

ANNEXES



FUNDING FOR GENDER EQUALITY AND THE EMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN AND GIRLS IN HUMANITARIAN PROGRAMMING

JUNE 2020



© 2020 UN Women and UNFPA

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of UN Women, UNFPA, the United Nations or any of its affiliated organizations.

This publication may be freely used for noncommercial, fair use purposes, with proper acknowledgement of UN Women and UNFPA. Any other use must be authorized in writing by UN Women following a written request for permission. Any use of the content, in whole or in part, in all hard or soft-copy including in any online display, shall include attribution to UN Women and UNFPA as the original publishers and display, or shall cause to be displayed, the copyright of UN Women and UNFPA as follows: “Copyright © 2020 by the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA).

No user shall have the right to grant rights in the publication or contents that would purport to restrict the rights of UN Women and/or UNFPA.

Research commissioned by UN Women and UNFPA and produced by the Share Trust.

The creation of this study was supported by funding from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, SIDA, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark and the United States Government.



**MINISTRY OF FOREIGN
AFFAIRS OF DENMARK**

Cover photo: Rohingya refugees participate in International Women’s Day activities at a women’s centre in Balukhali camp in March 2018 in Cox’s Bazar, Bangladesh. © UN Women/Allison Joyce.

ANNEXES

FUNDING FOR GENDER
EQUALITY AND THE
EMPOWERMENT OF
WOMEN AND GIRLS
IN HUMANITARIAN
PROGRAMMING



JUNE 2020





CONTENTS

ANNEX A: STEERING COMMITTEE COMPOSITION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE	6
ANNEX B: REVIEW OF GENDER MARKERS AND TRACKING MECHANISMS	9
ANNEX C: CASE STUDY COUNTRY SELECTION CRITERIA	13
ANNEX D: LITERATURE REVIEW PROTOCOL	16
ANNEX E: LIST OF CONSULTATIONS - GLOBAL	17

Photo: Senuara, 17, is pictured in Balukhali camp in March 2018 in Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh. © UN Women/Allison Joyce.

ANNEX A

STEERING COMMITTEE COMPOSITION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

Organization	Contact
CARE	Natasha Lewis
IASC	Najat Rochdi
UNOCHA	Francesca Faccaroli, April Pham, Angelica Alhaique, Laura Calvio
UNFPA	Emily Krasnor; Henia Dakkak; Astrid Haaland
UNICEF	Marilena Viviani
Women Deliver	Marcy Hersh
ABAAD	Ghida Anani
UN Women	Arlene Baez

Steering Committee for Joint Research Initiative on the Levels of Funding for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls in Humanitarian Programming

Context

UN Women and UNFPA are in partnership to undertake a research project on the current level of funding across all major humanitarian funding mechanisms that can be designated as supporting GEEWG. This includes examining UN pooled funds notably the Central Emergency Response Fund, country-based pooled funds (CBPF) and other humanitarian funds.

In addition, the research will assess the level of funding required to ensure delivery of the global and

interagency commitments through the Humanitarian Response Plan made to gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action. The research will also ascertain where there are gaps when comparing the funding support that exists against what is needed, and what are the consequences of those gaps for humanitarian outcomes for women and girls, their dependents and their wider communities.

Expected outcomes

Clarity on existing levels of funding, the extent of funding gaps and the consequences of such shortfalls, will provide a powerful advocacy tool for enhanced funding of gender equality and empowerment of women and girls humanitarian programming that will ensure humanitarian outcomes that are more effective, cost-effective and human rights-based.

Such information on gender in humanitarian action funding will also be an essential element in the tracking

of global commitments to supporting and resourcing gender and empowerment focused humanitarian action. In particular, it will feed into the process of monitoring – through its accountability framework – the renewed commitments to ensuring adequate gender funding availability contained with the IASC’s 2017 policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls in Humanitarian Action.

Steering committee

A Steering Committee (SC) will be established to ensure a wider representation across the humanitarian sector and inclusion of humanitarian financing expertise, and to provide guidance and inputs to the process of conducting the research. The Steering Committee will assist in the development of the inception report, the research plan and the field missions. The ascertain will also assist in the development of the final report

and the advocacy strategy for further dissemination and use of the research findings.

Composition: The Steering Committee will include representatives from UN organizations (OCHA/FTS, UNICEF, INGOs, representatives from Peer-2-Peer Support and GenCap Members.

Role of the steering committee

The Steering Committee members will serve as an advisory board and make recommendations and inputs on the inception and final report.

The Steering Committee will meet periodically to support the study’s milestones, provide specific inputs towards:

- Drafting an outline and parameters of the study to be reflected in the inception report.

- Providing comments on reports, information and data provided by the research consultant.
- Facilitating stakeholder consultations and field missions if required.
- Reviewing Final Report drafts to provide inputs as necessary.
- Developing a dissemination plan.

Timeline

Deliverables/ Outputs	Time Frame
Inception report including desk review of current humanitarian financial analysis report on gender, identification of field mission sites, scope of the work and methodology to be applied	Month 1
Field mission report highlighting the impact on context specific humanitarian outcomes of underfunding of gender -focused humanitarian programming	Month 2 & Month 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A research-based paper that accomplished the following: • (i) measures the current allocation versus the actual requirements of humanitarian funding needed for adequate levels of gender equality and empowerment of women and girls humanitarian programming; • (ii) sets a baseline of the current levels of GEEWG across all major humanitarian funding mechanisms; • (iii) establishes recommended targets for the levels of funding required to ensure delivery of commitments to GEEWG in humanitarian action, as set out in key intergovernmental and interagency humanitarian mechanisms; • (iv) outlines the impact of GEEWG funding gaps on humanitarian outcomes on crisis affected populations – with a focus on underfunded HRP – based on field research of ongoing crisis contexts. contexts; and, in addition, highlights the benefits when those gaps are filled. 	Month 4 & Month 5
A tool/mechanism that consolidates sources of gender equality funding data (FTS, OECD data, donor reports, etc.) into a single data set for ongoing tracking, monitoring and analysis.	Month 5
Advocacy materials on the impact of impact of underfunding for gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action.	Month 6
Dissemination and advocacy	Month 7 - close

Expected activities:

Research: The research consultant will develop a research paper that:

- Measures both the current allocation vs. the actual requirements of humanitarian funding needed for adequate levels of gender equality and empowerment of women and girls humanitarian programming;
- Sets a baseline of the current levels of GEEWG across all major humanitarian funding mechanisms;
- Establishes recommended targets for the levels of funding required to ensure delivery of commitments to GEEWG in humanitarian action, as set out in key intergovernmental and interagency humanitarian mechanisms;

- Outlines the impact of GEEWG funding gaps on humanitarian outcomes on crisis affected populations - with a focus on underfunded HRP – based on field research of ongoing crisis contexts. In addition, highlights the benefits when those gaps are filled.

Tool development: A tool/mechanism that consolidates sources of gender equality funding data (FTS, OECD data, donor reports, etc.) into a single data set for ongoing tracking, monitoring and analysis.

Dissemination and advocacy: Advocacy materials on the impact of impact of underfunding for gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action.

ANNEX B

REVIEW OF GENDER MARKERS AND TRACKING MECHANISMS

Review of existing gender markers

A desk review found seven gender markers used in humanitarian contexts to monitor gender equality. This section will briefly list and summarize each of them since they play a key role in tracking GEEWG globally.

Agence Française de Développement (AFD)'s Sustainable Development Analysis and Opinion mechanism – Since 2013, the French Development Agency has used a tool to track its funded operations. The sustainable development analysis is prepared by the project team and is based on a qualitative assessment of the scope of the expected impacts. The sustainable development opinion is issued by an independent unit from the Operations Department to inform decision-making by the AFD Board. Not all operations are subject to an opinion, but the analysis is generally mandatory, with a few exceptions.¹ Each project is given a score based on how effectively it promotes gender equality and empowerment. It should ensure women's access to the opportunities created by the project, support structural changes in society to foster greater independence for women, consider gender in its project governance and

¹ “All AFD-funded operations are subject to a sustainable development analysis, not including Proparco, FFEM, BPI, FEXTE and operations linked to partnerships with NGOs... The scope of sustainable development opinion covers all AFD operations except: overall budget support; study funds; guarantees; management of delegated funding without AFD co-financing; small amounts operations (less than or equal to €1.5m in subsidies and €5m in loans); calls for FICOL projects (French Local Authorities Financing Facility) aimed at local authorities; co-financed operations involving mutual recognition of procedures in which the project leader is not from AFD; resolutions amending projects for which funds have already been granted; additional resolutions for minor changes to the financing amount without changes to the project objective.” AFD (2018). “The Sustainable Development Analysis: Raising Questions and Integrating Project Sustainable-Development Issues Upstream.” p.2. <https://www.afd.fr/en/ressources/sustainable-development-analysis>

combat violence against women. It should facilitate women's control over resources and income, as well as access to justice and their participation in economic, social and political decision-making bodies.

CARE's Gender Marker – CARE created a mandatory self-assessment tool for its staff in 2016 to be used in humanitarian and development contexts. It measures the integration of gender into programming, rating programmes on a scale from harmful to transformative. It is compatible with all other gender markers on this list.

ECHO's Gender-Age Marker – This tool measures the extent to which EU-funded humanitarian actors integrate gender and age. It is used by both ECHO staff and partners at all stages of a project: proposal, monitoring and final report stages. It also tracks gender and age sensitive actions and financial allocations to facilitate ECHO's monitoring of its performance. The most recent assessment is for 2014/15.

Enabel's Gender Budget Scan – The Belgian Development Agency has required mandatory tracking of the integration of gender equality in its funded projects since 2016. This is required of all countries and sectors from the planning stage to the evaluation stage. It tracks this for both humanitarian and development projects. Budget lines are screened and classified along a spectrum ranging from gender-blind to gender-transformative.

Feed the Future Women's Empowerment Index (WEI) – Feed the Future requires its focus countries to monitor direct and indirect Feed the Future programme performance and track changes regarding women's empowerment and inclusion levels in the agricultural sector. The index is also used for impact evaluations to determine effectiveness of different approaches and how they impact women and men. Baselines were collected in 2011 and 2012. Programmes are rated on five main criteria: production, resources, income,

leadership and time use. It measures women's empowerment relative to men's within their household.

GAC Gender Equality Policy Marker – Global Affairs Canada (GAC) has a gender marker very closely aligned with OECD DAC's Gender Equality Policy Marker as part of its Feminist International Assistance Policy, which puts GEEWG at the heart of international development, humanitarian, peace and security efforts. The codes are used for annual reporting to OECD-DAC as part of GAC's accountability process. The main difference is that GAC's GE Policy Marker has four categories rather than three: targeted, full integration, partial integration and none.

IASC's Gender with Age Marker (GAM) – The The Inter-Agency Standing Committee's marker was updated in 2015 to include age and a monitoring component. It is the most widely used marker across humanitarian actions, assessing projects based on 12 elements called the Gender Equality Measures. There are three elements considered during the design phase: gender analysis, tailored activities and benefits for beneficiaries and beneficiary influence on project decisions. In the monitoring phase, the remaining elements are: collection and analysis of sex- and age-disaggregated data (SADD), appropriate targeting, protection from GBV, coordination with other sector members and sectors, appropriate feedback channels, transparency, beneficiary satisfaction and an awareness of project shortfalls. "The GAM has seen significant uptake and use since its launch at ECOSOC in June 2018. On average, 44% of projects in the 2019 HPC completed the GAM, with country completion rates as high as 80%. In addition to the over 1200 GAMs completed

for Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) projects, an additional 2000 GAMs have been completed for projects outside the HPC."²

OECD DAC's Gender Equality Policy Marker – This is a mandatory tool for all DAC members that has been active since 2007, though new minimum criteria were incorporated in 2016. It tracks gender equality across all aid; 92% of total bilateral "sector-allocable" aid is screened against the gender equality marker. It is meant to be an estimate of DAC member support of gender equality, not an exact quantification. It provides a snapshot of individual gender equality focused projects and programmes; the global estimate of aid committed for gender equality; the proportion of DAC members' aid focused on achieving gender equality and women's empowerment; the sectors prioritized for gender equality focused aid; the investments within the individual sectors; and the countries prioritized for gender equality focused aid. Upon evaluation, projects are assigned a score: (2) relates to projects whose main objective is gender equality; (1) is for projects for whom gender equality is a significant objective; and (0) is for projects that do not target gender equality.

OECD also requires DAC members to classify projects based on a Creditor Reporting System (CRS) purpose code. Relevant codes relating to gender equality are: code 15170 - Women's equality organizations and institutions; and code 15180 - Violence against women.

2 IASC (2019). "The IASC Gender with Age Marker marks its one-year anniversary." ReliefWeb. <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/iasc-gender-age-marker-marks-its-one-year-anniversary>

Humanitarian funding tracking mechanisms

A desk review found six mechanisms for tracking GEEWG in humanitarian funding. The strengths and weaknesses of each tracking tool are outlined in this section.

Financial Tracking Service (FTS) — FTS is managed by OCHA and tracks global humanitarian funding contributions of government donors, UN funds, UN agencies, NGOs, the private sector and other actors and partners. It includes 8,000 recorded organizations and outlines funding flows between donors and recipient organizations. It also keeps track of progress on HRPs and appeal requirements.

- **FTS funding data covers:** humanitarian data. Though voluntary, it is the most complete data source. For humanitarian funding by country, it is possible to track by donor, donor type, recipient, recipient type, and sector. In appeals, FTS tracks donor, donor type, recipient, recipient type, appealing organization, appealing organization type, sector, project, GAM, project restriction, cash and vouchers and project priority. This can be looked at broadly or further broken down by country appeals. GBV is labeled its own sector in FTS.
- **It does not cover:** GAM for all HRPs. Only some countries have this data available. While FTS is the most comprehensive database, it is dependent on

information reported by donors and recipients. FTS also does not seem to track gender as clearly in the affected country data; there it tracks GBV. Further, “the use of multi-year and unearmarked allocations cannot be readily tracked against the annual HRP requirements, and distinctions between funds flowing “inside” and “outside” the appeals may not be clear-cut.”³ The distinction between “inside” and “outside” can be highly dependent on context and agency, as well as on the particular boundaries decided by each HRP in-country. Certain types of activities might be considered inside a plan in one country but not in another. In addition, governments of affected countries and agencies may be receiving funding outside the appeals that are also contributing to relief efforts.

- **How it tracks GEEWG:** FTS uses the IASC GAM though primarily when tracking appeals. It also does not record project GAM score for all appeals; cluster-costed HRPs, such as Myanmar, cannot be broken down based on GAM score because estimating overall resource needs is done through unit-based costing, using average costs per sectoral activity per person served (or another suitable unit). “These plans are sometimes referred to as “project-less” because the total requirements are not the sum of individual project requirements.”⁴ When the GAM score is marked it shows – by score – original requirements, current requirements, funding level, coverage percentage and pledges. For affected countries more generally, FTS does not track by gender marker but does track funding for GBV.

Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) – CERF is the UN’s global emergency response fund, pooling contributions from around the world into a single fund that can be accessed quickly whenever crisis hits. CERF gives two kinds of grants: “rapid response” grants for new crises, existing crises that deteriorate significantly or in response to time-critical needs; and “underfunded emergencies” grants for underfunded and protracted crises. CERF funding is available to UN agencies, funds and programmes.

- **CERF funding data covers:** humanitarian and rapid response. It includes the IASC GAM, however this data needs to be requested. CERF reports include

3 Swithern, Sophia (2018). “Underfunded Appeals: Understanding the Consequences, Improving the System.” EBA report 2018:09 Expert Group for Aid Studies, Sweden, p.63

4 <https://fts.unocha.org/appeals/overview/2018>

very specific gender data, thus we may need to go through each country’s grant report individually. It shows funds allocated by country, agency, sector and funding window (rapid response of underfunded emergency). CERF also has a GBV self-assessment tool.

- **It does not cover:** data that donors omit, and funding that is not part of CERF.
- **How it tracks GEEWG:** It seems to use the IASC GAM to track gender by appeal. However, their website does not make it clear how they do this and does not provide a clear avenue for searching for this data. Preliminary exploration into the grant reports did not reveal use of the GAM, though it did show marked funding towards sexual and gender-based violence. It could be helpful for the country case studies, though it seems as if FTS would be a more user-friendly way to access the same data.

Country-based pooled funds: Grant Management System (CBPF GMS) – CBPF are established when a new emergency occurs or an existing crisis deteriorates, though they do not exist for all current crises and are not established for all new emergencies. Donors contribute to specific CBPFs, the unearmarked funds are pooled and humanitarian partners can apply for funding. They are managed by OCHA at the country level and are meant to complement CERF and bilateral funding. The [CBPF Business Intelligence Portal](#) is part of the grant management system and is designed to provide detailed contribution and allocation data in real-time.

- **CBPF GMS funding data covers:** contributions to CBPFs. It tracks projects using the IASC GAM. There is an interactive graph that shows funding based on GAM under the [CBPF project summary tab](#).
- **It does not cover:** data that is not from a CBPF.
- **How it tracks GEEWG:** It uses the IASC GAM criteria to rate each project allocated CBPF funding. The data can be sorted by country, region, year (2014-2019), organization name and type. In 2018, 77.9% of funding went to projects designed to contribute significantly to gender equality (\$128.8 million). This will be helpful for gaining an idea of GEEWG funding, though it will not be the most useful source since CBPFs only account for a fraction of humanitarian spending.

d-Portal – The International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) works to increase the transparency and openness of resources flowing into developing countries. Organizations publish the information they choose in XML format based on the IATI Standard, a set of rules

and guidance produced by IATI. d-Portal is an open source platform that houses IATI's data. It asks two main questions: where do resources come from and where are they going (by sector and location).

- **d-Portal funding data covers:** humanitarian and development data. It allows searches based on recipient country, sector group and sector, publishing organization, year range, policy marker and activity status. The policy marker drop-down includes the OECD Gender Equality Policy Marker.
- **It does not cover:** data that has not been self-reported by an organization. It does not include humanitarian as a broader category; instead it breaks the information down into sectors such as “emergency response”. The platform is currently in BETA testing.
- **How it tracks GEEWG:** It uses the OECD Gender Policy Marker and relies on what organizations choose to publish. Due to this fact, the user of this data source cannot be assured of finding complete information. A global analysis can not be drawn from it. Because it tracks both humanitarian and development data, the user can only search for projects under “emergency response” which may or may not include all the humanitarian data required. It could provide interesting snapshots for the case studies. For example, data for Bangladesh emergency response that has a gender marker score shows 228 total projects between 1998 and 2019. It shows that the majority of the funding has come from the United Kingdom (\$210 million). When searching for projects whose primary focus is gender equality in Bangladesh, the tool came up with 14 total projects between 2009 and 2020 and UNICEF was now the primary funder (\$65 million).

Humanitarian InSight – Humanitarian InSight is a new OCHA platform that helps easily visualize response plans in humanitarian crises and its progress on funding and results achieved. It pulls funding data from FTS and additionally provides in-depth data for response plans in 2018 and 2019.

- **Humanitarian InSight data covers:** HRPs, regional refugee response plans, other response plans. It looks at the number of people in need, targeted people, percentage reached, United States dollars required and percentage of funding coverage.
- **It does not cover:** gender-specific data or data outside of the response plans.
- **How it tracks GEEWG:** Humanitarian InSight does not seem to track gender funding and therefore is not relevant for this study.

QWIDS and OECD.Stat – OECD DAC international development statistics show volume, origin, destination, types of aid and resource flows to over 150 developing countries and territories. The data is drawn from the 23 DAC members, international organizations and non-DAC countries. While reporting is mandatory for DAC members, it is voluntary for everyone else which means the data coverage for non-DAC varies over the years. There are two ways to access DAC international development statistics: Query Wizard for International Development Statistics (QWIDS) and OECD.Stat. QWIDS searches through datasets to find the appropriate data for a specific search, while OECD.Stat allows you to search for datasets.

- **DAC international development statistics covers:** all DAC members most thoroughly. It uses the OECD Gender Equality Policy Marker, and it seems to be possible to select “humanitarian aid” as a sector under QWIDS and to further sort the information by the gender marker score. It is also possible to sort through OECD.Stat to find relevant datasets such as “Aid projects targeting gender equality and women’s empowerment (CRS)” and to sort by “humanitarian” in sector.
- **It does not cover:** donors that are not a part of DAC who do not report their data. OECD is also more focused on development aid, which may make humanitarian data less reliable.
- **How it tracks GEEWG:** OECD uses its own gender marker as of 2016 and reporting is mandatory for DAC members, therefore gender equality project data for DAC members should be fairly thorough starting with 2016 aid flows. Through QWIDS it is possible to access the CRS datasets and select “Humanitarian Aid, Total” under sector. This reveals that the majority of humanitarian aid in 2017 (there is no data for 2018 yet) came from non-DAC donors, who are not required to report against the gender marker. When searching further, it is apparent that CRS microdata indicates a project’s gender marker score by year. Accessing and manipulating this data will take time, but it could be used to build a rough global picture of funding, though only for 2016 and 2017. This would also only represent bilateral allocable aid and a certain subset of funders (30 DAC, G7 countries, 21 non-DAC countries, 56 multilateral agencies and 28 private donors). DAC international development statistics could also be helpful in building the case studies.

ANNEX C

CASE STUDY COUNTRY SELECTION CRITERIA

Case study country typology

Region/Country	Protracted	Rapid/ new	Natural	Conflict	IASC Priority	Gender Inequality Index	GenCap Advisor
ASIA							
Afghanistan	X			X	X	153	Y
Bangladesh		x		X	X	134	Y
Myanmar	X	X		X		106	Y
AFRICA							
Cameroon	X			X		141	Y
Central African Republic	X			X	X	156	Y
Democratic Republic of the Congo	X	x	x	X	X	152	Y
Malawi/ Mozambique/ Zimbabwe		X	X			148/ 138/ 128	N/A
Nigeria	X			X	X	N/A	Y
Sierra Leone	X			X		150	Not avail
Somalia	X	x	X	X	X	N/A	N
South Sudan	X		x	X	x	N/A	N
Middle East and North Africa (MENA)							
Iraq	X			X	X	123	Y
Jordan/ Lebanon /Syria	X			X		108/ 85/ 136	Y (Syria) N (Jordan, Lebanon)
Yemen	X			X	x	160	Y
SOUTH AMERICA							
Venezuela		X			X	105	N

* N/A means not available

Summary of IASC GEEWG accountability framework

Country	HNO Includes SADD + Gender Analysis	HRP Supports Women's Economic Empowerment	HRP Includes SRH	HRP Includes GBV	HRP Includes PSEA*
Afghanistan	X	X		X	
Cameroon			X	X	X
Central African Republic	X	X	X	X	X
Chad	X	X	X	X	X
Colombia		X	X	X	
Democratic Republic of the Congo					X
Ethiopia	X	X	X	X	X
Haiti		X	X		
Iraq	X	X		X	X
Jordan		X			
Lebanon					
Libya		X			X
Mali		X		X	X
Myanmar		X	X	X	X
Niger			X		
Nigeria	X	X	X	X	
occupied Palestinian territory (oPt)	X	X	X	X	X
Somalia					X
Sudan			X	X	X
South Sudan	X				X
Syria	X				
Ukraine			X	X	X
Yemen			X		

* Prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse

Consult with Local Women's Organizations	Gender Working Group	Plan on GEEWG	Joint Gender Analysis	Analytical Work on Gender Capacities	Rank
X					4
X	X				5
X	X				7
					5
					3
					1
	X			X	7
X					3
X					5
	X		X	X	4
X	X				2
					2
X					4
X		X	X	X	8
					1
X	X	X	X	X	9
X	X	X	X		9
X	X	X			4
X					4
	X				3
					1
					3
X	X		X	X	5

ANNEX D

LITERATURE REVIEW PROTOCOL

The literature review used a systematic process of searching Google and Google Scholar for relevant articles, both peer reviewed as well as agency reports and white papers. The following search protocol was used, resulting in a total of 117 distinct searches per country. Given the breadth of this literature review, the study team did not try to capture a full review of the literature, but rather focused on key studies within each of these searches that articulated the benefits of action. As one would expect, for some sectors, limited to no analysis had been done.

Search terms include:

“gender” OR “women” OR “girl”;

AND “cost”;

AND “programme” OR “intervention” OR “inaction”

Each of these iterations was then combined with search terms for each sector considered in the analysis:

- **GBV/child protection:** AND “violence” OR “trafficking” OR “marriage” OR “protection” OR “ECD”
- **SRH:** AND “sexual reproductive health”
- **MH:** AND “maternal” (“pregnancy” used with “girl”)
- **Nutrition:** AND “nutrition”
- **PSS:** AND “psychosocial support” or “mental health”
- **Livelihoods:** AND “livelihood”
- **Education:** AND “education”
- **Life skills:** AND “life skills”

ANNEX E

LIST OF CONSULTATIONS - GLOBAL

ANNEX A: Consultation table

Note that these tables indicate the range of people who were approached for consultation. Consultation was not completed with all people on this list, due to non-response of several people.

Organization	Contact
CARE	Joe Read, funding flows to women-led organizations
Development International	Sophia Swithern Sarah Dalrymple Angus Urquhart
European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)	Eliana Irato Ellen Gorris
Gender Reference Group (GRG)	Julie Lafreniere Hiba QASAS
Global Cluster Leads	WASH, protection, nutrition, food security and livelihoods, emergency telecoms, shelter, early recovery, CCCM, education, health (see below)
Global Affairs Canada	Kateryna Sherysheva
Humanitarian Outcomes	Lydia Poole
IASC	Hicham Daoudi, leading the IAHE on gender
IAWG – Gender Group	Maria Holtsberg Dabney Evans
International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)	Elena Garagorriaristain, Senior Adviser, Donor Relations, Government Affairs and Fundraising
International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA)	Jeremy Rempel, Head, Humanitarian Financing, and co-chair IASC Result Group 5 on Humanitarian Financing
International Organization for Migration	Jordan Menkveld, Donor Relation Officer
IRC/ Equality Institute	Meredith Blake Mendy Marsh
MFA, Norway	Mette Tangen
Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)	Cecila Roselli Nicole Anshell

UNFPA	Jennifer Chase, UNFPA GBV AoR Advisor Lene Aggernaes, Senior Programme Advisor
UNHCR	Hiroko Araki , Chief Humanitarian Financing and Field Support, William Chemaly , Coordinator, Global Protection Cluster
UNICEF	Catherine Poulton, Lindsay Stark, Melissa Meinhart (GBV costing study)
UNICEF	Philimon Majwa
UN OCHA: CERF	Shelley Cheatham
UNOCHA: Country Based Pooled Fund (CBPF)	Meron Berhane Maria Isabel Tomas de Mul, Humanitarian Affairs Officer
UNOCHA: Pooled Funds	Lisa Doughten, Chief, Pooled Fund Management Branch
UN OCHA: FTS	Laura Calvio
UN OCHA: IASC	Emily Walker, Head of ProCap/GenCap Support Unit Deborah Clifton Francesca Fraccaroli
UN Women/Gender hub	Tess Dico-Young Shoko Ishikawa
World Health Organization	Elisabeth Roesch
Womens Refugee Commission	Dale Buscher Joan Timoney

Global Cluster Leads

WASH
Protection
Nutrition
Food Security & Livelihoods
Emergency Telecommunications
Emergency Shelter
Early Recovery
CCCM
Education
Health

Annex F

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Area of investigation	Supporting Questions
Definition of GEEWG	<p>How do organizations define and track funding to GEEWG? What labels do they use to identify funding flows to GEEWG? What would implementing organizations recommend as key actions to strengthen their tracking of funding to GEEWG activities? Who are the primary organizations implementing gender targeted programming? What types of programming are they investing in?</p>
Current levels of funding	<p>What are the current levels of funding to women and girls, with a specific focus on the categories of targeted programming? Is it possible to map current levels of funding? What has been achieved? And what are the gaps? Where do implementing organizations see gaps in funding/programming for women and girls? How much of partner organization funding is targeted at women-focused organizations and what are the main activities of these organizations?</p>
Funding required	<p>How much funding is required? This will be based on the requested amounts in the HRP/RRP but also a review of projects documents, to the extent possible. Consultation may be used to explore this question further. How do agencies assess and account for funding requirements for GEEWG when they work out their humanitarian response plans? Are there any costing estimates for funding required?</p>
Consequences of the gap	<p>How big is the gap between funding required and actual levels of funding? What are the consequences on women and girls of any shortfall in funding?</p>



605 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10158 USA

www.unfpa.org
www.facebook.com/unfpa
www.instagram.com/unfpa
twitter.com/unfpa
www.youtube.com/user/unfpa
www.linkedin.com/company/unfpa/



220 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017 USA

www.unwomen.org
www.facebook.com/unwomen
www.twitter.com/un_women
www.youtube.com/unwomen
www.flickr.com/unwomen