
Donor Spending on Gender in Emergencies 2013

An investigation by CARE International UK into the UN data on donor aid to emergency appeals for 17 countries in crisis

CARE International places special focus on working with poor girls and women because, equipped with the proper resources, they have the power to help lift families and communities out of poverty. CARE International UK co-ordinates the organisation's work on women, peace and security globally.



Why have we done this report?

This year, after years of silence on the issue of gender-based violence, the international community has finally sat up and taken notice of what many NGOs on the ground including CARE have been saying – that sexual violence in and after war and disaster needs to be tackled, both in terms of prevention, and direct assistance to women in the immediate and longer term.

In March, Justine Greening, the Secretary of State for International Development called a High Level Summit seeking international action to protect women and girls from violence and sexual exploitation in emergency situations, and a month later the G8 Foreign Ministers meeting in the UK made tackling rape as a tactic of war a priority. The high level event takes place this week, on Wednesday (November 13).

While CARE warmly welcomed these developments, we were concerned that it is still unclear just what proportions of international aid were being directed to gender projects. On October 23, Robert Buckland MP asked Ms Greening in a Parliamentary question how much of her Department's funding for the Syria emergency is currently being used for (a) gender-based violence prevention, (b) gender-based violence case management and (c) sexual and reproductive health in (i) Syria and (ii) neighbouring countries.

She answered that it is not possible to detail accurately the overall amount of funding that has gone to these activities. She added this is because in most cases they are integrated within wider programmes providing healthcare, livelihoods support and protection.

So, we decided to investigate the wider question ourselves, not just relating to Syria but also 16 other countries under the Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP).¹

To do this we analysed data from the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Financial Tracking System database.²

1. The Consolidated Appeal Process run by UNOCHA brings aid organisations together to jointly plan, coordinate, implement and monitor their response to natural disasters and complex emergencies. It allows them to appeal for funds cohesively, not competitively. <http://www.unocha.org/cap/about-the-cap/about-process>

2. Financial Tracking Service: Tracking Global Humanitarian Aid Flows <http://fts.unocha.org/>

How are projects monitored in relation to gender?

CARE is clear that gender needs to be factored into how NGOs and others design and implement life-saving projects when disasters strike. We are committed to improving how we do this with our new humanitarian strategy.

In 2009, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) introduced the concept of the 'Gender Marker', which was fully implemented in 2012.³ This is a tool that codes, on a 0-2 scale, whether or not a humanitarian project is designed well enough to ensure that women/girls and men/boys will benefit equally from it, or that it will advance gender equality in another way.

Category 2a is for projects that seek to 'mainstream' gender considerations in their design (such as presenting information separately for women and men, boys and girls, known as sex-disaggregation of data, in assessments of need).

Category 2b is for projects that are a targeted intervention addressing gender dynamics (such as projects in response to sexual violence).

Category 1 is for projects including basic elements that have the potential to address gender concerns.

Category 0 is for projects that have taken no visible steps to address these issues and are considered 'gender blind'. The term gender blind is used for projects submitted to the UN system which demonstrate no visible potential to contribute to gender equality, and may fail to address the needs of specific population groups or even unintentionally do harm.

In 2013, the Gender Marker was applied in 16 consolidated appeals processes: Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Philippines, Somalia, Republic of South Sudan, Sudan, Yemen and Zimbabwe. In addition, it was applied in five UN Pooled Funds established at country level, as well as in the funding for operations inside Syria (the Syria Humanitarian Assistance Response Plan or 'SHARP').

In 2010, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon set a target that the primary purpose of 15% of all projects implemented in post-conflict settings should address women's specific needs, advance gender equality or empower women.⁴ This includes preventing and responding to Gender Based Violence (GBV) such as rape.

CARE recognises that effectively integrating gender into emergency response is as much a challenge for ourselves as other agencies, UN and donors. To get our own house in order, CARE has designed an internal version of the Gender Marker for our own emergency preparedness efforts, humanitarian programme design, monitoring and evaluation processes with support from UNICEF and GENCAP experts.⁵ We are piloting this in our response to crises in West Africa and countries neighbouring Syria where we are supporting refugee response.

3. The IASC Gender Marker <https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/CAP/Gender%20Marker%20FAQ%2029%20July%202011.pdf>

4. 2012 United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, Fifty-sixth session 27 February – 9 March 2012, New York. Interactive Expert Panel: Review theme: Evaluation of progress in the implementation for gender equality and the empowerment of women. Page 3, para 3

5. The IASC Gender Capacity Stand-by Project (GenCap) is a pool of Gender Capacity Advisers to be deployed on short notice to support the UN in the initial stages of humanitarian emergencies. GenCap Advisers provide technical leadership and support on gender-sensitive programming

Methodology

The Financial Tracking System (FTS) is a global, real-time database which records all reported international humanitarian aid. FTS features a special focus on consolidated and flash appeals, because they cover the major humanitarian crises. Their funding requirements are well defined, which allows them to indicate to what extent populations in crisis receive humanitarian aid in proportion to needs. FTS is managed by the UN Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). All FTS data are provided by donors or recipient organisations.

We carried out a customised search using the data generated through the OCHA website for 17 countries in crisis. We examined the funding for the emergency appeals for 2013 and looked at the amounts given by all donors. Data was then analysed according to the Gender Markers allocated to every project implemented under each country appeal. This provided findings for each country which allowed us to measure the percentage of total emergency appeal funding allocated to projects that were gender focused/sensitive or specifically targeted gender issues, such as violence against women. In doing so, we drew on a Gender Marker Analysis of Results and Lessons Learned document from the GENCAP secretariat from February 2013 and our own up-to-date analysis of data on the FTS.

Cautions

The UN Gender Marker has been seen as an important tool that can help design and implement the kinds of humanitarian responses that fully understand and address the differing vulnerabilities of men and women.⁶

However this is a relatively new system, with varying levels of consistent usage by donors, UN agencies and aid agencies delivering projects on the ground. A review by the GENCAP secretariat in 2012 – the first year in which the system was rolled-out globally – found that 36% of projects were not coded correctly. This was reduced to 28% this year. But there is clearly still a way to go for staff working at the frontlines of crisis to be effectively and consistently implementing the Gender Marker.

We also know that the Gender Marker is only one tool, amongst others, to address gender issues. Other key challenges include the need to develop cadres of field staff with expertise in giving women and girls a meaningful role in needs assessments and project evaluation, and working in a more coordinated fashion across different sectors, for example in terms of the referral systems between those agencies in refugee camps and those supporting health clinics or psycho-social support.

The UN's own internal review of Gender Marker this year points to how even those projects which have scored well on the Gender Marker in the project proposal and design stage may not always fully translate into effective project implementation and monitoring on the ground.⁷ A more detailed list of CARE recommendations regarding the Gender Marker to the High Level Event is available at <http://insights.careinternational.org.uk/>

Therefore, there has to be some caution over interpreting the results and our report cannot be seen as the true global picture of donor funding. However the data can provide important indications and suggest where Gender Marker coding needs to be improved.

6. Siobhán Foran, Aisling Swaine & Kate Burns (2012): Improving the effectiveness of humanitarian action: progress in implementing the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Gender Marker, *Gender & Development*, 20:2, 233-247
To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2012.687221>

7. 2013 IASC GENDER MARKER Analysis of Results and Lessons Learned, February 2013

Results – Donors

First our researchers looked at data from the viewpoint of the donors – how much money do they give to projects that are being coded with a Gender Marker and, of this money, what percentage were taking account of gender, ie what percentage were going to projects coded 2a or 2b.

Overall

In absolute terms, the US gives the most, with a \$1.5 billion donation to 412 projects, followed by the European Commission with \$550 million in 352 projects. European countries also give individually and there is a range: for example, the UK gives \$373 million while Sweden gives \$168 million. Germany gives \$121 million. France, Spain and Italy are not in the top 10.

Table 1: The Top 10 Donors Global Humanitarian Contributions

	Donor	Amount of Contribution Commitment	No. Projects	0 (Gender blind)	2a	2b	Total 2a&b
1	USA	\$1,543,238,382	412	7%	57%	3%	60%
2	EC	\$550,597,375	352	8%	61%	1%	62%
3	Japan	\$392,734,149	153	9%	48%	4%	52%
4	UK	\$373,584,874	110	2%	50%	0.5%	50.5%
5	Germany	\$121,193,581	92	4%	65%	0%	65%
6	Canada	\$214,493,499	117	14%	47%	0.5%	47.5%
7	Sweden	\$168,073,637	126	7%	32%	2%	34%
8	Norway	\$93,102,467	72	3%	47%	0.2%	47%
9	Switzerland	\$52,064,875	100	6%	49%	2%	51%
10	Kuwait	\$71,581,148	17	0%	53%	5%	58%

2b and 'Gender Blind' funding

In terms of projects whose primary purpose is to be able to account for how they take the specific needs of women and girls, men and boys, into account, Kuwait appears to be the highest with 5%, followed by Japan with 4% and the US with 3%. Germany appears to fund no 2b projects at all, although it had the highest percentage of 2a projects at 65%.

In terms of projects that are considered 'gender blind', Canada appears to be the highest within the overall top 10 donors, with 14%, followed by Japan at 9% and the EC at 8%. In terms of projects reported through the UN system, Kuwait appears to have no gender blind projects, and the UK only 2%.

Table 2: Table of Top 10 Global Humanitarian Contributors Ranked by Lack of 2b Funding

	Top 10 Donors	2b
1	Germany	0%
2	Norway	0.2%
3	UK	0.5%
3	Canada	0.5%
4	EC	1%
5	Switzerland	2%
5	Sweden	2%
6	USA	3%
7	Japan	4%
8	Kuwait	5%

Results – Recipient Countries

Table 3: Top 5 Recipient countries ranked by funding

	Country	Amount of Funding
1	SHARP (Syria)	\$813,525,417
2	South Sudan	\$760,370,660
3	Somalia	\$545,441,287
3	Djibouti	\$15,771,822
4	DRC	\$545,242,266
5	Sudan	\$474,989,524

The desperate situation in Syria has led to a successful appeal making it the highest funded area so far in 2013, followed by South Sudan, Somalia, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Sudan, again where need is high.

However, when a further analysis of whether projects in these countries are addressing gender, it appears that the countries which need to address gender most may not be achieving this as much as others.

Table 4: Recipient countries ranked by level of 2a and 2b projects

	Country	Amount of Funding	No. Projects	0 (Gender blind)	2a	2b	Total 2a&b
1	Philippines	\$51,255,670	99	1%	91%	0.6%	92%
2	Sudan	\$474,989,524	560	0%	81%	1%	82%
3	South Sudan	\$760,370,660	909	7%	79%	1%	80%
3	Djibouti	\$15,771,822	33	13%	80%	0%	80%
4	oPT	\$247,840,944	224	2%	76%	1%	77%
5	Mali	\$222,398,290	209	0.2%	75%	0.8%	76%
6	Syria (SHARP) ⁸	\$813,525,417	364	2%	73%	2%	75%
7	Mauritania	\$64,893,311	81	0.3%	72%	0.9%	73%
8	Burkina Faso	\$61,842,278	69	0%	56%	7%	63%
9	CAR	\$81,033,402	148	13%	52%	0.4%	52%
10	Chad	\$182,076,145	118	9%	43%	0.4%	43%
11	Somalia	\$545,441,287	555	0%	41%	1%	42%
12	Kenya	\$330,842,423	127	0.1%	38%	1%	39%
13	Niger	\$264,950,043	126	8%	38%	0.1%	38%
14	Yemen	\$357,776,736	226	5%	30%	0.2%	30%
15	DRC	\$545,242,266	405	54%	19%	10%	29%
16	Afghanistan	\$350,593,353	194	22%	22%	0%	22%
17	Zimbabwe	\$74,310,428	31	2%	9%	0%	9%

8. The Syria Humanitarian Assistance Response Plan

Gender blind

Many countries are known to have experienced high levels of sexual violence in and after conflict. The DRC, for example, is sometimes labelled the 'rape capital' of the world. However, more than half (54%) of all projects are categorised as 'gender blind', that is, as submitted through the UN system, they do not account for how they understand gender or will address the specific needs of women and girls, men and boys in a deliberate fashion. In Afghanistan, 22% were gender blind.

In contrast, none of the 560 projects in Sudan, nor the 555 projects in Somalia appeared to be gender blind – both countries where sexual violence has been witnessed.

Gender mainstreaming and direct interventions

At the time of our research, two days before Super Typhoon Haiyan hit land, the Philippines appears to have the highest percentage of all of its projects either mainstreaming gender or including direct interventions. 92% of all its humanitarian funded projects are 2a or 2b. In Sudan, a country which has experienced much conflict and turmoil, 82% of its projects are 2a or 2b.

When analysing 2b projects separately, Burkina Faso has the highest percentage with 7%, while Afghanistan, Djibouti and Zimbabwe have none.

Syria

To date the Syria Humanitarian Assistance Response Plan (SHARP) 2013 appeal has achieved \$814 million of the \$1.41 billion requested for 2013. Reassuringly 73% of the projects funded to date have met the criteria for 2a inclusion; however only 2% meet 2b.

Conclusion

The Gender Marker tool is a relatively new, though very welcome, mechanism to determine whether humanitarian projects respond effectively to the distinct needs of women and girls, men and boys.

Donors' use of the Gender Marker to make decisions on which projects they fund is an important development. It can show a significant movement towards donors committing to funding only those interventions that address gender equality.

However it is acknowledged that there are challenges in its design and implementation.⁹ The Gender Marker categorisation is crude and it appears that NGOs are inconsistent in the way they report it.

The fact that a project has a Gender Marker code of 2a or 2b does not necessarily attest to its quality. The wide range of actors implementing the Gender Marker need help to ensure that it is applied accurately and consistently.

In our report, we have found data which is in turn worrying and surprising. As the UN's own internal evaluations have found, the coding is not always done accurately and the process of establishing a global system for accountability on gender has inevitably faced teething problems. One obvious challenge is that initiatives frequently address gender as a sub-component of projects with

another over-arching objective, such as providing support for shelter or water and sanitation. This can cause the gender focus to be lost in the coding process. Some donors also provide core funding for agencies to work on gender, violence against women and girls and protection, which does not get documented by the CAPs as the funding does not flow through country-specific funding streams.

We know the figures do not capture the full picture of what aid agencies are supporting on the ground, but this is precisely the point. All of us – donors, UN and NGOs in the field – need to become much better at holding ourselves to account in what we are doing to address gender in emergency aid – specifically violence against women and girls.

Signatories to the Communique for the High Level Event on 13 November have committed to “strengthen accountability at global, national and operational levels to address VAWG (Violence Against Women and Girls) in humanitarian responses and promote gender equality.” CARE believes that one key step to make this commitment real is to become more rigorous about categorising projects using the Gender Marker - not only in the design phase and reporting through the CAP system, but as a priority throughout on-going project monitoring and evaluation. Only then will the true picture of efforts to address the specific needs of women and girls, men and boys – including but not limited to gender-based violence – become clear.

For more information, visit:
<http://insights.careinternational.org.uk/>

CARE International UK
89 Albert Embankment
London SE1 7TP

Telephone 020 7091 6000

Registered charity number 292506

9. *ibid*