



## Briefing Paper



ODI Europe

# Strengthening aid integrity against anti-gender actors

A tool to support bilateral and multilateral ODA donors' due diligence processes

Aline Burni

## Key messages

Anti-gender actors are drawing on increasing funding and transnational networks to coordinate, expand and proliferate attacks on gender equality, women's and LGBTQI+ rights. They are also becoming more difficult to spot. With shrinking ODA budgets, the de-prioritisation of gender equality among donors and the increasing sophistication of anti-gender actors, due diligence processes must be strengthened.

Donors risk inadvertently supporting anti-gender actors through foreign aid. This not only compromises the integrity, transparency and accountability of aid, but also jeopardises the sustainability and effectiveness of investments across broader development sectors.

Existing due diligence mechanisms focus on assessing potential grantees' financial stability, legal/tax status, governance structures and operational capacity, and the technical merit of projects. They often fail to assess the mission and values of an organisation or identify the broader networks or movements they are part of and any hidden anti-gender activities.

This tool outlines four areas for donors to further integrate in their due diligence processes: networks, partners and funding flows; narratives and language; spaces of participation, engagement and advocacy; and social media. It is designed to support bilateral and multilateral ODA donors in their due diligence processes. It is also relevant for implementing agencies and partners.

# Acknowledgements

---

The author would like to thank the members of the expert working group for their invaluable advice in developing this tool: Beatriz Gonzalez (Vice President, Global Programs, Equality Fund), Chantelle de Nobrega (Grants Manager, Mama Cash), Chiara Cosentino (Countdown 2030 Europe Coordinator, International Planned Parenthood Federation European Network), and Neil Datta (Executive Director, European Parliamentary Forum for Sexual and Reproductive Rights). The author would also like to thank Claire Kumar (Senior Research Fellow, ODI Europe), Dr Ján Michalko (Research Fellow in the Gender Equality and Social Inclusion team at ODI Global) and Dr Divya Singhal (Professor and Chair, Centre For Social Sensitivity and Action (CSSA) at the Goa Institute of Management (GIM), India) for their peer review and very constructive feedback. Finally, thanks to Sherry Dixon for coordinating the production of this paper, Matthew Foley for editing, and Nick Martin at YeahYou Design for developing the infographic.

The views and opinions expressed belong solely to the author.

## **About this publication**

This is a pilot tool and subject to revision. Feedback from readers and users is welcomed.

## **About the authors**

Dr Aline Burni is a Research Fellow, Gender and Foreign Policy for ODI Europe.

ODI Europe  
35 Square de Meeûs  
1000 Brussels  
Belgium

EU transparency register: 051479091677-17

© ODI Global 2025. This work is licensed under CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.

Front page photo: Shutterstock

Readers are encouraged to reproduce material for their own publications, as long as they are not being sold commercially. ODI Global requests due acknowledgement and a copy of the publication. For online use, we ask readers to link to the original resource on the ODI Global website. Views and opinions expressed in this publication are the responsibility of the author(s) and should in no way be attributed to the institutions to which they are affiliated or to ODI Global.

How to cite: Burni, A. (2025) *Strengthening aid integrity against anti-gender actors: A tool to support bilateral and multilateral ODA donors' due diligence processes*. Briefing Paper. Brussels: ODI Europe.

# Contents

---

## **Acknowledgements / II**

### **1 Introduction / 1**

### **2 Context / 3**

- 2.1 When development aid unintentionally boosts harmful actors / 3
- 2.2 Challenges posed by increasing sophistication of anti-gender actors / 4
- 2.3 Gender equality at risk amid ODA cuts / 5

### **3 Due diligence: learning and recommendations / 8**

- 3.1 Improving existing due diligence processes / 8

### **4 Key aspects for donors to consider / 10**

- 4.1 Networks, partners and funding flows / 10
- 4.2 Narratives and language / 12
- 4.3 Spaces of participation, engagement and advocacy / 14
- 4.4 Social media / 15
- 4.5 When in doubt, rely on and consult the gender equality movement / 17

## **References / 18**

## **Appendix 1 Anti-gender actors, funders and networks / 21**

## **Appendix 2 Examples of anti-gender advocacy activity / 24**

## **Appendix 3 Examples of potential ‘red flag’ terms / 26**

## **Appendix 4 Examples of questions to strengthen due diligence processes / 29**

## **Boxes**

**Box 1** Definition of anti-gender actors / 2

**Box 2** Norm spoiling and tactics of anti-gender actors / 4

**Box 3** Declining share of development aid for gender equality / 6

**Box 4** Why gender equality is at the heart of development / 7

**Box 5** Best practices from feminist funds / 9

# Acronyms

---

<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>LGBTQI+</b>	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning, Intersex, and others
<b>NGO</b>	Non-governmental organisation
<b>ODA</b>	Official Development Assistance
<b>OECD-DAC</b>	Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>SDG</b>	Sustainable Development Goal
<b>SRHR</b>	Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights

# 1 Introduction

Across the world, anti-gender actors and movements are drawing on increasing funding and transnational networks to coordinate, expand and proliferate actions opposing gender equality and the rights of women and LGBTQI+ individuals. In Europe alone, funding for anti-gender movements has grown four-fold in a decade, from \$22.2 million in 2009 to \$96 million in 2018, totalling \$707.2 million over the period (Datta, 2021). Anti-gender movements are a threat not just to gender equality and women's and LGBTQI+ rights, but also to democracy as such (Korolczuk, Graff and Kantola, 2025).

Against a backdrop of increasingly professionalised anti-gender actors, this tool is designed to support bilateral and multilateral Official Development Assistance (ODA) donors in their due diligence processes. It provides additional elements to consider when conducting background checks on potential grantees. It is also relevant for donors' implementing agencies and partners, such as United Nations (UN) bodies and international non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

The tool aims to help donors understand how anti-gender actors operate (see Box 1 for a definition of anti-gender actors) and to identify warning signs at an early stage, enabling them to conduct more in-depth checks when necessary. Based on consultations with an expert working group and desk research, the tool aims to help donors reduce the risks of inadvertently funding actors who, in different contexts, are working to undermine gender equality and the rights of women and LGBTQI+ people. The tool addresses the broader risks of ODA funds being misused or captured by strategic anti-gender actors who, while perhaps implementing a local development programme in relation to agriculture or religious freedom, for example, are also carrying out harmful activities from a gender equality perspective. This will also help ensure that aid resources are used more effectively and with integrity. Improving due diligence processes is equally a matter of enhancing donors' accountability to their citizens, as taxpayers' money should not support actions that conflict with democratic principles and human rights and – in the case of this tool's particular regional focus – the European Union's fundamental values, including gender equality.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The EU's commitment to gender equality is enshrined in its treaties (Articles 2 and 3(3) of the Treaty of the European Union; Articles 8 and 157 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union; the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union; and the Lisbon Treaty) and is reflected in its core policies and strategies, such as the EU Gender Action Plan III and the Gender Equality Strategy.

### Box 1 Definition of anti-gender actors

‘Anti-gender actors are individuals, organisations, and networks that mobilise against what they call “gender ideology” – a term used to denounce a range of policies, rights, and academic fields associated with gender equality, sexual and reproductive rights, and LGBTQI+ rights. These actors include religious institutions, conservative civil society organisations, political parties, and sometimes state representatives, who collaborate to oppose the advancement of gender and sexual rights at national and transnational levels.’

Source: Kuhar and Paternotte (2017)

While this tool may be of use to the gender equality community or for gender equality-specific aid budget lines, it is primarily aimed at broader sectors of ODA and donor staff not necessarily engaged in, or familiar with, gender equality support. There are two reasons for this. First, feminist movements, gender experts and ODA actors working towards gender equality are often well-equipped to identify the deceiving or misleading strategies employed by anti-gender actors and typically rely on extensive networks of allies and experts for context-specific knowledge and background checks. Second, anti-gender movements have become increasingly effective in operating across different sectors to advance their agendas, often relying on a wider range of funding across multiple sectors and engaging in diverse areas of policy to advocate for restrictive frameworks. Therefore, funding explicitly intended for (perhaps fairly gender agnostic) development projects is being exploited by anti-gender actors to cause harm.

The limitations of this tool in dealing with a complex, multifaceted issue is acknowledged. First, the tool is not primarily intended to channel funds exclusively to progressive or feminist actors. Its main purpose is not to identify eligible grantees based on specific gender equality or feminist criteria, but rather to help ensure the foreign aid - whether aimed at gender equality or other thematic areas - does not inadvertently cause harm. Second, it is clear that strengthening due diligence processes alone will not be sufficient to prevent funding from reaching anti-gender movements, which often benefit from substantial, intentional and well-organised transnational financial and political support. However, given the increasing threats to women’s and LGBTQI+ rights globally – often orchestrated by anti-gender actors – and in the context of shrinking aid budgets, this tool can help donors who care about gender equality and human rights make smarter and more ethical use of the resources that are available. Finally, while both state and non-state actors engage in anti-gender activities, this tool focuses on the latter. Nevertheless, links to state actors known for their anti-gender activities may warrant further scrutiny of potential non-state grantees.

## 2 Context

### 2.1 When development aid unintentionally boosts harmful actors

Anti-gender movements are on the rise globally. They have mobilised fear around gender equality and human rights (Gabritchidze, 2022), often framing these as foreign/Western impositions (Kinch, 2023), threats to national identity and to a traditional conception of ‘natural family’. They are also actively shaping increasingly restrictive policies and legislation targeting women, LGBTQI+ individuals and other minorities.

There is significant evidence that anti-gender actors are being funded by a global network of far-right and ultra-conservative groups or wealthy individuals, including religious organisations and clerical and aristocratic networks, as well as authoritarian states such as Russia (Datta, 2021). The difference between the resources received by anti-gender movements and progressive civil society organisations is significant. While \$3.7 billion was spent globally on anti-gender movements between 2013 and 2017, LGBTQI+ movements received only \$1.2 billion during the same period (GPP, 2020). Funding for the anti-gender movement is continuing to rise.

Progressive governments, sometimes self-labelled as feminist, have inadvertently supported anti-gender actors undermining women’s and LGBTQI+ rights through foreign aid. For example, the Institute for Journalism and Social Change found evidence that, between 2014 and 2024, aid from European governments funded conservative religious organisations in Uganda, including the Inter-Religious Council of Uganda (IRCU), that have long opposed LGBTQI+ rights and called for harsher legislation (Provost, 2023). A law imposing penalties of up to life in prison for consensual same-sex relations – the ‘Anti-Homosexuality Act 2023’ – passed in May 2023. Aid from the US and from European governments has also gone to anti-LGBTQI+ groups in Ghana that have been pushing for repressive legislation there (Provost and Darko Sekyiamah, 2022).

In these cases, projects encompassed a range of activities, including education and healthcare. Many also included capacity support for the groups involved. Even though the intention of aid donors might not have been to strengthen anti-gender actors, having aid funding from prominent development donors would have boosted anti-gender groups’ credibility, reputation and access to influence and other finance. In this sense, some ODA donors have indirectly contributed to activities aligned with regressive legislation towards women’s and LGBTQI+ rights.

## 2.2 Challenges posed by increasing sophistication of anti-gender actors

The increasing professionalisation and sophistication of anti-gender actors poses growing challenges for donors and philanthropy. Anti-gender movements are no longer active solely on the margins; they have permeated mainstream institutions, operating in spaces not obviously linked to their platform opposing women's and LGBTQI+ rights, and developing coordinated strategies that can be hard to spot. Anti-gender movements have engaged in collaborative efforts to undermine established norms and challenge the legitimacy of critical global women's rights and gender equality frameworks, especially within the UN, a practice referred to as 'norm-spoiling' (Box 2) (Holmes, 2024).

### Box 2 Norm spoiling and tactics of anti-gender actors

Norms are standards of 'appropriate behaviour for actors with a given identity' (Bloomfield and Scott, 2018). Norm spoiling refers to the process through which state or non-state actors directly challenge existing norms with the aim of weakening their influence (Sanders, 2018).

International women's rights norm spoilers are becoming more organised and effective. They form international and transnational networks which have a heterogeneous composition and deploy a variety of tactics aimed at blocking and reversing the development and diffusion of international women's rights norms (Sanders, 2018).

Among their tactics, norm-spoilers advance interpretations of extant human rights norms, particularly the protection of the 'right to life' and the 'natural family', that accord with their preferences. They also work to change and remove language in UN documents that elaborate what they consider objectionable policies and indicators of women's rights. References under frequent attack in the UN include 'various forms of the family', 'sexual and reproductive health and rights' and 'comprehensive sexuality education' (Sanders, 2018).

Norm spoilers also attempt to delegitimise the international women's rights agenda by advocating cultural relativism and 'traditional values', and by appropriating anti-colonial critiques. For instance, they often argue that 'rights' are a Western construct and not universally applicable. Such anti-colonial frames have been encouraged by conservative activists in the US and Europe in attempts to win partners in the Global South (Sanders, 2018).

Source: Sanders, 2018



## 2.3 Gender equality at risk amid ODA cuts

Development aid has recently experienced some of the most severe cuts in its modern history. In 2024, ODA from major donor countries fell by 9% compared to 2023, marking the first decline after five consecutive years of growth and the largest single-year decrease since at least 2017 (OECD, 2025). The OECD projects that ODA is set to decline by 9% to 17% in 2025 (OECD, 2025). Aid cuts have been particularly pronounced in the area of gender equality, and threaten to undo generations of investment and progress in building more equal and inclusive societies (Harper et al., 2025). ODA budgets are decreasing precisely at a time when gender equality and human rights are being attacked, and democracies are in jeopardy. No country in the world is on track to achieve gender equality by 2030, and SDG 5 (Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls) is among the least funded globally. Many countries are seeing stalled progress and even pushbacks against gender equality and the rights and empowerment of women and girls.

In terms of volume, the largest ODA donors in relation to gender equality were historically also often the largest donors of total ODA (e.g. Germany, Japan, the US, France) (Focus 2030, 2025). However, no country has reached the international target of directing at least 85% of its ODA towards gender equality, and only the Netherlands and Spain have devoted at least 20% of their ODA to the direct promotion of gender equality in the past years. Of the 32 members of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD-DAC), 20 reduced their focus on gender equality in 2021–2022 compared to 2019–2020 (see Box 3 for more detail on budget trends in this area).

### Box 3 Declining share of development aid for gender equality

According to the OECD (2024), after a decade of expansion the share of ODA with gender equality objectives fell to 42% (reaching \$60.4 billion out of the \$143 billion screened against the gender equality policy marker) in 2022–2021, from 45% in 2019–2020. Of this, \$5.5 billion (only 4% of bilateral ODA) targeted gender equality as a principal objective<sup>2</sup> and \$54.9 billion (38% of bilateral ODA) integrated gender equality as a significant objective, or as one policy objective among others. According to preliminary 2023 OECD-DAC data,<sup>3</sup> gender equality funding continues to shrink relative to overall bilateral ODA, dropping to 37%. Just under 4% of bilateral ODA was committed to projects with gender equality as a principal focus, a slight decrease from 2022.

Gender-related development finance has additionally faced risks of distortion, diversion and dilution (George and Gulrajani, 2023). In relation to distortion, the current OECD gender marker system can be inaccurate, as the marker is often applied erroneously and can create inflated aggregated measures of the actual volume of funding supporting gender equality objectives. In relation to diversion, the scarcity of development finance can push donors to shift their focus away from gender equality and prioritise other issues, such as the climate emergency, pandemics or conflict. In terms of dilution, if gender mainstreaming efforts are not complemented by targeted actions, there is a risk that gender concerns become weakened or disappear altogether. However, as illustrated in Box 4, gender equality is at the heart of development and overlooking it can undermine progress on other development areas.

In 2025, the US, under the Trump administration, took the unprecedented step of dismantling its primary development agency, USAID. Previously responsible for nearly 40% of global aid, the withdrawal of USAID is projected to have a direct and significant impact on gender equality, as well as sexual and reproductive health and rights (Celis, 2025). A majority of European donors – including the Netherlands, France, the UK, Sweden, Germany, Belgium, Finland and Switzerland – have also scaled back their commitments, announcing reductions to ODA totalling €30 billion over the next four years (Countdown 2030, 2025).

- 
- 2 OECD-DAC members indicate for each project/programme whether it targets gender equality as a policy objective according to a three-point scoring system. Significant (score 1) means: gender equality is an important and deliberate objective, but not the principal reason for undertaking the project/programme. Principal (score 2) means: gender equality is the main objective of the project/programme and is fundamental in its design and expected results. Not targeted (score 0) means: the project/programme has been screened against the marker but has not been found to target gender equality.
  - 3 SEEK development Donor Tracker webinar, April 2024.

#### **Box 4      Why gender equality is at the heart of development**

Achieving gender equality remains a major challenge globally. Gender inequality places barriers in the way of the fulfilment of human rights for all, and hinders social and economic progress. Numerous studies have shown that gender equality benefits a wide range of areas and sectors, including peace and stability, democracy (Inglehart, Norris and Welzel, 2003), health, the economy and the environment. Empowering women can lead to more equitable societies, as gender equality benefits not only individual women and girls, but also their families and communities.

Countries that prioritise gender equality are more stable and secure. Research has shown that peace agreements involving women are 35% more likely to endure 15 years after signature than those that do not (Steinberg, 2025).

Gender equality is also associated with more rapid economic development, higher income per capita and more efficient and effective businesses. Gender equality is not only a core development objective in its own right, but also a matter of smarter economics (IBRD/World Bank, 2011). Countries that create better conditions and opportunities for equality can raise productivity, improve outcomes for children, make institutions more representative and advance development prospects for all.

Gender equality is also linked to more sustainable management of natural resources. A study focusing on India and Nepal found that the participation of women in forestry and fisheries management groups was associated with improved resource governance and conservation outcomes (Leisher et al., 2016).

Gender equality is a cross-cutting objective critical to all aspects of a resilient society – from reducing poverty to promoting health, education, protection and the wellbeing of all individuals. Development aid has significantly greater potential for impact when gender equality considerations are integrated.

At the same time, there is a risk of undermining sustainable progress in key development areas such as health, security and economic growth if gains in gender equality are rolled back by anti-gender movements.

## 3 Due diligence: learning and recommendations

### 3.1 Improving existing due diligence processes

In the context of shrinking ODA budgets, the deprioritisation of gender equality among major donors, and the increasing professionalisation of anti-gender actors, due diligence processes must be strengthened. While most ODA donors have due diligence mechanisms in place, these focus on assessing potential grantees' financial stability, legal/tax status, governance structures and operational capacity, and the technical merit of submitted projects.

However, these mechanisms often fail to assess the mission and values of an organisation, identify broader networks or movements they are part of or uncover any hidden anti-gender activities. Existing due diligence tools, though useful for ensuring procedural soundness and alignment with strategic goals, may not be sufficient to prevent funding from inadvertently supporting harmful agendas, particularly as anti-gender actors may secure funds intended for apparently unrelated objectives, such as agriculture, education or youth empowerment.

Some groups can hide anti-gender agendas behind progressive-sounding language or proposals which technically meet high requirements. For example, the World Youth Alliance (WYA), a US-based organisation self-defined as 'speaking out against violence and human rights abuse worldwide, [where] WYA members recognise the inviolable dignity of each person, from conception through natural death, and work to build free and just societies' (World Youth Alliance, n.d.), received €1.2 million from the EU via the Erasmus+ programme. WYA was granted funds to provide, amongst other activities, training on reproductive health and rights. However, the organisation has opposed reproductive freedom, stating that 'abortion is not part of reproductive health' and 'in no case should abortion be promoted as part of family planning' (Norris, 2024). Such statements are not aligned with international standards on sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) and have raised concerns in Europe of funding being misused to promote anti-abortion views (Norris, 2024; European Parliamentary Forum, 2025).

There is a need for more nuanced, in-depth due diligence processes that are attentive to values-based aspects. Feminist funds are recognised for their robust due diligence and can provide lessons in this area. These processes primarily look into potential grantees' mission alignment and coherence between their stated values and best practice, as well as drawing on peer feedback and community knowledge (see Box 5). Grant-making based on trust, transparency and inclusive partnerships is seen as good practice in development aid (Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, 2022).

### Box 5 Best practices from feminist funds

When selecting grantees, a key criterion – and often the starting point – for feminist funds such as Mama Cash and the Equality Fund is alignment with feminist principles and a primary focus on advancing women’s rights and gender equality.

Feminist funds consider a range of factors in their assessments, including whether the organisation is led by the communities it aims to serve (self-led leadership), the composition of its staff and the consistency of the organisation’s mission, values and day-to-day practices.

Due diligence processes involve advisory or consultative boards and committees that draw on community-based knowledge and lived experiences. Staff members are typically well-connected to social movements and have a deep understanding of contextual specificities. Feminist funds also pay close attention to the broader networks and movements that applicants are part of, often inquiring about their roles within those collectives.

A key element of the assessment methodology is the use of open-ended questions in application forms, rather than the multiple-choice formats increasingly preferred by other donors. These open-ended prompts offer opportunities for applicant organisations to describe themselves, their work and their values. For example, applicants may be asked to explain the context or issue they seek to address through their work.

Applicants are also required to provide referees. These references are triangulated with external assessments from individuals or organisations with strong contextual knowledge, which helps validate the applicant’s credibility and alignment with feminist values. Finally, grantees are required to declare that they do not engage in any activities that are hostile to, or seek to undermine, human rights.

These practices represent strong, values-based due diligence models that could be adapted by donors working in other thematic areas.

Source: Expert working group

## 4 Key aspects for donors to consider

This section outlines four key areas for donors to consider when conducting their due diligence processes, in addition to their traditional steps:

1. Networks, partners and funding flows.
2. Narratives and language.
3. Spaces of participation, engagement and advocacy.
4. Social media.

These four categories were identified through desk research and consultations with the expert working group.

### 4.1 Networks, partners and funding flows

Anti-gender actors are both diverse and context-specific. They usually mobilise around locally relevant issues, for instance by framing campaigns as protecting the ‘natural family’, children or ‘national identity’ against a supposed Western/liberal ‘imposition’. In some cases, anti-gender advocacy strongly opposes same-sex marriage legislation, or the focus may be comprehensive sexuality education or reproductive rights.

Anti-gender actors most likely do not operate in isolation. Research identifies cross-border patterns of mobilisation, which include a shared discourse, a travelling repertoire of action, and similar strategies (Kuhar and Paternotte, 2017). Beyond these similarities and common playbooks, there is also increasing recognition of the transnational character – alliances, organisation and resource flows – driving the expansion and proliferation of anti-gender activities. These networks serve as platforms for the exchange of strategies, funding and ideologies across borders. Common spaces where anti-gender movements operate include international conferences such as the World Congress of Families.<sup>4</sup>

Anti-gender advocacy has become a rallying point for a range of actors, both religious (both institutional and grassroots) and secular (neo)conservative, and the far right. Organisations involved in activities opposing gender equality, as well as women’s and LGBTQI+ rights, are often linked to transnational networks that include US-based Christian-right organisations, Orthodox and evangelical alliances and far-right populist parties (along with associated foundations and think tanks). In some contexts, Hindu-supremacist groups can also carry out anti-gender activities (Wilson, 2023; Chigateri and Kundu, 2024).

---

4 For a sample list of anti-gender actors, networks and funders, see Appendix 1.

While the Catholic Church does not typically engage in the same forms of activism as explicitly anti-gender movements, and its actions should not be interpreted as targeting gender equality in its entirety, some actors affiliated to the Church (especially the Vatican) have engaged in initiatives opposing gender equality and women's and LGBTQI+ rights (Datta, 2021). For example, in the context of the International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo (1994) and the Beijing Conference in 1995, the Vatican led a diverse collection of state, religious and neo-conservative actors that began to coalesce around their resistance to so-called 'gender ideology' and the alleged threat it posed to the sanctity of 'sex' and the 'traditional family' (Cupać and Ebetürk, 2020).

Individual countries, including the US, Iran and Saudi Arabia as well as the Vatican, have facilitated efforts to remove the language of sexual and reproductive rights – or the term 'gender' – from international agreements (Khan, Tant and Harper, 2023). Growing anti-gender mobilisation in the framework of the UN has engaged post-Soviet and Islamic states, occasionally joined by the Organisation for Islamic Cooperation or the League of Arab States (Cupać and Ebetürk, 2020).

This does not mean that any organisation linked to the Vatican, the Church or those other state/intergovernmental actors should be automatically excluded; however, in certain contexts such affiliations may warrant further scrutiny.

Anti-gender actors do not merely resist gender equality policies: they also actively seek to reshape public discourse, roll back rights and influence policy and legislation. Donors must carefully examine applicants' networks, partners and sponsors, and undertake further investigation in cases of affiliations or relevant connections with already mapped anti-gender actors – such as those listed in Appendix 1.

## What to look out for:

- **Current and past affiliations, partnerships or endorsements:** Look for connections to religious fundamentalism, ultra-conservatism or far-right groups, forums, networks or individuals usually associated with anti-gender advocacy, such as US-based Christian-right organisations, Orthodox and evangelical alliances and far-right populist parties.
- **Funding flows:** Assess sources of funding and whether resources are transparently declared and traceable. Look for funds flowing from actors that are known to be part of the anti-gender movement and are listed throughout this tool.
- **Double-check references, associated 'panellists'/'experts' and sources of information cited in projects and documents:** Even if some sources appear legitimate due to their academic or peer-reviewed nature, pay close attention to the organisations, institutions, groups or funders behind them.

There can also be reassuring indicators. For example, as explained in Box 4, established feminist funds tend to conduct robust due diligence processes – so links to, or support from, such funds can serve as a positive signal about an organisation or group. Looking beyond the gender equality space, similar logic applies: it may be a good sign if, for instance, an organisation working in agriculture and food security is also part of a network focused on farmers' rights or land rights. Such affiliations can indicate consistency with rights-based approaches and alignment with broader social justice values.

## 4.2 Narratives and language

This area is highly complex. To oppose gender equality, anti-gender movements often exploit heightened anxieties to create moral panic. Anti-gender actors have become increasingly skilled at adapting their language to evade scrutiny and broaden their appeal, often referring to 'moral values' or 'common sense', or mobilising fear or hate (Shameem, 2021). For example, anti-gender actors in Kenya tap into citizens' emotions through apparently 'sound' discourse, citing de-contextualised narratives that resonate with many people, such as 'family values' and 'Kenyan moral codes'. Gender equality is increasingly framed as 'non-African', with laws, policies and practices focused on gender equality depicted as destructive of the 'African family' (Otieno and Makabira, 2024).

Stigmatising or delegitimising claims and re-traditionalising gender roles are also frequently employed tactics (Nazneen, 2024). One commonly used rhetorical tactic is 'whataboutism', which anti-gender actors invoke to portray themselves as victims of double standards or as defenders of overlooked groups, thereby muddying the waters and making it more difficult to hold them accountable for actions targeting women's and LGBTQI+ rights. For instance, political and religious leaders in Kenya who promote such narratives, posturing as a persecuted minority, claim that men and boys are underprivileged in contemporary Kenyan society due to the supposed over-empowerment of women and girls – arguing that this shift causes men and boys to lose their morally rightful place in society (Otieno and Makabira, 2024). By focusing on the question 'What about men and boys?', these groups seek to discredit arguments for gender equality and reinforce existing gender hierarchies.

Anti-gender actors have adapted their language in three main ways. First, they subtly shift terminology – for example, referring to 'crisis pregnancy centres' instead of discussing abortion, or promoting 'natural family planning' rather than contraception. While such terms may initially appear neutral or even benevolent, they often conceal agendas that oppose gender equality and sexual and reproductive health and rights. Second, anti-gender actors may use coded language or euphemisms – such as 'protecting innocence', 'natural roles', or 'parental rights' – that subtly reinforce anti-abortion, anti-LGBTQI+ or anti-comprehensive sexuality education positions without explicitly stating them. Third, anti-gender actors frequently co-opt legalistic and rights-based language, framing their positions under terms like 'religious freedom', 'freedom of belief', 'freedom of expression', 'rights of the unborn' or 'parents' rights'. This mimics the discourse of



legitimate human rights frameworks to mask anti-rights advocacy. Of growing concern is the use of professionalised strategies, including hiring former human rights consultants and leveraging Artificial Intelligence (AI) to refine rhetoric in project proposals and public-facing documents.

References to terms such as ‘freedom’, ‘family’, ‘children’, ‘human dignity’ or the ‘common good’ are not inherently problematic. In fact, they can also be used by progressive actors to reach broader audiences. However, in certain contexts such terms can function as dog whistles, signalling alignment with anti-gender agendas. Therefore, it is essential to analyse this language within the broader narrative and specific context. This requires careful contextual interpretation and, when relevant, further investigation and consultation with local communities or experts to understand the underlying intent of particular narratives.

### What to look out for:

- **Moral panics and narratives of fear:** It is necessary to interrogate whether campaigns and narratives exploit societal fears, such as ‘gender ideology in schools’ (D’Angelo et al., 2024). Anti-gender campaigns often portray feminism and LGBTQI+ rights as existential threats to traditional values, national survival and the ‘purity’ of a nation or society. Equal rights can also be framed as ‘foreign interference’, ‘Western imposition’ or ‘neocolonialism’. For example, anti-gender actors often promise to protect the ‘traditional family’ from a supposed moral disorder, presented as ‘ideology’ threatening children, marriage, the natural order and national values (Biroli and Caminotti, 2020).
- **Language of exclusion:** Anti-gender actors often use polarising and exclusionary rhetoric, framing issues in terms of ‘us versus them’ or casting a ‘morally grounded, good people’ against a ‘corrupt elite’. It is important to assess whether stated commitments to inclusion are upheld in practice. For example, are trans people excluded from women’s initiatives? In certain cases, what is not explicitly said (e.g. intersectional, LGBTQI+) can be as telling as what is. Even the use of the word ‘feminist’ does not guarantee that an organisation is not an anti-gender actor. For example, some self-identified ‘feminist’ organisations exclude trans women.
- **Evolving and coded language:** As noted, anti-gender actors have shifted terminology in subtle ways. They have referred, for example, to ‘crisis pregnancy centres’ instead of talking about abortion, or they speak about ‘promoting natural family planning’ instead of contraception. It is necessary to stay alert to those terminological shifts and the use of euphemisms. Phrases such as ‘human dignity’, ‘family values’, ‘common sense’ or ‘the unborn’ are not inherently problematic, but have increasingly been used as dog whistles and may signal deeper ideological agendas.

- **Legal and rights-based framing:** Scrutinise claims to rights like ‘religious freedom’ or ‘parental rights’, particularly when used to undermine LGBTQI+ rights, gender equality or comprehensive sexuality education. Look for indirect signals, links or partnerships that reveal underlying activities incompatible with human rights principles, such as support for the ‘Geneva Consensus Declaration’.

### 4.3 Spaces of participation, engagement and advocacy

Anti-gender networks comprise a heterogeneous set of actors (Sanders, 2018). This diversity allows them to operate across a wide range of policy spaces, including those not immediately associated with their core anti-gender ambitions. Monitoring indirect places of action and engagement of anti-gender groups can provide critical insight – even if they have not been very outspoken or if debates are not directly related to ‘obvious’ targets, like LGBTQI+ rights or abortion rights.

As an example, anti-gender movements in Latin America opposed public health measures meant to contain the Covid pandemic by denying science, rejecting vaccines and endorsing unproven treatments. A commonly present feature in those mobilisations and their narratives has been use of the catchword ‘freedom’ to oppose both ‘gender ideology’ and public health measures to contain infections (Equal Rights Coalition, 2022). In 2024, the Entebbe Inter-Parliamentary Forum in Uganda – known for promoting anti- LGBTQI+ policies – featured addresses by two of Africa’s most vociferous anti-vaxxers, Shabnam Mohamed and Wahome Ngare (Cullinan, 2025).

Anti-gender actors have increasingly positioned themselves within mainstream intergovernmental bodies – such as the UN – and less obvious international policy forums. These include spaces that discuss topics such as population, religious freedom, demography, migration, education and even sustainable development (McEwen and Narayanaswamy, 2023). Many anti-gender NGOs have obtained UN ECOSOC status (Datta, 2021), and become active in UN spaces, for instance in the Geneva NGO Committee on Freedom of Religion and Belief – whose vice-president is a member of ADF International, an organisation that has strongly advocated against the Istanbul Convention<sup>5</sup> – or the NGO Committee on the Family. Anti-gender actors have been able to influence UN processes in a range of areas, including climate, labour and trade. Such actors also increasingly object to the inclusion of terms such as ‘sexual orientation’ or ‘gender identity’ in the budgets and programming documents of major international organisations such as the World Health Organisation (WHO) and International Labour Organisation (ILO) (International Labour Organisation, 2025).

---

5 The Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, also known as the ‘Istanbul Convention’, requires parties to develop laws, policies and support services to end violence against women and domestic violence.

## What to look out for:

- Indirect spaces of participation and cross-cutting engagement:** Monitor involvement in forums and policy areas not directly associated with gender, women's or LGBTQI+ rights debates, such as demography, education, family, religion, freedom of expression, health or migration. Non-institutional forums such as the World Congress of Families and the Pan-African Conference on Family Values are very relevant. When monitoring spaces and networks of engagement, it is important to track how anti-gender narratives are being introduced into intersecting topics – such as religious freedom, parental rights, health or national identity – within international or multilateral settings, often by similar groups or organisations across multiple arenas.
- Participation in mainstream institutions as a means to challenge women's and LGBTQI+ rights:** Many anti-gender actors have entered mainstream intergovernmental bodies, such as the UN, by obtaining ECOSOC consultative status, joining conservative state delegations at key UN meetings and engaging in negotiations to weaken human rights language in declarations and resolutions (Sanders, 2018). Accreditation with such institutional and intergovernmental bodies is not a guarantee of alignment with or respect for human rights. For example, UN spaces that have seen anti-gender advocacy include the Geneva NGO Committee on Freedom of Religion or Belief and the NGO Committee on the Family. It is essential that donors examine more closely the actions and advocacy efforts in which these groups are engaging, for instance whether organisations are advocating for the removal of 'gender-related language' in procedural or budgetary decisions.
- Beyond rhetoric, assess actions:** Look for inconsistencies between public statements and actual practices or activities. Evaluate concrete examples of past programmes, campaigns and outcomes. What were their stated objectives, and what effects did they have, for example on legislation, protest mobilisation or the positioning of politicians? This approach helps reveal whether rhetoric aligns with real-world impact and can expose contradictions or hidden agendas.

## 4.4 Social media

Anti-gender actors have skilfully used social media platforms and digital presence to amplify their narratives, mobilise supporters, shape public discourse and influence policies.

Social media serves as a valuable tool for identifying the previously outlined three categories: networks, narratives and spaces of engagement, as well as revealing contradictions between an organisation's stated mission and its actual activities. Do social media channels feature actors associated with already mapped anti-gender networks/funders? What kind of narratives and language are used, and how do they connect to transnational anti-gender agendas?

Anti-gender movements often curate a carefully controlled online footprint that promotes campaigns as grounded in protecting values such as ‘family’, ‘children’, ‘parents’ or ‘freedom of speech’. By presenting themselves on social media as advocates ‘for’ morally grounded concepts, rather than opponents of rights, these groups avoid appearing radical or extremist. A study on anti-gender campaigns in Norway demonstrated that anti-science ideology can also be a central discursive tactic for online anti-gender campaigns. Anti-gender groups have mobilised ‘gender’ and ‘science’ on social media to posit LGBTQI+ populations and activist mobilisations as counter to biological ‘facts’ and moral values, and hence as threats to societal stability (Engebretsen, 2022).

A review of organisations’ websites, social media posts and activities and public-facing digital campaigns – including petitions, video content, interviews and infographics – can offer insights into potential disconnects between stated missions and actual agendas. Close attention should be paid to the visual and textual messaging shared online. For instance, organisations that claim to prioritise women’s rights or empowerment may post imagery and content that predominantly features men in decision-making roles or at the forefront of campaigns.

Social media can also be evaluated for its strategic use by organisations to advance anti-gender campaigns. Concerns may arise not only from the nature of public messaging or potential inconsistencies, but also from the strategic use of social media with the aim of mainstreaming and globalising anti-gender agendas. For example, CitizenGO operates a sophisticated network of social media accounts to coordinate and amplify anti-gender messages across multiple languages and regions (Righetti et al., 2025). The organisation, which is active in 50 countries, uses online petitions particularly focusing on opposition to same-sex marriage, abortion and what they term ‘gender ideology’ (Zervoulakou, Kesberg and Mügge, 2025).

### What to look out for:

- **Assess online footprint and social media activity to uncover networks, narratives and spaces of engagement:** Audit website content and all visible online materials, including social media posts and digital campaigns; check how the organisation’s channels connect to or feature well-known anti-gender movements, actors and global anti-gender agendas. Identify any affiliations or interactions with known anti-gender or ultra-conservative movements and funders, as well as the use of moral panic rhetoric and narratives of fear.
- **Online–offline consistency:** It is also important to check whether online messaging aligns with the organisation’s stated mission and values (for example, in contrast to what is presented in application forms). Donors should be alert to contradictions between public rhetoric and online representation, imagery and activities.
- **Strategic use of social media to advance and amplify anti-gender rhetoric and advocacy:** Identify which types of platforms the organisation prioritises (e.g. X is prominently used for the promotion of anti-gender agendas (Zervoulakou, Kesberg and Mügge, 2025)), and whether

the organisation's online platforms effectively facilitate low-cost, low-effort activism. This may include tactics such as orchestrating online hate campaigns, spreading disinformation or fake news, and connecting frames and themes to international anti-gender events – such as the overturning of *Roe vs. Wade* by the US Supreme Court (2022), the Anti-Homosexuality bill in Uganda (2023), or the March for Life. Be attentive to disruptive strategies aimed at gaining attention and visibility (e.g. The Traditional Wives or the Red Pill Reddit community) as these are common methods/channels used to amplify anti-gender narratives and expand their global reach.

## 4.5 When in doubt, rely on and consult the gender equality movement

In contexts where concerns arise or information is unclear, it is advisable to engage with feminist and gender justice movements (or consider adopting some of the due diligence practices of feminist funds – Box 4). These movements are often anchored in local and regional realities and networks which possess deep contextual knowledge and are often well-positioned to assess the legitimacy, intentions and track records of organisations or groups under consideration for partnerships or funding.

### Additional elements to consider:

- **Local reputation and legitimacy:** Consult with local or regional feminist/progressive organisations or networks to assess whether potential partners are recognised and trusted by local communities. Assess whether the applicant organisation has meaningful community relationships.
- **Peer vetting:** Engage with peer organisations and grantees who can offer references and first-hand insights into actors' histories, actions, affiliations and local media coverage.
- **Certification possibilities:** Consider whether a local certification scheme, endorsed by established feminist funds, gender justice or progressive networks, could support decision-making and periodically accredit potential grantees.
- **Consult with feminist funders and independent experts:** Rely on the expertise and experience of established feminist funds, their advisory structures and recognised independent knowledge organisations (e.g. think tanks) for informed recommendations and assessment of specific potential grantees.

# References

---

- Biroli, F. and Caminotti, M.** (2020) 'The Conservative Backlash against Gender in Latin America' *Politics & Gender* 16(1): E1 (<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X20000045>).
- Bloomfield, A. and Scott, S.V.** (2018) *Norm Antipreneurs and the Politics of Resistance to Global Normative Change*. New York: Routledge ([www.routledge.com/Norm-Antipreneurs-and-the-Politics-of-Resistance-to-Global-Normative-Change/Bloomfield-Scott/p/book/9781138361904](http://www.routledge.com/Norm-Antipreneurs-and-the-Politics-of-Resistance-to-Global-Normative-Change/Bloomfield-Scott/p/book/9781138361904)).
- Celis, B.** (2025) 'Dismantling of USAID will impact women more intensely', EL PAÍS [Preprint] (<https://english.elpais.com/international/2025-02-12/dismantling-of-usaid-will-impact-women-more-intensely.html>).
- Chigateri, S. and Kundu, S.** (2024) 'Virulent Hindutva, Vigilante State: Situating Backlash and its Implications for Women's Rights in India' *IDS Bulletin* 55(1) (<https://doi.org/10.19088/1968-2024.109>).
- Countdown 2030** (2025) *The European Funding Gap: How Slashed Cooperation Budgets Can Jeopardize Global Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights*. Brussels: Countdown 2030 ([www.countdown2030europe.org/resources/the-european-funding-gap-how-slashed-cooperation-budgets-can-jeopardize-global-sexual-and-reproductive-health-and-rights](http://www.countdown2030europe.org/resources/the-european-funding-gap-how-slashed-cooperation-budgets-can-jeopardize-global-sexual-and-reproductive-health-and-rights)).
- Cullinan, K.** (2025) 'Women's Groups Sound Alarm over "African Family" Conferences Headlined by US Conservatives – Health Policy Watch', 8 May (<https://healthpolicy-watch.news/womens-groups-sound-alarm-as-prominent-us-conservatives-headline-african-family-conferences>).
- Cupać, J. and Ebetürk, I.** (2020) 'The personal is global political: The antifeminist backlash in the United Nations' *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 22(4): 702–714 (<https://doi.org/10.1177/1369148120948733>).
- D'Angelo, S.M., Marcus, R., Khan, A. and Homonchuk, O.** (2024) *Whose hands on our education? Identifying and countering gender-restrictive backlash*. ALIGN ([www.alignplatform.org/resources/report-whose-hands-our-education-countering-backlash](http://www.alignplatform.org/resources/report-whose-hands-our-education-countering-backlash)).
- Datta, N.** (2021) *Tip of the Iceberg: Religious Extremist Funders Against Human Rights for Sexuality and Reproductive Health in Europe 2009–2018*. Brussels: European Parliamentary Forum for Sexual and Reproductive Rights ([www.epfweb.org/node/837](http://www.epfweb.org/node/837)).
- Engbreetsen, E.L.** (2022) 'Scientizing Gender? An Examination of Anti-Gender Campaigns on Social Media, Norway', in H. Eslén–Ziya and A. Giorgi (eds) *Populism and Science in Europe*. Cham: Springer International Publishing ([https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-97535-7\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-97535-7_9)).
- Equal Rights Coalition** (2022) *Anti-Gender Movement Background Paper*. Equal Rights Coalition (<https://equalrightscoalition.org/documents/anti-gender-movement-background-paper>).
- European Parliamentary Forum** (2025) Joint Statement by Parliamentarians on the Global Rise of Disinformation in Sexual and Reproductive Health Policies ([www.epfweb.org/node/1130](http://www.epfweb.org/node/1130)).
- Focus 2030** (2025) 'Slight increase in Official Development Assistance in 2023'. 16 January (<https://focus2030.org/slight-increase-in-official-development-assistance-in-2023>).
- Gabritchidze, N.** (2022) 'Rise of Georgian alt-right group sparks fear of unrest'. Eurasianet, 23 March (<https://eurasianet.org/rise-of-georgian-alt-right-group-sparks-fear-of-unrest>).
- George, R. and Gulrajani, N.** (2023) 'Trends in development finance for gender: mapping risks and opportunities for funders'. ODI: Think change (<https://odi.org/en/publications/trends-in-development-finance-for-gender-mapping-risks-and-opportunities-for-funders>).

- Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation** (2022) *Rebuilding Trust through Effective Development Co-operation: GPEDC Special Summit Report*. Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation ([www.effectivecooperation.org/SummitReport](http://www.effectivecooperation.org/SummitReport)).
- GPP – Global Philanthropy Project** (2020) *Meet the Moment: A Call for Progressive Philanthropic Response to the Anti-Gender Movement*. Oakland, CA: GPP (<https://globalphilanthropyproject.org/2020/11/12/meet-the-moment>).
- Harper, C., Khan, A., Browne, E. and Michalko, J.** (2025) ‘There’s not enough money – so why spend it on gender equality and justice?’. ODI: Think change, 14 March (<https://odi.org/en/insights/theres-not-enough-money-so-why-spend-it-on-gender-equality-and-justice>).
- Holmes, R.** (2024) *Feminist responses to ‘norm-spoiling’ at the United Nations*. London: ODI Global (<https://odi.org/en/publications/feminist-responses-to-norm-spoiling-united-nations>).
- IBRD/ World Bank** (2011) *World Development Report 2012: Gender Equality and Development*. Washington DC: World Bank Group (<https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/en/492221468136792185>).
- Inglehart, R., Norris, P. and Welzel, C.** (2003) ‘Gender Equality and Democracy’, in Inglehart, R. (ed) *Human Values and Social Change: Findings from the Values Survey*. Brill ([https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047404361\\_007](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047404361_007)).
- International Labour Organisation** (2025) Records of proceedings of the 113th Session of the International Labour Conference. Report of the Finance Committee ILC.113/Record No. 3A. Geneva ([www.ilo.org/international-labour-conference/113th-session-international-labour-conference/records-proceedings-113th-session-international-labour-conference](http://www.ilo.org/international-labour-conference/113th-session-international-labour-conference/records-proceedings-113th-session-international-labour-conference)).
- Ipas** (2024) *The Geneva Consensus Declaration in Action: Why Advocates and Policymakers Should Be Concerned, and What Can Be Done*. Chapel Hill, NC: Ipas ([www.ipas.org/resource/the-geneva-consensus-declaration-in-action](http://www.ipas.org/resource/the-geneva-consensus-declaration-in-action)).
- Khan, A., Tant, E. and Harper, C.** (2023) ‘Facing the backlash: what is fuelling anti-feminist and anti-democratic forces?’ Advancing Learning and Innovation on Gender Norms (ALIGN). ([www.alignplatform.org/resources/briefing-facing-backlash](http://www.alignplatform.org/resources/briefing-facing-backlash)).
- Kincha, S.** (2023) Government supporters rally against Western ‘interference’ and ‘LGBT propaganda’ in Tbilisi, OC Media (<https://oc-media.org/government-supporters-rally-against-western-interference-and-lgbt-propaganda-in-tbilisi>).
- Korolczuk, E., Graff, A. and Kantola, J.** (2025) ‘Gender danger. Mapping a decade of research on anti-gender politics’ *Journal of Gender Studies* (<https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2025.2489584>).
- Kuhar, R. and Paternotte, D.** (2017) *Anti-Gender Campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against Equality*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers (<https://rowman.com/ISBN/9781786600011/Anti-Gender-Campaigns-in-Europe-Mobilizing-against-Equality>).
- Leisher, C., Temsah, G., Booker, F. et al.** (2016) ‘Does the gender composition of forest and fishery management groups affect resource governance and conservation outcomes? A systematic map’ *Environmental Evidence* 5(1) (<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13750-016-0057-8>).
- McEwen, H. and Narayanaswamy, L.** (2023) *The International Anti-Gender Movement: Understanding the Rise of Anti-Gender Discourses in the Context of Development, Human Rights and Social Protection*. UNRISD working paper 2023-06 (<https://cdn.unrisd.org/assets/library/papers/pdf-files/2023/wp-2023-4-anti-gender-movement.pdf>).
- Nazneen, S.** (2024) ‘Voice: A Useful Concept for Researching Backlash and Feminist Counter-Actions?’ *IDS Bulletin* 55(1) (<https://doi.org/10.19088/1968-2024.103>).

- Norris, S.** (2024) 'MEPs demand answers over EU funding of anti-abortion charity'. openDemocracy, 19 December ([www.opendemocracy.net/en/eu-anti-abortion-funding-questions-world-youth-alliance-erasmus](http://www.opendemocracy.net/en/eu-anti-abortion-funding-questions-world-youth-alliance-erasmus)).
- OECD – Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development** (2024) *Development Finance for Gender Equality 2024* ([www.oecd.org/en/publications/development-finance-for-gender-equality-2024\\_e340afbf-en.html](http://www.oecd.org/en/publications/development-finance-for-gender-equality-2024_e340afbf-en.html)).
- OECD** (2025) *Cuts in official development assistance: OECD projections for 2025 and the near term* ([www.oecd.org/en/publications/cuts-in-official-development-assistance\\_8c530629-en/full-report.html](http://www.oecd.org/en/publications/cuts-in-official-development-assistance_8c530629-en/full-report.html)).
- Otieno, P.E. and Makabira, A.M.** (2024) 'Gender Equality vs “Morality”: The Erosion of Gender Agendas in Kenya' *IDS Bulletin* 55(1) (<https://doi.org/10.19088/1968-2024.110>).
- Provost, C.** (2023) *Progressive cash for the anti-LGBTQI backlash? How aid donors and 'feminist' governments have funded backers of Uganda's deadly Anti-Homosexuality Bill*. Amsterdam: Institute for Journalism and Social Change (<https://cftp.uber.space/wordpress>).
- Provost, C. and Darkoa Sekyiamah, D.** (2022) 'Millions in Western aid flowed to churches that oppose LGBTQI+ rights in Ghana'. CNN ([www.cnn.com/2022/12/13/africa/us-europe-aid-lgbtqi-ghana-churches-investigation-as-equals-intl-cmd-dg/index.html](http://www.cnn.com/2022/12/13/africa/us-europe-aid-lgbtqi-ghana-churches-investigation-as-equals-intl-cmd-dg/index.html)).
- Righetti, N., Kulichkina, A., Almeida Paroni, B. et al.** (2025) 'Mainstreaming and transnationalization of anti-gender ideas through social media: the case of CitizenGO' *Information, Communication & Society* (<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2025.2470229>).
- Sanders, R.** (2018) 'Norm spoiling: undermining the international women's rights agenda' *International Affairs* 94(2) (<https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iyy023>).
- Shameem, N.** (2021) 'Chapter 5: Anti-rights tactics, strategies and impacts' in *Rights at Risk: Time for Action*. The Observatory on the Universality of Rights ([www.awid.org/ours-2021](http://www.awid.org/ours-2021)).
- Steinberg, D.** (2025) 'Revitalizing the Global Women, Peace, and Security Agenda' Global Governance Forum, 21 January (<https://globalgovernanceforum.org/revitalizing-global-women-peace-security-agenda>).
- Wilson, K.** (2023) 'Hindu supremacism, “anti-gender” politics, and feminist resistance'. London School of Economics, 29 March (<https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/gender/2023/03/29/narratives-of-transnational-resistance-in-pakistan-and-india>).
- World Youth Alliance** (n.d.) World Youth Alliance. Webpage (<https://wya25.evecloud.com>).
- Zervoulakou, M., Kesberg, R. and Mügge, L.** (2025) 'Threat Narratives in Anti-gender Movements' Online Presence: A Comparative Analysis between CitizenGo and Europe for Family' *Politikon: The IAPSS Journal of Political Science* 59(2): 57–90 (<https://doi.org/10.22151/politikon.42025.3>).



# Appendix 1 Anti-gender actors, funders and networks

## A non-exhaustive list

Name	Type	Reference
Acton Institute	Think tank	Datta, 2021
Agenda Europe	Network	Datta, 2021
Alexey Komov	Individual	Datta, 2021
Alliance Defending Freedom International (ADF)	Network	Shameem, 2021
American Center for Law and Justice	NGO	Hughson, 2021
Austin Ruse	Individual	Sanders, 2018
Beatrix von Storch	Individual	Datta, 2021
Benjamin Harnwell	Individual	Datta, 2021
Billy Graham Evangelist Association (BGEA)	NGO	Datta, 2021
Brian Brown	Individual	Datta, 2021
Center for Family and Human Rights (C-Fam)	NGO	Sanders, 2018
Chiaroscuro Foundation	Fund	Datta, 2021
Christian Council International	International network	Datta, 2021
CitizenGO	Activist website	Sanders, 2018
Concerned Women for America	NGO	Sanders, 2018
DeVos Family Foundations	Foundation	Datta, 2021
Entebbe Inter-Parliamentary Forum	International conference	Cullinan, 2025
Europe for Family	NGO	Zervoulakou, Kesberg and Mügge, 2025
European Christian Political Movement (ECPM)	Political party	Datta, 2021
Family First Foundation	Foundation	Sanders, 2018
Family Policy Institute	NGO	Cullinan, 2025
Family Research Council	NGO	Sanders, 2018
Family Watch International	NGO	Sanders, 2018
Fondazione Vita Nova and Movimento per la Vita	Foundation	Datta, 2021
Foundation for African Cultural Heritage	NGO	Cullinan, 2025
Fundacion Valores y Sociedad	Foundation	Datta, 2021
Fundacja Lux Veritatis	Foundation	Datta, 2021

Name	Type	Reference
Gregor Puppink	Individual	Datta, 2021
Group of Friends of the Family (GoFF)	Coalition of UN member states	Sanders, 2018
HazteOir	NGO	Sanders, 2018
Heartbeat International	International association	Hughson, 2021
Heritage Foundation	Think tank	Sanders, 2018
Holy See	Religious jurisdiction	Sanders, 2018
Ignacio Arsuaga	Individual	Datta, 2021
Institute of Women's Health	Institute	Ipas, 2024
International Organisation for the Family (IOF)	NGO	Sanders, 2018
International Right to Life Federation	NGO	Sanders, 2018
Janice Shaw Crouse	Individual	Sanders, 2018
Jerome Lejeune Foundation	Foundation	Datta, 2021
Jerzy Kwasniexski	Individual	Datta, 2021
Koch Family Foundations	Foundation	Datta, 2021
Leo van Doesburg	Individual	Datta, 2021
Luca Volonte	Individual	Datta, 2021
Mathias Corvinus Collegium (MCC)	Think tank	Expert working group
Novae Terrae Foundation	Foundation	Datta, 2021
Ordo Iuris	Foundation	Cullinan, 2025
Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)	Intergovernmental organisation	Sanders, 2018
Pan-African Conference on Family Values	Regional conference	Expert working group
Patriarchal Commission for the Family, the Protection of Motherhood and Childhood	Structure under Russian Orthodox Church	Datta, 2021
Paul Herzog von Oldenburg	Individual	Datta, 2021
Political Network for Values	Network	Datta, 2021
Population Research Institute	NGO	Sanders, 2018
Prince Foundation	Foundation	Datta, 2021
ProLife Europe	Network	Author
PROTEGO	Project	Ipas, 2024
REAL Women of Canada	Advocacy group	Sanders, 2018
St. Andrew the First-Called Foundation	Charitable organisation	Datta, 2021
St. Basil the Great Charitable Foundation	Foundation	Datta, 2021
Strengthening Families Conference	International conference	Cullinan, 2025
The Foundation for African Cultural Heritage	NGO	Sanders, 2018
The Istoki Endowment Fund	Fund	Datta, 2021
Tradition, Family and Property (TFP)	Network	Datta, 2021
United Families International	NGO	Shameem, 2021

Name	Type	Reference
Universal Peace Federation	NGO	Shameen, 2021
Vatican	State actor	Sanders, 2018
Vladimin Yakunin	Individual	Datta, 2021
World Congress of Families	International conference organised by IOF	Sanders, 2018; Datta, 2021
World Youth Alliance (WYA)	NGO	Shameem, 2021; Datta, 2021

# Appendix 2 Examples of anti-gender advocacy activity

## A non-exhaustive list

Organisation/movement	Anti-gender activity
Catholic Church in Uganda	<p>In February 2023, Bishop Joseph Antony Zziwa, Chairman, Uganda Episcopal Conference (UEC) – which is the Assembly of the Catholic Hierarchy in Uganda – said: ‘it is high time the government, cultural and religious leaders, teachers, parents and other stakeholders waged a fight against homosexuality in this country’.</p> <p>In 2014, a bishop in the Tororo diocese urged every citizen who supported the anti-homosexuality law to ‘put them to death and let generosity rise up within us and flow out in abundance’. Another bishop in the Jinja Diocese asked for Christians who helped ‘free the land of gays’ to be blessed. In 2019, this church was also involved in opposing sexuality education and in a religious ‘Task Force Against Homosexuality’.</p>
Con Mis Hijos No Te Metas (‘Don’t Mess With My Children’) (Peru)	<p>Founded in 2016 in Lima, Peru, the movement emerged in opposition to government policies aimed at combating homophobia and gender-based violence through education, including the integration of comprehensive sexuality education in schools. From 2017 onwards, it supported and organised a series of national marches – such as the ‘March for Heterosexual Pride’ – to protest against the Ministry of Education’s 2017 National Curriculum (Currículo Nacional) promoting sexuality education and gender equality, along with other related initiatives. In the wake of the protests, the Minister of Education was removed from office.</p>
Inter-Religious Council of Uganda (IRCU)	<p>In February 2023, the IRCU reportedly vowed to do everything possible to return the anti-LGBT bill to parliament (which happened soon afterwards); it also expressed ‘great concern over [the] growing spread of homosexuality and the LGBTQ agenda in Uganda’, and its effect on children, and said ‘the tendency these days is to normalise every life’s struggle into a right. This is wrong!’</p> <p>In 2016, the IRCU called on the government to ban all sex education materials in schools, concerned that they were ‘spreading homosexuality’. Previously, the IRCU had lost funding from the US over anti-LGBT activities and its support for the Anti-Homosexuality Act. In 2014, as a result of this funding cut, the organisation reportedly had to downsize and let go many of its staff.</p>

Organisation/movement	Anti-gender activity
Movimento Escola Sem Partido (Non-partisan school Movement) (Brazil)	<p>In 2014, a draft law stating that ‘public authorities shall not interfere in the sexual maturation process of students, nor permit any form of dogmatism or proselytism in the approach to gender issues’ was introduced in local and regional legislative assemblies by Flávio Bolsonaro and Carlos Bolsonaro – sons of Brazil’s former far-right President Jair Bolsonaro. The draft law was prepared by the Escola Sem Partido (Non-partisan school) movement and motivated by the idea that ‘it is necessary and urgent to adopt effective measures to prevent the practice of political and ideological indoctrination in schools and the usurpation of parents’ right to have their children receive the moral education that is in line with their own convictions’.</p> <hr/> <p>In 2016, the Escola Sem Partido (EsP) movement sought to influence elections more openly by publishing on its website both the draft bills and promotional material for candidates who had signed a commitment to the movement. With the election of supportive representatives, EsP expanded its reach across the country. On 15 August 2017, another conservative movement called Free Brazil Movement (MBL) launched a national day of mobilisation in support of Escola Sem Partido, which led to a doubling of the number of related bills introduced that year.</p>
Pentecostal Churches (Uganda)	<p>In 2015, the LGBTI group Out and Proud launched a petition against a visit to the UK by the General Superintendent of the Pentecostal Assemblies of God (PAG) as he had been involved in a ‘crusade’, including for the Anti-Homosexuality Act, ‘[that] caused incalculable damage as it labelled homosexuality as “a vice” and incited people to fight against it’.</p>

# Appendix 3 Examples of potential ‘red flag’ terms

## A non-exhaustive list

Terms alone are not sufficient to indicate anti-gender activity and should not be assessed in isolation. Some terms may also be used by progressive organisations. The language and terminology used by potential grantees must be evaluated in context, taking into account the underlying narrative and intentions of the organisations.

Term	Use in context	Source
Abortion lobby/ industry /business	‘The abortion industry is a multi-billion-dollar sector that encompasses clinics, pharmaceutical companies and organisations advocating for reproductive rights.’	<a href="https://proliffeurope.org/get-informed/the-billionaire-abortion-industry/">https://proliffeurope.org/get-informed/the-billionaire-abortion-industry/</a>
Common sense/ common concern	‘Founded in 2001, the Inter-Religious Council of Uganda (IRCU) is an indigenous, national faith-based organisation uniting efforts of religious institutions to jointly address issues of common concern.’	<a href="https://www.ircu.or.ug/about-ircu/">https://www.ircu.or.ug/about-ircu/</a>
Family rights/values	‘For 40 years, we’ve been committed to advancing faith, family, and freedom in public policy and the culture from a biblical worldview.’	<a href="https://www.frc.org/#gsc.tab=0">https://www.frc.org/#gsc.tab=0</a>
Gender ideology /identity	‘Gender ideology is the source of the belief that children can be born in the wrong body. It leads Californians to think that if a young girl feels anguish over her body, the doctors should not help her adjust to her body but should change her body and her surroundings - name, bathroom, pronouns - to conform to her “gender identity.”’	<a href="https://www.heritage.org/gender/commentary/what-gender-ideology">https://www.heritage.org/gender/commentary/what-gender-ideology</a>
Geneva Consensus Declaration	‘The Geneva Consensus Declaration and Coalition is putting divisive debates aside and taking a stand for women and families.’	<a href="https://www.theiwh.org/">https://www.theiwh.org/</a>

Term	Use in context	Source
Human dignity/ dignity of the person	‘We are convinced that the intrinsic dignity possessed by every human being from conception to natural death is the foundation of everyone’s right to life. We believe that this inalienable right to life is the basis of a free and just society and we believe that society through law and culture has an obligation to protect the dignity of the person and thus protect the right to life.’	<a href="https://wya.net/charter/">https://wya.net/charter/</a>
	‘C-Fam is a non-partisan, non-profit research institute dedicated to reestablishing a proper understanding of international law, protecting national sovereignty and the dignity of the human person.’	<a href="https://c-fam.org/about-us/">https://c-fam.org/about-us/</a>
Natural /traditional family	‘The family, born from the mutual commitment between a man and a woman, is the basic and natural unit of society.’	<a href="https://help.citizengo.org/article/891-principles">https://help.citizengo.org/article/891-principles</a>
	‘The family, based on marriage between a man and a woman, is the fundamental unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and government.’	<a href="https://familywatch.org/about-us/policy-positions/">https://familywatch.org/about-us/policy-positions/</a>
Natural marriage	‘We support and promote natural marriage between one man and one woman. Social science research has conclusively proven that a strong family based on marriage between a man and a woman is the best environment to protect, nourish and develop individuals. This family structure provides significantly better outcomes for individuals and societies than any alternative structure.’	<a href="https://familywatch.org/about-us/policy-positions/">https://familywatch.org/about-us/policy-positions/</a>
Parents’ /parental rights / protection	‘The United Nations General Assembly enshrined protections for children, parents, and the family into the core instruments that make up the International Bill of Rights.’	<a href="https://adfinternational.org/our-focus/parental-rights">https://adfinternational.org/our-focus/parental-rights</a>
	‘Guaranteeing the fundamental rights of parents to direct the upbringing and education of their children.’	<a href="https://adfinternational.org/our-focus/parental-rights">https://adfinternational.org/our-focus/parental-rights</a>

Term	Use in context	Source
Population control	‘In a broadside against what he considers the decadent West, Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan declared that all his country’s geopolitical clout will be deployed against gender ideology and population control.’	<a href="https://c-fam.org/">https://c-fam.org/</a>
Pro-life	‘The Population Research Institute is a non-profit research organisation whose core values hold that people are the world’s greatest resource. PRI’s goals are to educate on this premise, to expose the myth of overpopulation, and to expose human rights abuses committed in population control programmes. Our growing global network of pro-life groups spans over 80 countries.’	<a href="https://www.pop.org/about-home/">https://www.pop.org/about-home/</a>
Religious liberty	‘We uphold religious liberty and promote respect for the religious and cultural values of all people.’	<a href="https://familywatch.org/about-us/policy-positions/">https://familywatch.org/about-us/policy-positions/</a>
	‘TRUMP ESTABLISHES RELIGIOUS LIBERTY COMMISSION, PUTS PRO-LIFE ADVOCATES IN CHARGE. President Donald Trump established the Religious Liberty Commission through an executive order, in an effort to guarantee the religious rights of Americans.’	<a href="https://familywatch.org/newswire/nw-religious-liberty/">https://familywatch.org/newswire/nw-religious-liberty/</a>
Right to life	‘A right to life and its preservation, from the moment of conception to its natural end.’	<a href="https://help.citizengo.org/article/891-principles">https://help.citizengo.org/article/891-principles</a>
	‘We affirm the sanctity of life, the right to life before as well as after birth, and promote the protection of life at all stages.’	<a href="https://familywatch.org/about-us/policy-positions/">https://familywatch.org/about-us/policy-positions/</a>
	‘ADF International advances the God-given right to live and speak the truth.’	<a href="https://adfinternational.org/">https://adfinternational.org/</a>
Unborn	‘Nine young adults from Germany, Austria, Portugal, and the U.S. unite around a shared belief: every human being, born or unborn, is precious and deserves protection. They realize that building a culture of life and ending abortion transcends borders, politics and religions.’	<a href="https://prolifeeurope.org/about/">https://prolifeeurope.org/about/</a>
	‘The unborn, though unseen, voiceless, and unable to express their needs, are yet no less human.’	<a href="https://prolifeeurope.org/about/">https://prolifeeurope.org/about/</a>



# Appendix 4 Examples of questions to strengthen due diligence processes

---

## **For applicants:**

- Please list 3 to 4 alliances or networks your organisation is part of, and describe your role within each.
- Can you describe a partnership that has been important to your recent work?
- Please provide 2 to 3 references, including their names and affiliations.
- What specific issue(s) are you addressing, and how does your work aim to bring about change?
- What is happening in your community or context that your work seeks to change?

## **For referees of potential grantees:**

- How would you describe the organisation's work, approach, and the impact it has in its community or field?
- Do you have any concerns we should be aware of before considering funding this organisation?



---

ODI Europe brings research, ideas and dialogue with the wider world into the European policy debate. We address critical priorities while staying attuned to European policies and processes. We nurture global research excellence across our thematic priorities to inspire policy changes for a fairer and more sustainable world. We are based in Brussels and are part of the ODI Global network.

---

---

### **ODI Europe**

35 Square de Meeûs  
1000 Brussels  
Belgium

EU transparency register:  
051479091677-17

[odieurope@odi.org](mailto:odieurope@odi.org)

Website: [odi.org](https://odi.org)  
LinkedIn: ODI Global and  
ODI Europe  
BlueSky: [@odi.global](https://bsky.app/profile/odi.global)  
Threads: [@odi.global](https://www.threads.net/@odi.global)  
Instagram: [@odi.global](https://www.instagram.com/odi.global)

---