Funding Scan Methodology[1]

1. Database and website searches

We included 380 activities in our analysis of current (spanning the period July-Oct 2025 per Table 1) instances of mineral governance funding. The focus of the database searches was to find as many currently active mineral governance projects as possible, and record and categorize them in terms of the types of work being conducted. To achieve that, we manually combed development funding databases and funder websites to find and include details of relevant projects. **Table 1** describes the searches conducted.

Table 1: Database searches conducted

Source	Filters or search terms	Date of final search
Alfred P. Sloane Foundation	Search terms: "mining" "mineral" "extractive"	16 Sept 2025
Asian Development Bank	Search terms: "mining," "mineral"; Theme: Governance and capacity development	18 July 2025
AusDevPortal	Mineral Resources & Mining; 2023-2024	Mid-May 2025
BHP Foundation	Annual report 2024	20 August 2025
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation	Search terms: "mining" "mineral" "extractive"	16 Sept 2025
EGPS	Current projects (only those till July 2025)	20 August 2025
Ford Foundation grants database	Search terms: "mining" "mineral" "extractive"	16 Sept 2025
Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation	Search terms: "mining" "mineral" "extractive"	3 Sept 2025
IATI through D-portal	Sector: "Sector Group; Mineral/mining policy and administrative management 32210"; Active activities	16 July 2025
	Reporting Organisation: *Check for entries from a list of private foundations, for example William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and the Gates Foundation*	22 August 2025
	Search terms: "mineral governance" or "mining governance" or "governance of minerals"; Active Activities	25 Oct 2025
	Sector: "Domestic Revenue Mobilisation (15114)"; Search terms: "mining" or "mineral" or "extractive"; Active activities	26 Sept 2025

---

[1] This document forms part of Kazemi, L. & Bulman, A. (March 2026). Thinking Strategically About Mineral Governance Funding: Perspectives on Current and Future Priorities. https://taicollaborative.org/thinking-strategically-about-mineral-governance-funding-perspectives-on-current-and-future-priorities.

Source	Filters or search terms	Date of final search
	Spanish search terms: "minería"; "extractivo"; "extractive"	24 Sept 2025
	French search terms: exploitation minière; mineral; extractif	24 Sept 2025
	Reporting Organisation: African Development Bank; Search term: "mining" or "mineral" or "extractive"	1 Oct 2025
Inter-American Development Bank	Project status: preparation/implementation; Search terms: "mining," "mineral," "extractive"	6 August 2025
ISEAL Alliance (ISEAL Innovations Fund)	Sector: Mining; Active project	2 Sept 2025
MacArthur Foundation	Search terms: "mining," "mineral," "extractive"	22 August 2025
Open Society Foundations	Search terms: "mining," "mineral," "extractive"	20 August 2025
Quadrature Climate Foundation (QCF)	Opened their partner database until 2022 entries started appearing and then searched 2023-2025 ones for key terms "mining" "mineral" "extractive"	20 August 2025
United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF)	Search terms: "mining," "mineral," "extractive"	22 August 2025
William and Flora Hewlett Foundation	Search terms: "mining," "mineral," "extractive"	20 August 2025
World Bank Project List	Search terms: "mining governance"; Status: Active	4 August 2025

We chose not to search some databases for specific reasons. **Table 2** sets out the databases we excluded and the reasoning behind those decisions.

Table 2: Excluded databases

Source	Reason for exclusion
OECD Data Explorer	There is an 18–24-month delay on data due to pre-publication validation processes (the most recent year being 2023), which was too delayed for the purposes of our "current and future" mandate.
Candid – Foundation Directory (paid subscription)	This dataset focuses primarily on US-based philanthropic organizations so is geographically limited. Further, "Candid typically won't have a critical mass of transactions for a given year until 2-3

Source	Reason for exclusion
	years after that calendar year has ended."[2] We decided that limited time and resources were better spent employing our alternative chosen methods (including identifying funders through key INGO financial reports and interview references and reaching out directly to individual foundations through interviews and surveys).
Candid – Foundation 1000 dataset (available for purchase for a given year and code)	Code "Mining and resource extraction," defined as "Promotion of the mining and resource extraction sector, including prospecting activities and refining" appeared too limited for our search. Similar reasoning regarding time and resources as above due to validated data available only be up to the end of fiscal year 2023.
360 https://www.360giving.org/explore/ is good.	Limited to the UK in terms of country and region.

We checked for the following funders on d-portal (but they were not listed as reporting organisations) and on their individual websites in mid-August 2025 but did not find a database or other source of project information:

---

[2]

https://candid.issuelab.org/resource/research-manual-analyzing-grants-and-other-philanthropic-transactions.html

- 11th Hour Project
- Anglo American Foundation
- Chandler Foundation
- ClimateWorks Foundation (only Form 990 to 2022)
- DAI Global LLC
- Equinor
- Global Methane Hub

- Heising- Simons Foundation
- Heinrich Boll Stiftung
- Microsoft Corporation
- Robertson Foundation
- Sequoia Foundation
- Tortuga Foundation
- Waverly Street Foundation

We followed up with several of these funders via direct email requesting lists of projects (and funders in Table 1 above) to try to fill this particular set of informational gaps.

Finally, we looked at the websites and financials of some of the major international NGOs in the mineral governance space to see who their current funders are. **Table 3** describes those searches.

Table 3: International NGO websites and financial reports that were checked for current funders

Source	Filters or search terms	Date of final search
NRGI current funders	Only including those till July 2025	13 June 2025
EITI	2024 accounts	Mid-May 2025
Institute for Responsible Mining Assurance (IRMA)	2024 funders	Mid-August 2025

Database and website searches limitations

Our database and website searches were subject to the following limitations:

- IATI data (d-portal) is not fixed, which means that it can be and is updated at any time. This means that the data for those searches is not final and projects that would meet our criteria would inevitably have been missed if they were entered after the final day of searching listed above.
- The quality and nature of the data is variable across those funders who do publish.[3]
- We found almost no data on the funding activities of China or other BRICS countries.
- Relevant projects and funders will have been overlooked if the funder did not enter their data into the databases above or if we did not specifically search their website or receive information from them through an interview (see next section). This is likely to include "Academic funding unless captured in the OECD DAC, Corporate funding, Domestic government funding, e.g., countries' own funding to their competition authorities, Global South governments except for those that report to IATI or OECD, DAC Global South philanthropies, Individual donor funding, Union funding"[4] and embassies.
- In some cases there may be duplicate counting of money or an activity. This happens where we include the details of an original donor grant which is then given to an intermediary funder who then regrants. For example, we want to know which countries are funding the EGPS and so include those contributions. We also want to know who EGPS is giving grants to

---

and what for, so we include that as an activity as well. NB we have not included country contributions to IDA generally.
- We did not search all available databases and websites (per Table 2).
- Some donors, particularly those based in the United States, for safety and strategic reasons have removed project data from public sources and were unable to share project specifics with us. In some cases, they were able to share aggregated data points for us to include, in others they could not.

The specific challenges associated with funding amounts

Funding amounts were subject to some very specific limitations, including:

- The dataset not being comprehensive (for the reasons described above) means that totals *based on available data* would be an inaccurate representation of *actual* total funding flows and could very easily be taken out of context and misused.
- Reporting of aggregated sums by some funders, including for some of the largest funding packages, makes it impossible to parse out the amount specifically allocated for mineral governance activities, which might represent anything from a small fraction to the vast majority of the total provided.

As a result of these challenges, the authors decided that it would be misleading or confusing to integrate trends in funding flows based on funding amounts in our analysis and deliberately avoided doing so. To develop an accurate picture about the amount of funding flowing to mineral governance, a much larger and different type of study would be required; one that involves multiple layers of digital and human analysis.[5] This was simply beyond the scope of this analysis. However, on occasion, the authors do make some observations based on the 15 or so projects receiving the largest funding amounts *where mineral governance appeared to be the primary, and not incidental, focus.*

Data categorization and cleaning

Once we completed our searches, we doubled back and checked the relevance of each entry and "cleaned" the data so that it could be analysed using quantitative and qualitative methods. This process of cleaning included categorising topics in the following ways:

- We used the following list of regions based on World Bank Countries and Economies:[6]
  - East Asia and Pacific
  - Europe and Central Asia
  - Latin America and Caribbean
  - Middle East and North Africa
  - North America
  - South Asia
  - Sub-Saharan Africa
    - Where records say "Africa" we only applied the *Region/s* category "Sub-Saharan Africa" and not "Middle East and North Africa, Afghanistan and Pakistan" as well (per our Geographic regions set out below) unless there was specific mention of a North African country.
- For entries for current IRMA funders: "Not specified" for *Issue/s* due to range of issues included in IRMA's standards.
- For entries for current NRGI funders: "Not specified" for *Issue/s* when not a specific project described, due to the breadth of NRGI's work.

---

[5] See for example the methodology described in State of Funding for Tenure Rights
[6] https://projects.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/project-country

- For entries for current NRGI, IRMA and EITI funders: "Global" for *Region* unless a specific region was specified.
- Based on insights from an interview, we kept entries related to the US Departments of State, Labor and Defence, but deleted all those related to USAID on the assumption they have been cut since the shuttering of USAID in 2025.
- For d-Portal listings, we only included those named as "Implementing" and not collaborators that were included in project descriptions.
- We made assumptions regarding *Aid type* to call those that were not entered into d-portal but were very obviously described as projects as "Project-type interventions" – the same for "Core funding"
- NB: Where Mineral type included "Critical minerals" it did not always mean that the Issue/s tagged Global climate goals; that category was limited to explicit references to (1) reductions in mine emission and (2) climate justice or security of supply.

This process of categorising project descriptions is inherently imperfect for the following reasons:

- Human subjectivity – while we conducted random cross-checks of categorisations, descriptions could be subject to different interpretations, particularly regarding issue categories.
- The imprecise art not science of unpacking complex systems – we have tried our best to codify incredibly complex systems but recognise the insufficiency of data to capture social science nuance.

2. Interviews

We invited via direct email representatives from more than 44 funders that we identified as being present in the mineral governance space to participate in either a survey or interview (surveys were also circulated via LinkedIn). We interviewed 21 **funder representatives or consultants** from 20 entities with the following funder type breakdown:

- 8 x Private foundation
- 2 x Industry foundation
- 4 x Multilateral development banks
- 4 x Government funders
- 1 x Re-granting organization
- 1 x Private consultant

We invited via direct email representatives from more than 61 implementing parties that we identified as being present in the mineral governance space to participate in either a survey or interview (surveys were also publicly circulated via LinkedIn). We interviewed 17 **implementing party representatives** from 16 different organizations with the following entity type breakdown:

- 6 x INGOs
- 1 x Multi-stakeholder initiative
- 2 x Regional NGOs
- 1 x Industry standard body
- 1 x Industry body
- 2 x Think tanks / academia
- 2 x Inter-governmental organizations
- 1 x Private consultant

Going into each interview we had a template set of questions based on the survey questions, however in order to maximise the quality of the discussion in the narrow 30–45-minute window, we tailored and narrowed the questions accordingly during the interviews.

Interview limitations

The interviews were subject to the following limitations:

- With one inter-governmental organisation exception (where two separate interviewees worked in different divisions of the same organization) and one government exception (where two separate interviewees represented two different funder organizations from the same country), we only conducted one interview from each organization. While we tried to target those with the greatest knowledge of their organization's mineral governance portfolio, some are particularly large organizations and so one person/our contact would not necessarily be well placed to speak on behalf of the whole organization.
- Finite time and resources necessarily constrain the comprehensiveness of research, including, in this case the number of interviews that could be carried out. For an analysis of this scale and nature (a forward-looking funding scan), the authors prioritized funder interviews and were able to cover a reasonable cross-section of relevant actors funding mineral governance. A sampling of implementing parties were interviewed to provide a complementary set of "demand-side" perspectives. While the samples do not capture the views of the incredibly large number of international, regional, national and local level actors working in this space, they do provide a rich and varied starting point.
- We reached out to many more people than responded and so the sample was skewed by people's availability at the time.

3. Surveys

Three **funders** completed the funder survey: two from funder governments and one from a funder collaborative. In addition to directly contacting over 100 funders and implementing parties to request their input in either the interview or survey, we also distributed the **implementing party survey** via a public post on LinkedIn which was shared by a number of colleagues and by direct requests to colleagues to share among their networks.

The implementing party survey was distributed in English, Spanish and French. We received 11 responses in total: 7 x English; 4 French; 0 Spanish. The respondents represented the following entity types:

- 5 x National NGOs / civil society
- 4 x International NGO
- 1 x Regional NGO
- 1 x Multi-stakeholder organization

The English text of each survey is set out below.

Survey limitations

- The surveys were subject to the same limitations as the interviews, including a selection bias in terms of those who *chose* to respond.

Funder and implementing party survey texts – English

Funder survey

TITLE: Mineral Governance Funding Priorities and Trends

This survey is a key input into a **scan of current and anticipated trends in funding by industry, public, and philanthropic donors to improve mineral governance**. The results of this scan will be conveyed in a report and briefing on key findings and recommendations for participating funders. The intention is to identify gaps and opportunities to optimize mineral governance funding amid a moment of shifting geopolitical contexts, donor priorities and country finances.

Because the funding scan seeks to unpack forward-looking priorities or subjective assessments of the broader mineral governance landscape, **direct input from donors like yourself is a crucial source of information**. All details provided will be used only for internal purposes to make the best use of the data and **anonymized** in all public-facing outputs.

Thank you in advance for taking a few minutes to fill out the survey below. **If you would prefer to discuss these issues via a 30-minute call instead**, please email Leila Kazemi and Anna Bulman at mgsurvey2025[at]gmail.com.

*Further context: As demand skyrockets for minerals to serve the energy transition and the global economy more broadly, so too does the exposure of countries worldwide to the potential political, social, economic, and environmental consequences of mining. Under these circumstances, **governance** of the sector - the systems, policies, regulations and institutions that shape how mining activities unfold - is a crucial determinant of what the outcomes of mining will be for various stakeholders, from exploration to closure.*

OPTIONAL: Your name, organization, and title.

What type of organization do you work for?

- Private foundation
- Industry foundation
- Development finance institution or international finance institution
- Government
- Multilateral organisation
- Consortium (multiple)
- Other

Continuing minerals governance funding?: Does your organization plan to continue funding mineral governance projects for the foreseeable future?

Your organisation's forward-looking priorities: Over the next 3-5 years, what will be the mineral governance funding priorities of your organization (e.g., in terms of issues, geographic coverage, target actors, types of activities, etc.)? Will there be shifts away from your current priorities and if so, how and why?

Broader minerals governance funding landscape: What are the major trends you are observing in the funding for mineral governance beyond your organization? Is there growing interest in specific issues, geographies, target actors, or activities? Are others becoming more difficult to fund?

Gaps: What do you see as the most important gaps or blind spots that need to be addressed in the mineral governance funding landscape?

Availability for follow-up: Would you be available for a possible brief follow-up interview? If so, please provide contact information below.

Implementing party survey

TITLE: Mineral Governance Work Priorities and Trends

An opportunity for funding recipients to share feedback directly and anonymously with funders regarding mineral governance funding priorities.*

As part of a **scan of current and anticipated trends in funding by public, philanthropic, and industry donors to improve mineral governance,** we are seeking to complement donors' views with the **perspectives and priorities of actors working directly on mineral governance issues** at global, regional, national and subnational levels.

The results of this scan will be captured in a public report identifying gaps and opportunities to optimize mineral governance funding amid a moment of shifting geopolitical contexts, donor priorities and country finances. There will also be a convening of donors and stakeholders to discuss key findings.

Your insights are invaluable as we try to better understand how well aligned the priorities of donors are with those of those working on mineral governance issues on a daily basis. **All details provided will be anonymized in all outputs**.

Thank you in advance for taking a few minutes to fill out the survey below. If you would prefer to discuss these issues via a 30-minute call instead, or have any questions, please email Leila Kazemi and Anna Bulman at mgsurvey2025[at]gmail.com.

** Further context: As demand skyrockets for minerals to serve the energy transition and the global economy more broadly, so too does the exposure of countries worldwide to the potential political, social, economic, and environmental consequences of mining. Under these circumstances, **governance** of the sector - the systems, policies, regulations and institutions that shape how mining activities unfold - is a crucial determinant of the outcomes for various stakeholders, from exploration to closure.*

OPTIONAL: Your name, organization, and title.

What **type** of organization do you work for?
- National government entity/ies
- Subnational government entity/ies
- National NGO / civil society
- Community representative
- Privately owned company
- Multi-stakeholder organisation
- Academia
- Inter-governmental organization
- Public foundation
- International NGO
- Regional NGO
- Consortium
- Publicly owned company
- Multilateral organizaton
- Other

Your organisation's forward-looking priorities: Over the next 3-5 years, what will be the mineral governance priorities of your organization (e.g., in terms of issues, geographic coverage, target actors, types of activities, etc.)?

Modalities of support: What types of support from funders – financial (such as grants, co-financing, etc.) and non-financial (such as technical assistance, support for policy advocacy, support for convenings or for research) – would be most useful to support these priorities?

Gaps: Are there specific geographic areas, issues, target actors or types of activity that you think are particularly important for mineral governance but are not receiving enough attention from donors or global actors more broadly?

Additional feedback: What additional changes would you like to see to mineral governance funding (for example, in terms of focus, administrative requirements, or the types of support that funders offer)? Is there any other feedback you would like to offer?

Availability for follow-up: Would you be available for a possible brief follow-up interview? If so, please provide your contact information below.