 public policy or advocacy organizations**, such as Center for Rural Strategies, Demos: a Network for Ideas and Action, and Mathematica Policy Research;

- **9 independent research centers**, such as the Urban Institute (which houses the Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy), the Hudson Institute (publisher of *The Index of Global Philanthropy and Remittances*), and the Aspen Institute (which houses the Program on Philanthropy and Social Innovation);

- **34 consulting and advisory organizations**, such as FSG, Bridgespan Group, and Synergos Institute; and

- **48 academic research centers**, such as Duke University (which houses the Center for Strategic Philanthropy and Civil Society), Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (which houses the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy), and Grand Valley State University (which houses the Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy).

A full listing of all organizations that have occasionally provided support services for the social sector would include hundreds of additional organizations beyond the 100 multi-sector organizations included in this study.⁵ These organizations are not unimportant in terms of the services they provide to the sector, but they are not engaged consistently enough by a sufficient number of nonprofit and philanthropic organizations that they can be thought of as a relatively permanent part of a definable set of infrastructure organizations serving the field. It is important to recognize that these organizations exist, but the focus of this study is on organizations whose role in the infrastructure is significant enough that they can be unambiguously called “infrastructure organizations.”

For purposes of this updated report, we include “multi-sector” infrastructure organizations only if they have received at least $500,000 of foundation funding over a 10-year period (i.e., $50,000 per year).⁶

While the number of multi-sector infrastructure organizations included in this report is limited to those receiving at least $50,000 of funding per year, there is no minimum threshold of funding required in order for a philanthropic or nonprofit-focused infrastructure organization to be included.

See **Appendix B** for a full listing of the organizations included in this report.

---

⁵ See, for example, *Assessing Community Foundation Needs and Envisioning the Future* (Foundation Center, 2017), which lists more than 500 “support organizations” from which community foundations have received services.

⁶ The median grant size for nonprofit and philanthropic infrastructure organizations between 2004 and 2015 was $25,000. Drawing the cutoff line at $50,000 per year means that an organization had to receive funding equivalent to at least two grants of “average” (median) size per year in order to be included in our analysis of multi-sector organizations.
How Much Foundation Funding Supports Nonprofit and Philanthropic Infrastructure?

Percent of Total Infrastructure Funding by Type of Recipient Organization, 2004–2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Recipient Organization</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit-focused organizations</td>
<td>$845 M</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy-focused organizations</td>
<td>$740 M</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-sector organizations</td>
<td>$355 M</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING = $1.94 B

From 2004 through 2015, nonprofit and philanthropic infrastructure organizations received a total of $1.94 billion in U.S. foundation funding, an average of $162 million per year.

- Philanthropy-focused organizations (N=155) received $740 million of funding (38 percent), with a yearly average of $61.7 million.
- Nonprofit-focused organizations (N=256) received $845 million of funding (44 percent), with a yearly average of $70.4 million.
- Multi-sector infrastructure organizations (N=100) received $355 million between 2004 and 2015 (18 percent), with a yearly average of $29.6 million.

Although nonprofit-focused organizations received the most funding overall, proportionately, philanthropy-focused organizations still received more funding on average per organization (45 percent) than nonprofit-focused organizations.

Source: Foundation Center, 2018. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more awarded by 1,000 of the largest U.S. private and community foundations.
Is Funding for Infrastructure Growing?

Funding for Nonprofit and Philanthropic Infrastructure, 2004–2015

Foundation funding for infrastructure grew from $131 million in 2004 to $192 million in 2015. On the surface, this represents a 47 percent increase over 12 years. But this obscures some important fluctuations in funding over that period.

Between 2004 and 2008, infrastructure funding grew from $131 million to $177 million, an increase of 35 percent. During the economic downturn, however, funding fell to $135 million in 2009 (a 23 percent decrease) and did not surpass pre-2009 levels again until 2012. By 2015, funding had grown to $192 million, an increase of 42 percent since 2008.

Adjusted for inflation, though, infrastructure funding has basically been flat since 2006. Measured in 2015 dollars, funding for infrastructure peaked at $205 million in 2006. Between 2006 and 2015, funding for infrastructure declined by 6 percent, based on inflation-adjusted dollars.

Source: Foundation Center, 2018. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more awarded by 1,000 of the largest U.S. private and community foundations.
After grouping the data into three-year intervals to smooth out year-to-year fluctuations, we found that overall giving by U.S. foundations grew by 66 percent from 2004 to 2015, compared to just 25 percent for infrastructure-related giving.

Adjusted for inflation, overall foundation giving grew 35 percent, while infrastructure funding rose just 4 percent (measured in 2015 dollars).

**Cumulative Growth in Funding, 2004–2015**

Overall foundation giving rose **66%**, while infrastructure funding rose just **25%**.

**Share of total giving is on a decline.** As a share of overall foundation funding, support for infrastructure fell to just 0.59 percent in 2015, its lowest point over the 12-year period of the study.
How Does Funding Compare Across Types of Organizations?

Funding Trends by Type of Infrastructure Organization, 2004–2015

Source: Foundation Center, 2018. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more awarded by 1,000 of the largest U.S. private and community foundations.

While all types of organizations experienced drops in funding following the economic downturn in 2009, nonprofit-focused organizations and multi-sector organizations experienced much steeper declines. This suggests that U.S. foundations funding infrastructure focused their support on organizations with which they were most directly engaged, such as funder networks. Although funding for nonprofit-focused and philanthropy-focused organizations has since returned to and surpassed pre-recession levels, as of 2015, funding for multi-sector organizations is still lower than it was in 2008.
In our 2015 study, we reported that philanthropy-focused organizations grew 79 percent (before inflation) between 2004 and 2012. In the current report, we report that the rate of increase in funding for philanthropy-focused organizations between 2004 and 2015 was just 15 percent. The reason for this discrepancy is that the current report uses three-year averages to calculate rates of change from one period to another, i.e., 2004–06 compared to 2013–15. The earlier report calculated the rate of change using data from single years, i.e., 2004 compared to 2012. Because philanthropy-focused infrastructure giving was relatively low in 2004 ($42 M), the change from 2004 to 2012 ($72 M) was relatively dramatic, an increase of 72 percent. By averaging the amount of support across three-year periods a truer sense of overall change over time can be determined, by smoothing out year-to-year fluctuations that may be unrelated to broader trends in giving.

For purposes of this report, all grants (of any kind) were included in the totals for philanthropy-focused and nonprofit-focused infrastructure organizations. In some cases, e.g., Network for Good, Hispanics in Philanthropy, Women’s Funding Network, and others, it is certain that some grants intended for regranting have been included in their totals. This means that the total support indicated for these organizations likely overstates the amount of support they received strictly for “infrastructure” purposes, but we don’t know by how much. It was beyond the scope of this study to attempt to exclude such “pass-through” grants from our analyses, as it would have required detailed grant-by-grant review of thousands of grants. In future iterations of this research we hope to be able to provide more nuanced results.

Most of the growth in infrastructure funding was due to increased levels of funding for nonprofit-focused organizations.

During the three-year period 2004–06, infrastructure organizations received an average of $143 million per year. In subsequent three-year periods, this increased to $156 million, $169 million, and finally, between 2013 and 2015, $179 million per year.

Funding for philanthropy-focused organizations and networks grew slowly (15 percent) across the 12-year period, from $55 million per year to $63 million per year. Between 2007 and 2015, however, funding for philanthropy-focused organizations and networks was flat.

Funding for multi-sector organizations was flat from 2004 to 2015. Most of the growth in infrastructure funding was due to increased levels of funding for nonprofit-focused organizations, which grew from an average of $61 million per year (2004–06) to $88 million per year (2013–15), a 46 percent rise.

Just six grants of $1 million or more (totaling $11.2 million) were awarded to nonprofit-focused organizations from 2010 to 2012, while 19 such grants (totaling $43.6 million) were awarded to these organizations from 2013 to 2015.

The biggest recipients of these million-dollar grants between 2013 and 2015 were Network for Good (five grants for $13.4M) and American Fund for Charities (two grants for $9.2M).

Other organizations receiving grants of over $1 million between 2013 and 2015 were JustGive (2), Generous Giving, Good360, Midland Shared Spaces, Charitable Ventures of Orange County, GoodNet, Institute for Nonprofit News, NetHope (2), GiveDirectly, and Development Gateway.
The subcategory receiving the most funding over the 12-year period from 2004 to 2015 was **nonprofit service organizations**, which received $423 million (21.8 percent out of all infrastructure funding).

Combined with **nonprofit membership associations** ($265 million, 13.6 percent) and **information service organizations** ($157 million, 8.1 percent), nearly 44 percent of infrastructure funding focused on organizations that serve nonprofit organizations or the social sector in general.

**Membership associations and networks serving philanthropy** received $740 million in total, broken out as follows:
- General purpose associations: $308 million (15.8 percent)
- Geo-focused associations: $190 million (9.8 percent)
- Population-focused associations: $141 million (7.3 percent)
- Issue-focused associations: $101 million (5.2 percent)

Multi-sector organizations received $355 million in total, broken out as follows:
- Consulting/advisory organizations: $165 million (4.7 percent)
- Academic research centers: $131 million (3.7 percent)
- Independent research centers: $39 million (1.1 percent)
- Public policy/advocacy organizations: 20 million (0.5 percent)

**Nearly 44 percent of infrastructure funding** focused on organizations that serve nonprofit organizations or the social sector in general.
The 25 percent growth in funding for nonprofit and philanthropic infrastructure organizations was driven largely by a huge increase in the amount of support for nonprofit service organizations, which nearly doubled from an average of $29.3 million of support per year to $52.8 million per year (+80 percent).

Just one other infrastructure subcategory, issue-focused membership associations (+122 percent), increased at a rate that outpaced foundation giving in general (+66 percent) between 2004 and 2015. Information service organizations (+50 percent) was the only other infrastructure subcategory to see an increase of more than 21 percent.

Three subcategories experienced declines:  
- Public policy/advocacy organizations (-54 percent);  
- Population-focused membership associations (-18 percent); and  
- Nonprofit-focused membership associations (-5 percent).

### Changes in Levels of Annual Funding for Infrastructure Organizations, 2004–2015

#### PHILANTHROPY-FOCUSED INFRASTRUCTURE ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$22.3 M</td>
<td>$22.8 M</td>
<td>(+2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo-focused</td>
<td>$14.7 M</td>
<td>$17.7 M</td>
<td>(+21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue-focused</td>
<td>$5.6 M</td>
<td>$12.5 M</td>
<td>(+122%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population-focused</td>
<td>$12.1 M</td>
<td>$10.0 M</td>
<td>(-18%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NONPROFIT-FOCUSED INFRASTRUCTURE ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Associations</td>
<td>$20.4 M</td>
<td>$19.4 M</td>
<td>(-5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Services</td>
<td>$29.3 M</td>
<td>$52.8 M</td>
<td>(+80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services</td>
<td>$10.7 M</td>
<td>$16.1 M</td>
<td>(+50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MULTI-SECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Research</td>
<td>$9.0 M</td>
<td>$9.3 M</td>
<td>(+3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Research</td>
<td>$2.7 M</td>
<td>$2.8 M</td>
<td>(+2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting/Advisory</td>
<td>$14.4 M</td>
<td>$14.5 M</td>
<td>(+1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy/Advocacy</td>
<td>$1.9 M</td>
<td>$0.9 M</td>
<td>(-54%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Foundation Center, 2018. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more awarded by 1,000 of the largest U.S. private and community foundations.
How Many Funders Provide Support for Infrastructure?

The largest number of funders supporting infrastructure in a given year was 438 (in 2013). The smallest number was 346 (in 2004). Over the entire study period, the number of funders supporting infrastructure has grown 27.2 percent. (As explained in Appendix A, this research is based on an analysis of 1,000 of the largest U.S. funders per year, not the entire universe of U.S. grantmaking foundations. For a full list of 223 funders that provided more than one million dollars in infrastructure support between 2004 and 2015 see Appendix C.)
Who Is Funding Infrastructure?

Top 20 Funders of Infrastructure, 2004–2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
<td>$165.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>W.K. Kellogg Foundation</td>
<td>$150.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>$146.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Charles Stewart Mott Foundation</td>
<td>$ 70.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>William and Flora Hewlett Foundation</td>
<td>$ 61.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Robert Wood Johnson Foundation</td>
<td>$ 56.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>David and Lucile Packard Foundation</td>
<td>$ 52.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Rockefeller Foundation</td>
<td>$ 39.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Kresge Foundation</td>
<td>$ 35.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Annie E. Casey Foundation</td>
<td>$ 32.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>California Endowment</td>
<td>$ 31.7 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Lilly Endowment</td>
<td>$ 31.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Edna McConnell Clark Foundation</td>
<td>$ 25.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Surdna Foundation</td>
<td>$ 24.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>James Irvine Foundation</td>
<td>$ 24.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>John S. and James L. Knight Foundation</td>
<td>$ 24.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Silicon Valley Community Foundation</td>
<td>$ 21.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td>$ 20.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Marguerite Casey Foundation</td>
<td>$ 20.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Ruth Lilly Philanthropic Foundation</td>
<td>$ 18.2 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Foundation Center, 2018. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more awarded by 1,000 of the largest U.S. private and community foundations.

The top 20 infrastructure funders accounted for 54 percent of all funding received by infrastructure organizations between 2004 and 2015.

Twenty-seven foundations provided at least $1 million per year for infrastructure. Together, these 27 foundations accounted for about 60 percent of all infrastructure funding.

The next seven funders that round out the top 27 are: Foundation to Promote Open Society ($18.0M), Greater Washington Community Foundation ($16.5M), Barr Foundation ($15.9M), California Wellness Foundation ($14.5M), Omidyar Network Fund ($14.2M), Rasmuson Foundation ($12.6M), and Wallace Foundation ($12.5M).

Two of the top 27 foundations are community foundations—Silicon Valley Community Foundation and Greater Washington Community Foundation—which suggests that some combination of support for infrastructure may be coming from donor-advised funds as well as general funds.
Three foundations—the Ford Foundation, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation—stand out among all other infrastructure funders. Each provided an average of more than $12 million per year for infrastructure, led by the Ford Foundation ($13.8M), then the W.K. Kellogg Foundation ($12.5M), then the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation ($12.2M). Together, these “Big Three” funders accounted for 24 percent of all infrastructure funding.

While a small number of foundations continue to account for a substantial share of U.S. foundation giving for nonprofit and philanthropic infrastructure, the share of funding provided by foundations outside of the top 20 funders grew from 38 percent in 2004–2006 to 48 percent in 2013–2015. This suggests that a greater number of foundations are making a stronger commitment to supporting the infrastructure of the sector.
As noted previously, 44 percent of all infrastructure funding was directed to nonprofit-focused organizations, 38 percent to philanthropy-focused organizations, and 18 percent to multi-sector organizations. This funding pattern changes, though, when you break out the findings by funder rank—the “Big Three,” the top 20 (minus the “Big Three”), and all other funders.

For example, the 20 largest funders of infrastructure (including the “Big Three”), gave slightly more for philanthropy-focused organizations than for nonprofit-focused organizations (40 percent vs. 37 percent, when you merge those two groups together). For smaller funders, however, the reverse was true. More than half (51 percent) of all infrastructure support provided by funders outside of the top 20 went to nonprofit-focused organizations.

In general, the less a foundation gives for infrastructure, the more likely it is to support nonprofit-focused organizations.

Source: Foundation Center, 2018. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more awarded by 1,000 of the largest U.S. private and community foundations.
Three of the top 20 funders allocated more than 50 percent of their infrastructure support to philanthropy-focused organizations—Marguerite Casey Foundation (82%), Lilly Endowment (65%), and Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (53%).

Three of the top 20 funders allocated more than 50 percent of their infrastructure support to nonprofit-focused organizations—Ruth Lilly Philanthropic Foundation (86%), Silicon Valley Community Foundation (59%), and The Kresge Foundation (50%).

Two of the top 20 funders focused a majority of their support on multi-sector organizations—Edna McConnell Clark Foundation (75%) and The James Irvine Foundation (60%).
Consistency Among Infrastructure Funders Over Time

Seven foundations have appeared among the top 20 every year between 2004 and 2015 (12 consecutive years):
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation (top funder in 2006)
- Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
- William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (top funder from 2010 to 2015)
- David and Lucile Packard Foundation
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Eight funders have appeared in the top 20 list at least seven times between 2004 and 2015 (first and last appearance indicated for each):
- Lilly Endowment (10 times, between 2004 and 2015)
- The Kresge Foundation (10 times, 2006–2015)

Five foundations have become more prominent infrastructure funders in recent years (2010–2015):
- The California Endowment (appeared 5 times in the top 20 from 2010 to 2015)
- Foundation to Promote Open Society (4 times)
- Ruth Lilly Philanthropic Foundation (3 times)
- Conrad N. Hilton Foundation (3 times)
- Omidyar Network Fund (3 times)

Sample Infrastructure Grants

**Funder**

**FORD FOUNDATION**

**Recipient**

Brazilian Association of Non-Governmental Organizations

To strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations and to raise awareness about their importance for the future of democracy

**Funder**

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

**Recipient**

Association for Community Relations

For general support for work to build the capacity of nonprofit organizations in Romania to raise local resources, introduce new giving mechanisms and programs, improve the level and quality of corporate giving, strengthen community philanthropy and community foundations, and improve the visibility of the philanthropic sector in Romania

**Funder**

John S. and James L. Knight Foundation

**Recipient**

Hispanics in Philanthropy

To support the field of community foundations to build outreach strategies for diverse audiences during giving days by expanding HIPGive.org, a platform for engaging Latino donors nationally
What Share of Infrastructure Funding Is for General Support?

General Support for Infrastructure Organizations, 2004–2015

As a percentage of total giving for infrastructure organizations, general support averaged 27.5 percent between 2004 and 2015. By comparison, general support for foundation giving overall during this period was 18.5 percent.

General support for infrastructure organizations peaked between 2010 and 2012, reaching 31 percent.

Broken out across four three-year time periods, general support grew from 23.8 percent (2004–06) to 29.4 percent (2007–09), and then to 31.0 percent (2010–12). It declined to 25.7 percent in 2013–15.

General support for philanthropy-focused organizations was substantially higher than for other types of infrastructure organizations, averaging 37 percent, and peaking at 41 percent in 2010–12.

Source: Foundation Center, 2018. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more awarded by 1,000 of the largest U.S. private and community foundations.
What Is the Median Grant Size Awarded to Infrastructure Organizations?

The median grant size awarded to all infrastructure organizations increased from $28,348 in 2004 to $34,150 in 2015.

The median grant awarded to infrastructure organizations between 2004 and 2015 was $30,000. This aligns with the median grant awarded by U.S. foundations overall during the same time period, which was also $30,000.9

Broken out by type of organization, the median grant for multi-sector organizations was twice as large as it was for philanthropy-focused organizations, $50,000 vs. $25,000. The median grant for multi-sector organizations reached a high of $67,365 in 2013–15.10

The median grant for nonprofit-focused organizations increased over time from $30,000 (2004–06) to $35,000 (2013–15), while the median grant for philanthropy-focused organizations remained at $25,000 across the entire 12-year period.

9 This is based on grants of $10,000 or more awarded by 1,000 of the largest U.S. private and community foundations.

10 As a reminder, multi-purpose organizations include both academic and independent research organizations, as well as consulting and advocacy organizations. See Appendix A for more details.
Not surprisingly, grants made by the three biggest infrastructure funders tended to be larger than those of other funders. Overall, the median infrastructure grant made by the "Big Three" funders (Ford, Kellogg, and Gates) was $150,000. By comparison, the median grant made by other funders in the top 20 was $55,000, while for all other funders (outside of the top 20), the median grant was $25,000.

Across all funders, regardless of rank, multi-sector organizations received the largest grants, followed by nonprofit-focused organizations and philanthropy-focused organizations.
How Many Infrastructure Organizations Receive Grants Each Year?

**Number of Recipients of Infrastructure Funding, 2004–2015**

Source: Foundation Center, 2018. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more awarded by 1,000 of the largest U.S. private and community foundations.

While 511 organizations received infrastructure-related grants between 2004 and 2015, no more than 328 received grants in any given year. Although the number of recipient organizations receiving funding has increased 11% from 2004 to 2015, since 2011 this number has declined 12.5 percent, indicating a narrower distribution of support for this ecosystem.
Who is Receiving Infrastructure Funding?

### Top Recipients of Nonprofit and Philanthropic Infrastructure Grants, 2004–2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>NO. OF GRANTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Foundation Center</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>$78,784,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bridgespan Group</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$72,540,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Independent Sector</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>$66,392,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Council on Foundations</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>$64,178,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$45,129,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hispanics in Philanthropy</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$38,490,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Center for Effective Philanthropy</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>$36,696,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Council of Michigan Foundations</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$32,955,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Philanthropy Roundtable</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>$30,957,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>GuideStar USA</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>$30,266,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>InterAction</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$28,078,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Third Sector New England</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>$25,340,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$23,754,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Funders’ Network for Smart Growth &amp; Livable Communities</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>$22,955,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CompassPoint Nonprofit Services</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>$21,062,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Women’s Funding Network</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$20,051,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Network for Good</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$19,561,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Michigan Nonprofit Association</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>$17,949,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>BoardSource</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>$17,934,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Northern California Grantmakers</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>$17,473,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>TechSoup Global</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>$16,795,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>American Fund for Charities</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$16,651,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Taproot Foundation</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>$16,498,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Grantmakers in Health</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>$16,384,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Grantmakers for Effective Organizations</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>$16,041,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Philanthropy New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>$15,324,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Indiana Philanthropy Alliance Found</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$15,161,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Community Partners</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>$14,234,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Foraker Group</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$13,776,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Equal Measure</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$13,518,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>JustGive</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$12,739,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Colorado Nonprofit Development Center</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>$12,678,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Global Philanthropy Partnership</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$12,600,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Good360</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$12,445,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>European Foundation Centre</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>$12,379,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHILANTHROPY-FOCUSED**  **NONPROFIT-FOCUSED**  **MULTI-SECTOR**

---

Altogether, the top 35 recipients received 48 percent of all infrastructure giving.

Thirty-five organizations received more than $12 million in grant support from 2004 to 2015, an average of at least $1 million per year.11

Four of those organizations—Foundation Center, Bridgespan Group, Independent Sector, and Council on Foundations—each received more than $60 million, or at least $5 million per year. Each of these organizations was a top 10 recipient of infrastructure funding at least nine times.

Eighteen of the top 35 recipients were nonprofit-focused infrastructure organizations, led by Foundation Center, Independent Sector, GuideStar USA, InterAction, and Third Sector New England. Each of these five organizations received more than $25 million.

Fifteen of the top 35 recipients were philanthropy-focused infrastructure organizations, led by Council on Foundations, Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors, Hispanics in Philanthropy, Center for Effective Philanthropy, Council of Michigan Foundations, and Philanthropy Roundtable. Each of these six organizations received more than $30 million.

Only two of the top 35 recipients were multi-sector infrastructure organizations—Bridgespan Group and Equal Measure.

---

11 Totals for philanthropy-focused and nonprofit-focused infrastructure organizations may include some funds intended for regranting. This means that the total support indicated for these organizations likely overstates the amount of support they received strictly for “infrastructure” purposes, but it is not known by how much. See footnote 7 on page 12 for more information.

Source: Foundation Center, 2018. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more awarded by 1,000 of the largest U.S. private and community foundations.
Four of the top 15 philanthropy-focused infrastructure organizations received more than 50 percent of their support from the “Big Three” funders—Ford, Kellogg, and Gates—Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy (70 percent), European Foundation Centre (62 percent), Women’s Funding Network (59 percent), and Council of Michigan Foundations (50 percent).

Four of the top 15 philanthropy-focused infrastructure organizations received more than 50 percent of their support from the other 17 funders in the top 20—Indiana Philanthropy Alliance Foundation (100 percent), Northern California Grantmakers (73 percent), Center for Effective Philanthropy (54 percent), and Grantmakers in Health (53 percent).

All of the support for Indiana Philanthropy Alliance Foundation came from the Lilly Endowment (30 grants between 2004–2015).

The majority of the top 15 philanthropy-focused infrastructure organizations received more than 50 percent of their funding from top 20 funders.

Four of the top 15 philanthropy-focused infrastructure organizations received more than 50 percent of their support from funders outside of the top 20—Philanthropy Roundtable (84 percent), Council on Foundations (54 percent), Philanthropy New York (53 percent), and Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors (53 percent).
Just one of the top 15 nonprofit-focused infrastructure organizations received more than 50 percent of its support from the “Big Three” funders (Ford, Kellogg, and Gates)—InterAction: American Council for Voluntary International Action (92 percent). The vast majority of the support for InterAction came from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (seven grants of $1.5M or more between 2008 and 2015).

Almost all of the support for American Fund for Charities came from the Ruth Lilly Philanthropic Foundation (23 grants between 2004 and 2015).

Six of the top 15 nonprofit-focused infrastructure organizations received more than 50 percent of their support from funders outside of the top 20—JustGive (100 percent), Foraker Group (96 percent), Taproot Foundation (90 percent), CompassPoint Nonprofit Services (64 percent), Network for Good (60 percent), and Community Partners (58 percent).

Totals for philanthropy-focused and nonprofit-focused infrastructure organizations may include some funds intended for regranting. This means that the total support indicated for these organizations likely overstates the amount of support they received strictly for “infrastructure” purposes. See footnote 7 on page 12 for more information.
Four of the top 15 multi-sector infrastructure organizations received more than 50 percent of their support from the “Big Three” funders (Ford, Kellogg, and Gates)—Michigan State University (100 percent), Indiana University (67 percent), Grand Valley State University (65 percent), and Urban Institute (64 percent). All of the support for Michigan State University came from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (30 grants between 2005 and 2014).

Five of the top 15 multi-sector infrastructure organizations received more than 50 percent of their support from the other 17 funders in the top 20—TCC Group (98 percent), Equal Measure (84 percent), Harvard University (73 percent), Stanford University (72 percent), and FSG (64 percent). Most of the support for TCC Group came from The James Irvine Foundation (14 grants between 2006 and 2013).

The majority of the top 15 multi-sector infrastructure organizations received more than 50 percent of their funding from the top 20 funders.

Two of the top 15 multi-sector infrastructure organizations—Robert Morris University and University of Southern California—received more than 50 percent of their support from funders outside of the top 20 (100 percent and 65 percent, respectively).
What Does Infrastructure Support Look Like Outside of the U.S.?

Infrastructure organizations based outside of the U.S. received a total of $68.6 million from U.S. foundations between 2004 and 2015 (or 3.5 percent of all U.S. foundation funding for nonprofit and philanthropic infrastructure).

This equates to about $5.7 million per year, compared to $162 million per year for domestic infrastructure organizations.

For purposes of comparison, total funding for infrastructure organizations based outside of the U.S. was roughly the same as total funding received by Independent Sector ($66.4 million) from 2004 to 2015.

In total, 61 infrastructure organizations in 29 countries other than the U.S. received funding between 2004 and 2015. These organizations included philanthropy-focused organizations such as Grupo de Institutos Fundações e Empresas (GIFE) in Brazil, nonprofit-focused organizations such the Voluntary Action Network in India, and multi-sector organizations such as the Center for Research and Innovation in Social Policy and Practice in the United Kingdom. Nineteen of these organizations received at least $1 million in support, led by the European Foundation Centre, which received $12.4 million, or 18 percent of all funding for non-U.S.-based infrastructure organizations.

Two-thirds (68 percent) of all funding for infrastructure organizations based outside of the U.S. between 2004 and 2015 came from just two U.S. foundations—the Ford Foundation and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. Together, they provided $46.6 million in support, while 20 other foundations gave a combined total of $22 million.

The decline in funding for infrastructure organizations outside of the U.S. coincides with increased restrictions on civil society instituted by governments around the world, with 98 new restrictive laws being introduced across 55 countries from 2012 to 2015.13 Eighteen of the 29 countries that received infrastructure funding in the time period covered in this analysis have a current score of obstructed, repressed, or closed on the CIVICUS monitor.14 These countries are also the most in need of a robust ecosystem of support organizations that can protect and advance the work of civil society.


Putting It All Together

This report illuminates many trends in U.S. foundation support for infrastructure organizations, a few of which are worth underscoring again here:

- **Infrastructure funding is a small percentage of overall foundation giving, and this percentage is declining.** The overall share of giving for infrastructure declined from 0.86 percent of total giving in 2004 to 0.59 percent in 2015.

- **Infrastructure funding by U.S. foundations is concentrated in the United States and funding for infrastructure organizations based outside of the United States is declining.** While these findings are based on giving data from the largest U.S. foundations, they do suggest an uneven distribution of support for infrastructure organizations around the world. With increased restrictions on civil society being instituted by many governments, organizations operating in these restrictive legal environments are those most in need of a strong ecosystem of support organizations that can protect and advance their work.

- **Infrastructure funding includes a higher percentage of funding for general support than overall funding; however, this percentage has declined in recent years.** As a percentage of total giving for infrastructure organizations, general support averaged 27.5 percent between 2004 and 2015. By comparison, general support for foundation giving overall was 18.5 percent. In recent years, general support for infrastructure organizations declined from 31.0 percent in 2010–12 to 25.7 percent in 2013–15.

- **The fewer total dollars a foundation gives for infrastructure, the more likely it is to support nonprofit-focused organizations.** More than half (51 percent) of all infrastructure support provided by funders outside of the top 20 went to nonprofit-focused organizations.

- **Giving is concentrated among the leading funders of infrastructure, but this concentration is slowly waning.** The top 20 infrastructure funders accounted for 54 percent of all funding received by infrastructure organizations between 2004 and 2015. However, the share of funding provided by foundations outside of the top 20 grew from 38 percent in 2004–2006 to 48 percent in 2013–2015. This suggests that a greater number of foundations are making a stronger commitment to supporting the infrastructure of the sector.

This research also raises some questions:

- What trends would we see if we look outside of the 1,000 largest U.S.-based foundations and at grants under $10,000?
- Why are we seeing a decline in the overall share of funding for infrastructure organizations over this 12-year period? And is that decline likely to continue?
- How sustainable is it for infrastructure support to be so concentrated among a relatively small group of funders?
- What might compel more than 881 of the 1,000 largest U.S. foundations to support infrastructure?
- Would consolidation or expansion of the infrastructure landscape shift how funders support it?
- How can infrastructure organizations outside of the U.S. be better supported?

At a time when civil society is facing threats and restrictions around the globe, it is increasingly important to ensure there is a robust network of supporting institutions to help nonprofits and nongovernmental organizations strengthen and coordinate their efforts, evaluate their initiatives, learn from each other, and reach new levels of impact. We hope that funders and infrastructure organizations use the data in this report to better understand the landscape, inform strategy, and share the critical role infrastructure organizations play in building a more strategic sector for us all.
## APPENDIX A:
Methodological Changes from Previous Report

Foundation Center’s earlier analysis of infrastructure funding, covering 2004–2012, was released in 2015. This analysis of funding, covering 2004–2015, differs from the earlier one in three important ways:

1. It introduces a revised infrastructure taxonomy;
2. It introduces some changes in how infrastructure organizations and grants are counted; and
3. It includes three more years of data (2013–2015).

### Change #1: Revised Infrastructure Taxonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Philanthropy-specific Organizations and Networks</strong></td>
<td><strong>1. Philanthropy-focused Organizations and Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General</td>
<td>• General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Issue Focus</td>
<td>• Issue Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Population Focus</td>
<td>• Population Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional Focus</td>
<td>• Geography Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Other Nonprofit Infrastructure Organizations, Networks, and Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Nonprofit-focused Organizations and Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nonprofit Associations/Centers</td>
<td>• Nonprofit Associations and Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information Service Organizations</td>
<td>• Nonprofit Service Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic/Research Centers</td>
<td>• Information Service Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Policy/Advocacy Organizations</td>
<td><strong>3. Multi-sector Infrastructure Organizations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multipurpose and Other Organizations</td>
<td>• Academic Research Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Independent Research Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public Policy/Advocacy Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consulting/Advisory Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our earlier report classified infrastructure organizations into two main categories—"Philanthropy-specific Organizations and Networks" and "Other Nonprofit Infrastructure Organizations, Networks, and Services.”

**Philanthropy-specific Organizations and Networks** included:

- **“General” Organizations and Networks**, such as Council on Foundations, Center for Effective Philanthropy, and Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors;
- **Geographically focused Associations**, such as Philanthropy New York, Northern California Grantmakers, and Forefront;
- **Issue-focused Associations**, such as Grantmakers in the Arts, the Consultative Group on Biological Diversity, and Funders’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities; and
- **Population-focused Associations**, such as Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy, Funders for LGBTQ Issues, and the Association of Black Foundation Executives.

All other organizations receiving infrastructure-related support were gathered together under the rubric of "Other Nonprofit Infrastructure Organizations, Networks, and Services." This bucket of organizations included:

- **Academic/Research Centers**, such as university-based centers like the Dorothy A. Johnson Center at Grand Valley State University and independent research organizations like Aspen Institute and Hudson Institute;
- **Information Service Organizations**, such as Foundation Center and GuideStar USA;
- **Nonprofit Associations/Centers**, such as Association of Fundraising Professionals and place-based nonprofit associations like Nonprofit Association of Oregon;
- **Public Policy/Advocacy Organizations**, such as Demos: a Network for Ideas and Action and Mathematica Policy Research; and
- **Multipurpose and Other Organizations**, such as Equal Measure and FSG.
For this report, the taxonomy has been revised and expanded in the following ways, to better capture the full range of organizations making up the nonprofit and philanthropic infrastructure (new categories introduced in this report are highlighted):

1. Academic/Research Centers has been broken into two new categories—Academic Research Centers and Independent Research Centers.

2. Multipurpose and Other Organizations has been broken into two new categories—Nonprofit Service Organizations and Consulting/Advisory Organizations.

3. Nonprofit Associations/Centers has been refined to focus exclusively on nonprofit membership organizations and relabeled “Nonprofit Associations and Networks.”

4. Three types of organizations—Nonprofit Associations and Networks, Nonprofit Service Organizations, and Information Service Organizations—have been rolled up into a new major category, “Nonprofit-focused Organizations and Associations.”

5. As a result, the new taxonomy now has three main categories rather than two:
   - Philanthropy-focused Organizations and Associations
   - Nonprofit-focused Organizations and Associations
   - Multi-sector Infrastructure Organizations

The first category—“Philanthropy-focused Organizations and Associations”—remains the same as it was in the earlier report.

The second category—”Nonprofit-focused Organizations and Associations”—consists of other social sector–specific organizations that deliver services primarily to nonprofit organizations or civil society in general. These include nonprofit associations and networks, nonprofit service organizations, and information service organizations.

All the organizations included in these two main categories comprise a “core” group of organizations that exists solely to provide services in support of the social sector. These are the organizations that the field tends to have in mind when it loosely refers to “the nonprofit and philanthropy infrastructure.” What sets them apart from all other organizations that may receive some form of infrastructure-related support is that the only reason they exist is to provide infrastructure support for the field.

Beyond these “core” infrastructure organizations, there is a third main category of organizations that provide infrastructure support for the field, even though they are not exclusively focused on the social sector. These are referred to as multi-sector infrastructure organizations. They include academic research centers, independent research centers, consulting and advisory organizations, and public policy and advocacy organizations.

Change #2: How the Amount of Infrastructure-related Support is Determined

**FIRST REPORT (2015)**

- Included only grants with a “subject code” of philanthropy, that also met either of the following criteria:
  - “Organizations or programs that focus on promoting the practice of giving and volunteering or which represent and serve a wide range of philanthropy and charitable institutions”
  - “Programs that provide management and administrative support to philanthropic and nonprofit organizations and projects”

- Included all organizations that received at least one such grant

**THIS REPORT (2018)**

- Included all grants made to philanthropy-focused and nonprofit-focused infrastructure associations and organizations

- Exceptions were made for some organizations that provide fiscal sponsorship or grants management services; in these cases, only philanthropy-related grants were counted.

- Included only “philanthropy”-related grants (defined as before) made to multi-sector organizations

- Excluded from the analysis all “multi-sector” infrastructure organizations receiving less than $500,000 total funding over the most recent 10-year period
In our earlier report, a grant was counted as “infrastructure-related” if:

- The grant had a subject related to philanthropy, and
- The purpose of the grant was either:
  - To support “organizations or programs that focus on promoting the practice of giving and volunteering, or which represent and serve a wide range of philanthropy and charitable institutions,”
  - OR
  - To support “programs that provide management and administrative support to philanthropic and nonprofit organizations and projects.”

All grants that met these criteria were included in the analysis, no matter what organization received the grant. As a result, the analysis included grants to over 1,150 organizations, many of which would not typically be considered “nonprofit and philanthropic infrastructure” organizations.

For the current study, we adopted a new methodology that allows us to focus more specifically on a clearly defined set of organizations that better represent what we mean by the nonprofit and philanthropic infrastructure.

- Philanthropy-focused and nonprofit-focused infrastructure organizations. For this report, we counted all grants made to any exclusively nonprofit or philanthropy-focused infrastructure organization that received at least one grant (of at least $10,000) between 2004 and 2015 (N=411). In the earlier report, we counted only “infrastructure-related” grants to these organizations. As a result, the total number of grants included for these organizations in the current report is larger than the number that was included in the previous report.

- Multi-sector infrastructure organizations. Grants made to organizations not exclusively focused on the social sector were included only if they were “infrastructure-related,” as defined above. In other words, grants to these organizations were counted the same way they were in the earlier report. We refer to these recipients as “multi-sector” infrastructure organizations. These include: 1) academic research centers; 2) independent research centers; 3) consulting/advisory organizations, and 4) public policy/advocacy organizations.

Further, to keep the analysis from being cluttered with hundreds of sparsely supported organizations that are not what the field typically thinks of as belonging to the social sector “infrastructure,” we have excluded any multi-sector infrastructure organization that did not receive at least $500,000 in funding in the past 10 years (or an average of at least $50,000 per year).

Organizations excluded from this report

- There are many hundreds of other organizations that occasionally performed support services for philanthropic and nonprofit organizations over this 12-year period, but they have been excluded from this analysis because they did not receive at least $500,000 over the most recent 10-year period.

- These organizations are not unimportant in terms of the services they provide to the sector, but they are not engaged consistently enough by a sufficient number of nonprofit and philanthropic organizations that they can be thought of as a relatively permanent part of a definable set of infrastructure organizations serving the field. It is important to recognize that these organizations exist, but the focus of this study is on organizations whose role in the infrastructure is significant enough that they can be unambiguously called “infrastructure organizations.”

- By employing these criteria consistently, we can better track the relative growth or shrinkage of the civil society infrastructure over time.

- Were these peripheral organizations to be included in this report, they would likely add about $100 million (about 5 percent) more to the total amount of funding for infrastructure between 2004 and 2015.

- In other words, the 511 organizations tracked in this report account for around 95 percent of all funding that could be counted as infrastructure-related.
The current report extends the analysis by three years, through 2015. The data set consists of all infrastructure-related grants of at least $10,000 made by 1,000 of the largest U.S. foundations each year. [See below for information on how “infrastructure-related grants” were identified.]

The current analysis focuses on grants awarded to a specifically defined set of 511 organizations, instead of 1,152 as in the earlier study. This allows us to focus more directly on the main organizations that constitute the civil society infrastructure, rather than on a broader, more loosely defined collection of organizations, some of which may have received an infrastructure-related grant here or there.

- Although there are 511 “infrastructure” organizations in this 12-year data set, no more than 328 received funds in any given year.
- Likewise, while there were 881 funders who made infrastructure grants over this period, no more than 438 made grants in any given year.
- The earlier nine-year analysis included 12,200 grants, worth $1.04 billion. The current 12-year analysis includes 21,148 grants, worth $1.94 billion. The additional three years of data (2013–15) added 5,593 grants and $561,484,756 to the data set.

### Change #3: Three More Years of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Analyzed 9 years of data (2004–2012)</td>
<td>• Analyzed 12 years of data (2004–2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 717 funders</td>
<td>• 881 funders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 12,200 grants</td>
<td>• 21,148 grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1,152 recipient organizations</td>
<td>• 511 recipient organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total funding: $1.04 billion</td>
<td>• Total funding: $1.94 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: Infrastructure Organization Taxonomy

I. PHILANTHROPY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS—civil society organizations that provide services primarily in support of the work of foundations and other philanthropic entities

A. General Organizations and Associations—organizations and associations whose clients or members are philanthropic or philanthropy-related entities and whose focus is philanthropy in general

Examples: Committee to Encourage Corporate Philanthropy, Council on Foundations, European Foundation Centre, Philanthropy Roundtable, Russia Donors Forum

B. Geo-focused Organizations and Associations—organizations and associations whose clients or members are philanthropic or philanthropy-related entities and whose focus is on a specific sub-national geographic area15

Examples: Association of Baltimore Area Grantmakers, Forefront, Grantmakers of Oregon and Southwest Washington, Southeastern Council of Foundations, Southern California Grantmakers

C. Issue-focused Organizations and Associations—organizations and associations whose clients or members are philanthropic or philanthropy-related entities and whose focus is on a specific issue or subject area

Examples: Center for Disaster Philanthropy, Consultative Group on Biological Diversity, Funders’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities, Grantmakers in Health, Peace and Security Funders Network

D. Population-focused Organizations and Associations—organizations and associations whose clients or members are philanthropic or philanthropy-related entities and whose focus is on a specific population or demographic group


II. NONPROFIT-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS—civil society organizations that provide services primarily in support of the work of other civil society organizations (especially implementing organizations) or civil society in general16

A. Associations and Networks—associations and networks whose members are primarily implementing (“nonprofit”) organizations

Examples: Association of Fundraising Professionals, Center for Nonprofit Management, Coordinating Assembly of Nongovernmental Organizations (Swaziland), Independent Sector, Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations

B. Service Organizations—organizations that provide services primarily to implementing (“nonprofit”) organizations, such as capacity building, training, technical assistance, giving platforms, etc.

Examples: BoardSource, CompassPoint Nonprofit Services, JustGive, Network for Good, TechSoup Global

C. Information Service Organizations—organizations that collect data, conduct research, and/or disseminate information and knowledge about the work of implementing (“nonprofit”) and philanthropic organizations and civil society in general

Examples: Charity Navigator, Foundation Center, GuideStar USA, Philanthropic Collaborative, Rockefeller Archive Center

III. MULTI-SECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE ORGANIZATIONS (NOT CIVIL SOCIETY–SPECIFIC)—organizations whose remit is broader than civil society, but that also provide services in support of the work of implementing (“nonprofit”) and philanthropic organizations

A. Academic Research Centers—entities based at academic institutions that collect data, conduct research, and/or disseminate information and knowledge about the work of implementing (“nonprofit”) and philanthropic organizations

Examples: American University in Cairo, Grand Valley State University, Indiana University Purdue University Center on Philanthropy, Institute of Development Studies (UK), National Center on Philanthropy and the Law

B. Independent Research Centers—independent entities that collect data, conduct research, and/or disseminate information and knowledge about the work of implementing (“nonprofit”) and philanthropic organizations

Examples: Aspen Institute, Brookings Institution, Harder and Company Community Research, Hudson Institute, Urban Institute

C. Consulting/Advisory Organizations—organizations that provide strategic or project-focused expertise and advice in support of the work of implementing (“nonprofit”) and philanthropic organizations

Examples: Bridgespan Group, Equal Measure, FSG, Nonprofit Finance Fund, TCC Group

D. Public Policy/Advocacy Organizations—organizations that provide policy- or advocacy-focused expertise and advice in support of the work of implementing (“nonprofit”) and philanthropic organizations

Examples: Associated Black Charities, Capital Research Center, Center for Rural Strategies, Demos: A Network for Ideas and Action, Mathematica Policy Research

15 National-level associations, such as Council on Foundations in the United States, Asociación Española de Fundaciones in Spain, and Grupo de Institutos Fundaciones e Empresas in Brazil, are considered “general” organizations within their national context, rather than geo-focused organizations.

16 In the U.S., the term “implementing organizations” refers to nonprofit organizations, as distinguished from foundations or other philanthropic entities.
**PHILANTHROPY-FOCUSED ASSOCIATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS**

**GENERAL**
- Alliance for Global Good (NC)
- Asia Pacific Philanthropy Consortium (Philippines)
- Asian Venture Philanthropy Network (Singapore)
- Association for Community Relations (Romania)
- Association of Charitable Foundations (United Kingdom)
- Bulgarian Donors Forum (Bulgaria)
- Center for Effective Philanthropy (MA)
- Centre for Philanthropy (Ukraine)
- CFLeads (MO)
- Charities Aid Foundation-Southern Africa (South Africa)
- China Foundation Center (China)
- Committee to Encourage Corporate Philanthropy (NY)
- Community Foundation Insights (NY)
- Confluence Philanthropy (NY)
- Council on Foundations (VA)
- Czech Association of Community Foundations (Czech Republic)
- Czech Donors Forum (Czech Republic)
- East Africa Association of Grantmakers (Kenya)
- Emerging Practitioners in Philanthropy (CA)
- European Foundation Centre (Belgium)
- European Venture Philanthropy Association (Belgium)
- Exponent Philanthropy (DC)
- First Nations Development Institute (CO)
- Foundation Financial Officers Group (IL)
- Foundation Incubator (CA)
- Grantmakers for Effective Organizations (DC)
- Growth Philanthropy Network (NY)
- Grupo de Institutos Fundações e Empresas (Brazil)
- Hungarian Donors Forum (Hungary)
- Institute for Philanthropy (United Kingdom)
- Japan Philanthropic Association (Japan)
- Joint Affinity Groups (MN)
- Mexican Center for Philanthropy (Mexico)
- Mission Investors Exchange (WA)
- National Center for Family Philanthropy (DC)
- National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy (DC)
- Network of European Foundations for Innovative Cooperation (Belgium)
- Our Giving Community (ME)
- PEAK Grantmaking (DC)
- Philanthropic Initiative (MA)
- Philanthropy Roundtable (DC)
- Philanthropy Workshop West (CA)
- Polish Donors Forum (Poland)
- Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors (NY)
- Romanian Donors Forum (Romania)
- Russia Donors Forum (Russia)
- Sampradaan Indian Centre for Philanthropy (India)
- Slovak Donors Forum (Slovakia)
- Southern African Community Grantmakers Leadership Forum (South Africa)
- Southern African Grantmakers Association (South Africa)
- Ukrainian Philanthropists Forum (Ukraine)
- World Affairs Council of Northern California (CA)
- Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support - WINGS (Brazil)

**GEO-FOCUSED**
- Africa Grantmakers Affinity Group (DC)
- Alabama Giving (AL)
- Appalachian Funds Network (NC)
- Arizona Grantmakers Forum (AZ)
- Associated Grant Makers (MA)
- Association of Baltimore Area Grantmakers (MD)
- Chesapeake Bay Funders Network (MD)
- Colorado Association of Funders (CO)
- Connecticut Council for Philanthropy (CT)
- Council of Michigan Foundations (MI)
- Council of New Jersey Grantmakers (NJ)
- Donors Forum of South Florida (FL)
- Florida Philanthropic Network (FL)
- Forefront (IL)

**ISSUE-FOCUSED**
- Asset Funders Network (IL)
- Australian Environmental Grantmakers Network (Australia)
- Bay Area Justice Funders Network (CA)
- Center for Disaster Philanthropy (DC)
- Consultative Group on Biological Diversity (CA)
- EDGE Funders Alliance (CA)
- Environmental Grantmakers Association (NY)
- Funders Collaborative on Youth Organizing (NY)
- Funders Concerned About AIDS (DC)
- Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers (DC)
- Gateway Center for Giving (MO)
- Grantmakers Forum of New York (NY)
- Grantmakers of Oregon and Southwest Washington (OR)
- Grantmakers of Western Pennsylvania (PA)
- Indiana Philanthropy Alliance (IN)
- Indiana Philanthropy Alliance Foundation (IN)
- Kentucky Philanthropy Initiative (KY)
- Maine Philanthropy Center (ME)
- Minnesota Council on Foundations (MN)
- Mississippi Association of Grantmakers (MS)
- New Mexico Association of Grantmakers (NM)
- North Carolina Network of Grantmakers (NC)
- Northern California Grantmakers (CA)
- Philanthropy Network Greater Philadelphia (PA)
- Philanthropy New York (NY)
- Philanthropy Northwest (WA)
- Philanthropy Ohio (OH)
- Philanthropy Southwest (TX)
- San Diego Grantmakers (CA)
- Southeastern Council of Foundations (GA)
- Southern California Grantmakers (CA)
- U.S.-Mexico Border Philanthropy Partnership (CA)
- Washington Regional Association of Grantmakers (DC)
- West Virginia Grantmakers Association (WV)
- Wisconsin Philanthropy Network (WI)
Funders for Sustainable Food Systems (CA)
Funders’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities (FL)
Funders Network on Population, Reproductive Health and Rights (MD)
Funders Together to End Homelessness (MA)
Grantmakers for Education (OR)
Grantmakers for Southern Progress (NC)
Grantmakers for Southern Progress (LA)
Grantmakers in Health (DC)
Grantmakers in the Arts (WA)
Grantmakers Without Borders (CA)
Gulf Coast Funders for Equity (LA)
Health and Environmental Funders Network (MD)
Interfaith Funders (CO)
International Human Rights Funders Group (NY)
Juvenile Justice Work Group (MO)
Media Impact Funders (PA)
More for Mission Investing (MA)
National Public Education Support Fund (DC)
National Rural Funders Collaborative (TX)
Neighborhood Funders Group (CA)
Neighborhood Funders Group (DC)
Philanthropic Collaborative for a Healthy Georgia (GA)
Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement (DC)
Sustainability Funders (CA)
Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems Funders (CA)
Funders Collaborative for Strong Latino Communities (NC)
Funders Collaborative for Strong Latino Communities- Midwest Region (MN)
Grantmakers for Lesbian and Gay Issues (NY)
Grantmakers Concerned with Immigrants and Refugees (CA)
Grantmakers for Children, Youth and Families (MD)
Grantmakers in Aging (VA)
Hispanics in Philanthropy (CA)
International Funders for Indigenous Peoples (CA)
International Network of Women’s Funds (Mexico)
National Center for Black Philanthropy (DC)
Native Americans in Philanthropy (MN)
New England Blacks in Philanthropy (MA)
Students Helping Achieve Philanthropic Excellence (FL)
Women and Philanthropy (DC)
Women Donors Network (CA)
Women Moving Millions (NY)
Women’s Funding Network (CA)
Young Philanthropists Foundation (CO)
Youth Transition Funders Group (IL)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (WA)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (VA)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (MI)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (TX)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (NJ)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (ND)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (TX)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (OH)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (RI)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (AK)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (MD)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (CA)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (CA)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (TX)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (NY)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (IN)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (AL)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (CA)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (CA)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (FL)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (OH)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (OH)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (TX)
Association of Fundraising Professionals- Greater Houston Chapter (TX)
Association of Fundraising Professionals- Oregon and SW Washington Chapter (OR)
Big Sky Institute for the Advancement of Nonprofits (MT)
Brazilian Association of Non-Governmental Organizations (Brazil)
California Association of Nonprofits (CA)
Carbondale Community Nonprofit Center (CO)
Center for Excellence in Nonprofits (CA)
Center for Nonprofit Advancement (DC)
Center for Nonprofit Corporations (NJ)
Center for Nonprofit Excellence (OH)
Center for Nonprofit Excellence (KY)
Center for Nonprofit Excellence (VA)

**POPULATION-FOCUSED**

Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy (CA)
Association of Black Foundation Executives (NY)
Bay Area Blacks in Philanthropy (CA)
Bay Area Early Childhood Funders (CA)
Black Philanthropic Alliance (DC)
D5 Coalition (IL)
Disability Funders Network (WA)
Foundations and Donors Interested in Catholic Activities (DC)

**NONPROFIT-FOCUSED ASSOCIATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS**

**NONPROFIT ASSOCIATIONS**

Alliance for Better Nonprofits (TN)
Alliance for Nonprofit Excellence (TN)
Alliance for Nonprofit Management (NY)
Alliance of Arizona Nonprofits (AZ)
American Society of Association Executives (DC)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (NY)\(^{17}\)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (MN)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (CA)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (NA)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (VA)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (HI)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (IL)
Association of Fundraising Professionals (OH)

\(^{17}\) Some organizations have multiple local units or multiple chapters located in the same state that are all listed separately in this appendix.
### NONPROFIT SERVICES

- 501 Commons (WA)
- 501cTech (DC)
- Academy for the Development of Philanthropy in Poland (Poland)
- Achievements Unlimited Foundation (ND)
- Action Without Borders (NY)
- All Stars Helping Kids (CA)
- American Fund for Charities (DE)
- Americas Charities (VA)
- Apparo Solutions (NC)
- Arkansas Nonprofit Alliance (AR)
- Athletes for Hope (MD)
- BoardAssist (NY)
- BoardSource (DC)
- Business Civic Leadership Center (DC)
- Business Volunteers Unlimited (OH)
- Cause Effective (NY)
- Center for Civic Partnerships (CA)
- Charitable Ventures of Orange County (CA)
- Charities Review Council of Minnesota (MN)
- Colorado Nonprofit Development Center (CO)
- Community League (NJ)
- Community Partners (CA)
- Community Resource Center (CO)
- Community Resource Exchange (NY)
- CompassPoint Nonprofit Services (CA)
- Development Gateway, Inc. (DC)
- Entrepreneurs Foundation (CA)
- Executives in Action (TX)
- Financial Stewardship Resources (OR)
- Foraker Group (AK)
- Generous Giving (TN)
- GiveDirectly Inc (NY)
- GiveMN.org (MN)
- Good360 (VA)
- GoodNet (FL)
- Grassroots Institute for Fundraising Training (CA)
- Greater DC Cares (DC)
- Greenlights for Nonprofit Success (TX)
- Groundspring.org (CA)
- Hopa Mountain (MT)
- Impact Foundation (ND)
- Impact Online (CA)
- Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center (IN)
- Innovation Network (DC)
- Institute for Nonprofit News (CA)
- Interaction Institute for Social Change (MA)
- International Center for Innovation in Civic Participation (DC)
- JustGive (CA)
- La Piana Associates (CA)
- Lawyers Alliance for New York (NY)
- Learning to Give (MI)
- Long Beach Nonprofit Partnership (CA)
- Management Assistance Program for Nonprofits (MN)
- MarinSpace, Inc. (CA)
- MBA-Nonprofit Connection (CA)
- Michigan Community Resources (MI)
- Midland Shared Spaces (TX)
- NetHope (VA)
- Netroots Foundation (CA)
- Network for Good (DC)
- Nonprofit Assistance Center (WA)
- Nonprofit Connection (NY)
- Nonprofit Enterprise and Self-Sustainability Team (CA)
- Nonprofit Enterprise at Work (MI)
- Nonprofits Assistance Fund (MN)
- NPO Development Center, Shanghai (China)
- OneStar Foundation (TX)
- Orange County Shared Spaces Foundation (CA)
- Partnership for Nonprofit Excellence (VA)
- Potlatch Fund (WA)

### INFORMATION SERVICES

- Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (IN)
- BBB Wise Giving Alliance (VA)
- Catalogue for Philanthropy (MA)
- Catalogue for Philanthropy Greater Washington (DC)
- Charity Navigator (NJ)
- Charity Rating Ideell Forening (Sweden)
- Foundation Center (NY)
- FrameWorks Institute (DC)
- Funding Information Center of Fort Worth (TX)
- Global Philanthropy Partnership (IL)
- GreatNonprofits (CA)
- GuideStar International (United Kingdom)
- GuideStar USA (VA)
- International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (DC)
- IssueLab (IL)
- New Philanthropy Capital (United Kingdom)
- Nonprofit Knowledge Works (LA)
- Philanthropic Collaborative (DC)
- Philanthropic Enterprise (IN)
- Rockefeller Archive Center (NY)
MULTI-SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS

ACADEMIC RESEARCH CENTERS

American University in Cairo (Egypt)
Ancilla Domini College (IN)
Autonomous Technological Institute of Mexico (Mexico)
Boston College (MA)
Boston University (MA)
Brandeis University (MA)
Case Western Reserve University (OH)
Claremont Graduate University (CA)
Columbia University (NY)
Duke University (NC)
Georgetown University (DC)
Graduate Center, City University of New York (NY)
Grand Valley State University (MI)
Harvard University (MA)
Holy Cross College (IN)
Indiana University (IN)
Indiana University–Purdue University Center on Philanthropy (IN)
Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IN)
Institute of Development Studies (United Kingdom)
Johns Hopkins University (MD)
Kellogg Community College (MI)
La Salle University (PA)
Michigan State University (MI)
Michigan Technological University (MI)
Midland College (TX)
National Center on Philanthropy and the Law (NY)
New York University (NY)
Northwestern University (IL)
Peking University (China)
Renmin University of China (China)
Robert Morris University (PA)
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey (NJ)
Stanford University (CA)
Temple University (PA)
University of California (CA)
University of California (CA)
University of California (CA)
University of Cape Town (South Africa)
University of Chicago (IL)
University of Denver (CO)
University of KwaZulu–Natal (South Africa)
University of Minnesota (MN)
University of Pennsylvania (PA)
University of Pittsburgh (PA)
University of Southern California (CA)
University of Texas (TX)
Yale University (CT)

INDEPENDENT RESEARCH CENTERS

Aspen Institute (DC)
Beijing Civil Society Development Research Center (China)
Brookings Institution (DC)
Centre for Research and Innovation in Social Policy and Practice (United Kingdom)
Harder and Company Community Research (CA)
Health Research and Educational Trust of New Jersey (NJ)
Hudson Institute (DC)
Human Interaction Research Institute (CA)
Urban Institute (DC)

CONSULTING/ADVISORY

AccountAbility: Institute of Social and Ethical AccountAbility (United Kingdom)
ARCeconomics (SC)
Brandon Roberts and Associates (MD)
Bridgespan Group (MA)
Cause Communications (CA)
Changemakers (CA)
Common Impact (MA)
Communications Leadership Institute (DC)
Development Alternatives and Resource Centre (Nigeria)

PUBLIC POLICY/ADVOCACY

Associated Black Charities (MD)
Capital Research Center (DC)
Center for Effective Government (DC)
Center for Lobbying in the Public Interest (DC)
Center for Rural Strategies (KY)
CIN (NC)
Demos: A Network for Ideas and Action (NY)
Fund for Our Economic Future (OH)
Mathematica Policy Research (NJ)

Equal Measure (PA)
Executive Service Corps of Central Oklahoma (OK)
Executive Service Corps of Chicago (IL)
Executive Service Corps of New England (MA)
Executive Service Corps of Southern California (CA)
Executive Service Corps of the Charlotte Region (NC)
Executive Service Corps, Detroit (MI)
FSG (MA)
Gallup (DC)
IDEO (CA)
Just Partners (MD)
LaFrance Associates (CA)
LeaderSpring (CA)
Legacy Works Foundation (CA)
LM Strategies Consulting, LLC (IL)
Looking Glass Institute (PA)
Management Assistance Group (DC)
Management Consulting Services (MA)
McLeod Grant Advisors (CA)
Nonprofit Finance Fund (NY)
Root Cause Institute (MA)
Spitfire Strategies (DC)
Synergos Institute (NY)
TCC Group (NY)
Williams Group (MI)
## APPENDIX C:
### Infrastructure Funders That Provided More Than One Million Dollars in Support from 2004 to 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MORE THAN $50 MILLION</th>
<th>$5 MILLION TO $9.9 MILLION</th>
<th>$2 MILLION TO $4.9 MILLION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>3M Foundation</td>
<td>Abell-Hanger Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Stewart Mott Foundation</td>
<td>American Express Foundation</td>
<td>Abbott Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The David and Lucile Packard Foundation</td>
<td>The Bank of America Charitable Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>The Ahmanson Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
<td>Boston Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>Alfred P. Sloan Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. K. Kellogg Foundation</td>
<td>Bush Foundation</td>
<td>The Allstate Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation</td>
<td>Carnegie Corporation of New York</td>
<td>Altman Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation</td>
<td>The Chicago Community Foundation</td>
<td>The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$10 MILLION TO $49.9 MILLION</th>
<th>$5 MILLION TO $9.9 MILLION</th>
<th>$2 MILLION TO $4.9 MILLION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Annie E. Casey Foundation</td>
<td>3M Foundation</td>
<td>Abell-Hanger Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barr Foundation</td>
<td>American Express Foundation</td>
<td>Abbott Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Shield of California Foundation</td>
<td>The Bank of America Charitable Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>The Ahmanson Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The California Endowment</td>
<td>Boston Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>Alfred P. Sloan Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The California Wellness Foundation</td>
<td>Bush Foundation</td>
<td>The Allstate Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad N. Hilton Foundation</td>
<td>Carnegie Corporation of New York</td>
<td>Altman Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna McConnell Clark Foundation</td>
<td>The Chicago Community Foundation</td>
<td>The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund</td>
<td>Cisco Systems Foundation</td>
<td>Annenberg Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation to Promote Open Society</td>
<td>Citi Foundation</td>
<td>Arcus Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greater Washington Community Foundation</td>
<td>The Clark Foundation</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The James Irvine Foundation</td>
<td>The Cleveland Foundation</td>
<td>Bader Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td>Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation</td>
<td>The Bauman Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John S. and James L. Knight Foundation</td>
<td>GE Foundation</td>
<td>California Community Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kresge Foundation</td>
<td>Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation</td>
<td>California Community Foundation of Greater Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilly Endowment Inc.</td>
<td>The Heinz Endowments</td>
<td>Communities Foundation of Texas, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerite Casey Foundation</td>
<td>Houston Endowment Inc.</td>
<td>Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New York Community Trust</td>
<td>The Joyce Foundation</td>
<td>Dalio Foundation, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omidyar Network Fund, Inc.</td>
<td>The JPB Foundation</td>
<td>Daniels Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmussen Foundation</td>
<td>The JPMorgan Chase Foundation</td>
<td>The Denver Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rockefeller Foundation</td>
<td>Lumina Foundation</td>
<td>Dobkin Family Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Lilly Philanthropic Foundation</td>
<td>The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>Doris Duke Charitable Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon Valley Community Foundation</td>
<td>M. J. Murdock Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Dyson Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surdna Foundation, Inc</td>
<td>Marin Community Foundation</td>
<td>Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wallace Foundation</td>
<td>The McKnight Foundation</td>
<td>The F. B. Heron Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Michael and Susan Dell Foundation</td>
<td>The George Gund Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation</td>
<td>Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northwest Area Foundation</td>
<td>Gill Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Oak Foundation U.S.A.</td>
<td>Google Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Society Institute</td>
<td>The Harry &amp; Jeanette Weinberg Foundation Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Paul G. Allen Family Foundation</td>
<td>Hartford Foundation for Public Giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peninsula Community Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Healthcare Georgia Foundation, Inc.
The Herbert H. and Grace A. Dow Foundation
John Templeton Foundation
The Kendeda Fund
The Lemelson Foundation
Levi Strauss Foundation
The Maclellan Foundation, Inc.
Margaret A. Cargill Foundation
McGregor Fund
The Meadows Foundation
Meyer Memorial Trust
The Minneapolis Foundation
The Nathan Cummings Foundation
New Hampshire Charitable Foundation
Newman’s Own Foundation
Otto Bremer Trust
The Paul G. Allen Charitable Foundation
The Pfizer Foundation, Inc.
The Prudential Foundation
RGK Foundation
Robertson Foundation
The Saint Paul Foundation
The San Francisco Foundation
Sarah Scaife Foundation, Inc.
S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation
Searle Freedom Trust
The Skillman Foundation
Stuart Foundation
Ted Arison Family Foundation USA, Inc.
The Wal-Mart Foundation, Inc.
Wells Fargo Foundation
William E. Simon Foundation, Inc.
William Randolph Hearst Foundation
Yawkey Foundation II
Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, Inc.

$1 MILLION TO $1.9 MILLION

Alcoa Foundation
The Anschutz Foundation
The Applied Materials Foundation
Arie and Ida Crown Memorial
The Assisi Foundation of Memphis, Inc.
Baptist Community Ministries
Baton Rouge Area Foundation
Bloomberg Philanthropies
Blue Moon Fund, Inc.
Booth Ferris Foundation
The Bristol-Myers Squibb Foundation, Inc.
The Cargill Foundation
The Case Foundation
Charles K. Blandin Foundation
Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation
College Futures Foundation
The Colorado Trust
The Columbus Foundation and Affiliated Organizations
The Commonwealth Fund
Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta
The Community Foundation for Northeast Florida
Community Foundation Silicon Valley
Deerbrook Charitable Trust
DTE Energy Foundation
The Duke Endowment
The East Bay Community Foundation
El Pomar Foundation
Fannie Mae Foundation
Fidelity Foundation
Foundation For The Carolinas
Freddie Mac Foundation
The Frist Foundation
General Mills Inc
The Gordon and Llura Gund Foundation
The Grable Foundation
Grand Rapids Community Foundation
Greater Milwaukee Foundation
The Greater New Orleans Foundation
H. N. & Frances C. Berger Foundation
Henry Luce Foundation
Horace W. Goldsmith Foundation
Hudson-Webber Foundation
Irene W. & C. B. Pennington Foundation
Irving Harris Foundation
The J. Willard and Alice S. Marriott Foundation
Jessie Ball duPont Fund
Kalliopeia Foundation
Kansas Health Foundation
Kimberly-Clark Foundation, Inc.
The Leona M. and Harry B. Helmsley Charitable Trust
Longwood Foundation
The Marcus Foundation, Inc.
Marty and Dorothy Silverman Foundation
Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, Inc.
Max M. and Marjorie S. Fisher Foundation, Inc.
Medtronic Communities Foundation
The Melville Charitable Trust
Mertz Gilmore Foundation
MetLife Foundation
Minnesota Community Foundation
New York Foundation
New York Life Foundation
NoVo Foundation
The Noyce Foundation
Orange County Community Foundation
The Philadelphia Foundation
The Pittsburgh Foundation
Polk Bros. Foundation, Inc.
Public Welfare Foundation, Inc.
The Ralph M. Parsons Foundation
The Retirement Research Foundation
Richard and Rhoda Goldman Fund
Saint Luke’s Foundation of Cleveland, Ohio
The Spencer Foundation
The Starr Foundation
The Staten Island Foundation
State Street Foundation, Inc.
The Summit Foundation
The Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation
Travelers Foundation
Triad Foundation, Inc.
The Valhalla Charitable Foundation
Vermont Community Foundation
The Wachovia Wells Fargo Foundation, Inc.
Wallace Alexander Gerbode Foundation
Walter and Elise Haas Fund
The Wendling Foundation