© CARE

TIME FOR A BETTER BARGAIN:

How the Aid System Shortchanges
Women and Girls in Crisis

care®

75 YEARS

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

- **IASC:** Inter-Agency Standing Committee
- **IATI:** International Aid Transparency Initiative
- **NGO:** Non-Governmental Organization
- **OCHA:** United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
- **ODA:** Official Developmental Assistance
- **OECD:** Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development
- **UNDP:** United Nations Development Programme
- **UNFPA:** United Nations Population Fund
- **UNHCR:** United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
- **UNICEF:** United Children's Fund
- **WFP:** World Food Programme
- **WLO:** Women-Led Organization
- **WRO:** Women's Rights Organization

Executive Summary

More than one in 33 people worldwide (235 million) will need humanitarian assistance and protection this year.[1] Women and girls are typically disproportionately affected by conflict and disasters. They are generally more likely to be displaced and subjected to gender-based violence and livelihood loss.[2] The international community has long recognized that investing in women-led crisis response and prioritizing gender equality are key to effectively meet humanitarian and recovery needs, and to achieve peace and prosperity.[3] Yet despite this recognition, women's and

©Irene Nduwayezu/CARE

girls' priorities often go unmet and their voices and expertise go unheeded. While women constitute the bulk of COVID-19 carers and first responders, women-led groups remain undervalued and under-resourced. Funding to frontline women's organizations in fragile and conflict-affected areas remains at a paltry 0.2% of total bilateral aid, despite an upward trend of increased total aid committed to support gender equality efforts.[4]

CARE's global advocacy campaign, **#SheLeadsInCrisis**, calls this out: Women are most affected by crises; they must lead efforts to prevent and respond to them. When women and girls lead, entire communities benefit and sustainable solutions prevail. Women's and girls' involvement in humanitarian programming yields more effective and inclusive humanitarian response.[5]

To that end, in this report CARE appraises key actors in the international aid system on three priority areas:

A. **Resourcing** women's rights organizations, women-led organizations and women's institutions in crisis-affected areas;

B. **Funding** for gender equality and empowerment of women's and girls' programming; and

C. **Elevating** leadership and equal participation of women and women's organizations in humanitarian responses and crises.

This report draws on publicly available and accessible information to assess progress on a set of seven gender-specific benchmarks drawn from the High-Level Roundtable on Women and Girls at the first-ever World Humanitarian Summit in 2016. The roundtable gathered key international actors and governments seeking to define strategic initiatives to achieve gender equality and women's empowerment in humanitarian crises in accordance with the UN Agenda 2030 Sustainable Development Goal 5 on gender equality and the Women, Peace and Security Agenda of the UN Security Council.[6] These proposed commitments present the most concrete set of gender-specific goals for funding and leadership in humanitarian contexts.

The report analyzes the performance of the top 10 Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) donors,[7] along with EU institutions and five of the UN agencies most active

in crisis response. It also assesses humanitarian clusters — key forums which play a critical coordination, leadership and accountability role in aid responses, and which are normally led by a UN agency and co-led by an international Non-Governmental Organization (NGO). The donors and UN agencies combined represent a significant proportion of the international aid system. Additionally, CARE self-assessed against the same criteria.

While the World Humanitarian Summit benchmarks were not universally or formally adopted, or included in the subsequent *Grand Bargain* between donors, UN agencies and INGOs following the Summit, they remain the most unified and concrete set of gender-specific goals for funding and leadership in humanitarian contexts. They also reflect emerging global standards[8] and policy priorities that all of the actors reviewed have committed to and, through the UN Security Council's Women Peace and Security Agenda and the 2030 Agenda, are obligated to prioritize and take action to fulfill.

Despite positive and often impressive multilateral, individual donor and UN agency initiatives since the 2016 Summit, CARE's analysis revealed:

- Donors and UN agencies have fallen short, with notable exceptions, of significantly funding women's groups in fragile and conflict-affected states; seven of 11 top donors allocated less than 1% of aid to fragile states and directly to women's organizations.

- Most do not sufficiently fund gender equality or gender-sensitive programs; seven of 11 government donors allocate barely 2% of funds to targeted gender equality programming in humanitarian settings. Only four are close to ensuring all funded programs in humanitarian settings account equally for the needs of women and girls and men and boys.

- UN agencies and humanitarian coordination clusters do not systematically track which of their partners are women's rights or women-led organizations, making it difficult to assess whether the rhetoric around empowering local women's groups[9] is matched in reality.

- One notable success has been increased gender parity in UN operations, showing that, with adequate political will and resourcing, change is possible.

Worryingly, the COVID-19 pandemic's substantial economic and social toll threatens to reverse even modest progress on funding gender equality efforts and to exacerbate chronic under-resourcing of frontline women's organizations in fragile and conflict-affected contexts, despite evidence that women and girls-led crisis response leads to more effective, inclusive and long-lasting impact.[10]

This report card is part of CARE's #SheLeadsInCrisis global campaign, which demands gender-just and women-led crisis response to today's defining global challenges: conflict, climate and COVID-19. CARE's campaign builds on CARE's vision of a world of hope, inclusion and social justice that requires putting women and girls in the center, as poverty will not be overcome until all people have equal rights and opportunities.

—CARE International Council, CARE VISION 2030 (July 2020)

Summary Report Card

Priority	World Humanitarian Summit Indicator	Summary of Progress	Overall Rating
Resourcing women's rights organizations, women-led organizations and women's institutions	Increase funding to women's groups to 4% by 2020	**Satisfactory**: One donor and one UN agency **Approaching**: One donor and two UN agencies **Unsatisfactory/missing data**: Nine donors and two UN agencies	Unsatisfactory
Funding for gender equality programs (gender-targeted, transformational or gender-mainstreamed programs)	15% target for gender equality and women's and girls' empowerment programming in humanitarian settings	**Satisfactory**: One UN agency **Approaching**: One donor **Unsatisfactory missing data**: Ten donors and four UN agencies	Unsatisfactory
	Only provide financial support to programs that demonstrate how they meet women's and girls' needs equally with men's and boys' by 2020	**Satisfactory**: Four donors and two UN agencies **Approaching**: Two donors **Unsatisfactory/missing data**: Five donors and three UN agencies	Approaching
Participation and leadership of women and women's organizations in humanitarian and crisis responses	25% of implementing partners are women's organizations by 2020	UN agencies surveyed did not have information on the number of their implementing partners that are women's organizations	Missing
	Local and national memberships of humanitarian clusters is composed of 50% women's groups by 2020	No clusters had comprehensive information on the participation of women's rights or women-led organizations	Missing
	At least 40% of leadership positions in humanitarian contexts are held by women	**Satisfactory:** Two UN agencies **Unsatisfactory:** Three UN agencies	Unsatisfactory
	At least 30% of staff at all levels are women by 2020	**Satisfactory:** All five UN agencies	Satisfactory

Key Recommendations

International Aid Donors, UN agencies and INGOs to:

- Explicitly commit to the funding targets from the World Humanitarian Summit High-Level Roundtable on Women and Girls, or comparable gender-specific, time-bound benchmarks, including in revisions to the Grand Bargain;
- Systematically track and report funding to and partnerships with women-led and women's rights organizations, and regularly publish overall funding figures;
- Increase the amount and quality of humanitarian funding that goes to women's and girls' rights organizations, ensuring this includes flexible, multi-year funding for core operational and management costs; and
- Ensure that women, girls and women's organizations are equitably represented and have an equal voice in humanitarian decision-making structures, including leadership positions in agencies, in Humanitarian Country Teams and in Clusters.

Methodology: Benchmarks, Ratings, Data Gaps

This report aims to appraise key actors in the international aid system on i) resourcing women's rights organizations, women-led organizations and women's institutions; as well as funding for gender equality and empowerment of women and girls; and on ii) elevating leadership of women and women's organizations in humanitarian responses and crises. To measure progress on these areas, CARE drew on seven specific benchmarks developed during the High-Level Roundtable on Women and Girls at the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit. Drawing on existing, publicly available information and data, CARE analyzed the performance of the top 10 OECD donors, along with EU institutions and of five UN agencies most active in crisis response.

Benchmarks and Rating

This report uses benchmarks developed at the High-Level Roundtable on Women and Girls at the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016. CARE chose the most specific, relevant and measurable of the sample benchmarks that would genuinely lead to gender-transformative, women-focused and women-led crisis response. While non-binding,[11] these indicators reflect emerging global norms and standards around gender in humanitarian settings.[12] The indicators also align with existing commitments rooted in the Women, Peace and Security Agenda, as well as SDG 5 on gender equality and women's empowerment. The selected benchmarks are:

1. Funding to women's groups to be increased to 4% by 2020

2. 15% of funding to be allocated to targeted gender equality programming in humanitarian settings

3. All programs in humanitarian settings account equally for the needs of women and girls and men and boys by 2020

4. 25% of implementing partners are women's organizations by 2020

5. Women's organizations make up half of local or national cluster members by 2020

6. At least 40% of leadership positions in humanitarian contexts are held by women

7. At least 30% of staff at all levels are women by 2020

This report card establishes a baseline performance for the 11 donors and five UN agencies on these seven indicators, as non-binding, yet instructive benchmarks.

Performance on funding and partnerships below 50% of the World Humanitarian Summit targets is characterized as "unsatisfactory"; between 50% and 74% as "approaching"; and 75% and over as "satisfactory." For the two indicators on staffing of UN agencies (indicators 6 and 7), actors who fell short of the stated target — fewer than 40% of women in leadership positions in humanitarian contexts, and less than 30% of all staff being women by 2020 — received an unsatisfactory rating, as these are interim targets *en route* to gender balance of 50/50. Missing data is rated as unsatisfactory[13] (see section below on Data Gaps).

Data Sources

For this report, CARE drew on the most up-to-date information made publicly available by donors and UN agencies. There is currently no universally reliable, systemic, harmonized database available to track the data sought on resourcing and supporting women-led crisis response.

Thus, to analyze donor funding, CARE used the OECD database, which requires OECD member states to report on gender-equality programming and on funding to women's rights organizations, movements and ministries.[14] The OECD's international development database was spotlighted by a recent UN review for its unmatched ability to track gender-equality-coded funding across a broad range of funding sources, housing the most complete and reliable data of the reviewed databases.[15] Notably, some individual government donors employ unique definitions (for example around types of gender programming) or code and report their data differently than the way such data is presented or counted under the OECD markers, resulting in potential discrepancies between individual self-reporting and OECD reporting. This is a limitation as well as an opportunity to better align funding flow tracking. The OECD data analyzed is from the most recently available year; primarily from 2018 published at the end of 2019 and, where available, 2019 data currently being updated by the OECD, as of early 2021.

The data for indicator 1 on funding to women's rights organizations, movements and institutions is analyzed as a percentage of all Official Development Assistance (ODA)[16] — development and humanitarian aid combined — allocated to fragile states,[17] and coded by OECD as going to women's rights groups, movements and government institutions. The data for indicators 2 and 3, on "gender principal" (gender equality is a principal focus of the funding/project) and "gender significant" (the different needs of women, men, girls and boys are assessed and met) programming, were respectively analyzed for humanitarian funding only.

For UN agencies, CARE analyzed funding data published on the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) digital portal, which categorizes information using the same codes and criteria as the OECD.[18] UN data on IATI is not strictly separated between humanitarian and development funding as is the case with OECD data. Notably, the *Grand Bargain: A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need,* adopted during the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit, and which now has 63 signatories consisting of donor governments, multilateral and UN agencies and NGOs,[19] identified IATI as the common repository for data on humanitarian funding. The IATI data analyzed in this report is from 2019.[20]

Other data on participation in humanitarian clusters, UN agency partnerships with local women-led groups and UN staffing parity has been drawn from publicly accessible sources, where available, with requests sent by CARE to agencies for supplementary information when needed.

In all, CARE sourced or requested data from the 11 largest OECD donors, five UN agencies and eight clusters. Together, the assessed governments and agencies represent a significant proportion of the international aid system. The results of this report card should not, however, be considered representative of all international humanitarian actors, which includes governments, donors which are not part of the OECD Development Assistance Committee, smaller donors, private foundations or international Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs). CARE is considering adding other actors in future editions of the report.

CARE's own performance is based on funding, partnerships and staffing data drawn from its own internal monitoring systems from 2020 and is published externally in this report for the first time.

Data Gaps

With existing data scattered and disparate, and a lack of universal definitions and harmonized coding, the aid community has been unable to collectively monitor or showcase progress on moving rhetoric about the crucial need to support women-led crisis response into reality.[21] While the analysis in this report is based on the best publicly accessible sources, it is limited by unavailable, missing, incomplete and partial data.[22] Other studies have noted that such lack of data makes it "difficult to hold humanitarian actors accountable."[23]

However, in numerous resolutions dating back to 2009, the UN Security Council has called on Member States and UN agencies to collect data and track funds on the gender focus of aid operations and increase contributions to local civil society and women's organizations.[24] All UN agencies analyzed in this report are Grand Bargain signatories who have committed to "publish timely, transparent, harmonized and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding within two years of the [2016] World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul [with] IATI to provide a basis for the purpose of a common standard."[25] OECD members are required to report such data annually.

To the extent that the publicly available data is incomplete, that can be seen as a shortcoming of individual agencies and donors to live up to their own commitments and the demands of the UN Security Council. For this reason, where there is incomplete or no accessible data related to the indicators, CARE rated this as unsatisfactory.

©Nancy Farese/CARE

What Are Women's Rights and Women-Led Organizations?

Women-led organizations identify their own challenges, devise methods of solving them and define project activities and goals. A four-year, Canadian government-funded program in South Sudan called Women's Voice and Leadership (WVL) launched in 2017 and adopts an explicit feminist approach. WVL issues grants for core funding to the organizations to spend it as they see fit. Organizations are selected for grants by the WLO-led advisory committee. The lack of agreed-upon definitions of "women's rights organizations" and "women-led organizations" is one of the challenges to consistently tracking resourcing and partnering with such groups. Commonly cited definitions advanced by UN Women,[26] based on Grand Bargain[27] core commitments to more robustly fund local and national crisis responses, are:

Women's Rights Organization (WRO): 1) An organization that self-identifies as a women's rights organization with the primary focus of advancing gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights; or 2) an organization that has, as part of its mission statement, the advancement of women's and girls' interests and rights (or where "women," "girls," "gender" or local language equivalents are prominent in their mission statement); or 3) an organization that has, as part of its mission statement or objectives, to challenge and transform gender inequalities (unjust rules), unequal power relations and promoting positive social norms.

Women-Led Organization: An organization with a humanitarian mandate and/or mission that is 1) governed or directed by women; or 2) whose leadership is principally made up of women, demonstrated by 50% or more occupying senior leadership positions.[28]Despite these recent efforts, the lack of a commonly agreed upon and widely used definition may hinder both the allocation and tracking of funding and efforts to ensure the inclusion and consultation of these organizations in humanitarian, development and peacebuilding efforts. CARE takes a more stringent approach to defining women's rights organizations as those with an *explicit purpose* of advancing women's rights or gender equality and labels women-led organizations as any non-governmental, not-for profit and non-political organization where *two-thirds* of its board (including the Chair) and management staff/volunteers (including the Executive Director) are female, and it focuses on women and girls as a primary target of programming. CARE further recognizes that not all actors will be formal organizations and that supporting movements, grassroots groups, activists and individual leaders should also be part of the approach to achieve localized, women-led humanitarian action.[29]

Introduction

Given growing commitments by the international community to invest in women-led crisis response and gender equality programming as key to effective and sustainable solutions, CARE appraised key actors in the international humanitarian aid system on three priority areas:

A. Resourcing women's rights organizations, women-led organizations and women's institutions in crisis-affected areas (Indicator 1);

B. Funding for gender equality and empowerment of women and girls programming (Indicators 2-3); and

C. Elevating leadership and equal participation of women and women's organizations in humanitarian responses and crises (Indicators 4-7).

Despite positive and often impressive policy measures, as well an increased gender parity in UN operations, the following analysis reveals significant shortfall in direct funding to women's groups and to gender quality programming in humanitarian settings, and lack of systematic tracking of partnerships with women's rights and women-led organizations. Notably, the analysis flags concerns about subsequent funding reduction due to the ongoing toll of the global COVID-19 pandemic.

A. Resourcing Women's Organizations in Crisis-Affected Countries

In the years since the World Humanitarian Summit, donors and aid agencies have taken important steps to prioritize women's rights and voices in fragile and conflict-affected states and in humanitarian responses.[30]

Several governments, such as Sweden and Canada, have adopted feminist international assistance policies,[31] and the UK government adopted a Strategic Vision on Gender Equality. Important international initiatives, such as the Whistler Declaration by G7 countries and the Call to Action on Protection from Gender-Based Violence in Emergencies, promote gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in their humanitarian assistance.[32]

Both UN agencies and donors have made significant localization efforts to more directly resource local and national responders.[33] As part of the *Grand Bargain*, for example, UN agencies and donors committed to provide 25% of all their humanitarian funding to local and national actors.[34] Overall, 10 out of 61 Grand Bargain signatories in 2019 met this commitment, an increase from seven in 2018.[35]

These initiatives have not, however, translated into significantly increased funding to women's organizations as reflected in the selected databases. The UN Secretary General's latest report on Women, Peace and Security highlighted that while total bilateral aid committed to support

gender equality efforts in these countries has increased, bilateral aid to women's organizations has stagnated, at 0.2% of total bilateral aid.[36]

CARE's analysis of individual donors' Official Development Assistance (ODA) reported to the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) shows that most donor countries allocate a fraction of 1% of their funding directly to women-led organizations and institutions in fragile states.[37] Only one donor, the Netherlands, came close to reaching the target of at least 4% of total funding to women's organizations. Only one other, Norway, is more than halfway toward that target.

CARE's analysis of UN agencies showed both a lack of progress and a lack of data.[38] Of the UN agencies analyzed, UNFPA nearly met, and UNDP and UNICEF are approaching 4% of their total assistance in fragile and conflict-affected states being allocated to women's groups.

Indicator 1: Increase funding to women's groups to 4% by 2020

Donor	Total ODA to fragile states, 2019 (USD)	Percentage allocated to women's rights organizations and movements and government institutions, 2019	Rating
Canada	1,369,145,000	1.42	Unsatisfactory
Denmark	598,494,000	0.004	Unsatisfactory
France	2,497,469,000	0.043	Unsatisfactory
Germany	5,415,573,000	0.24	Unsatisfactory
Japan	4,673,015,000	0.134	Unsatisfactory
Netherlands	746,147,000	3.11	Satisfactory
Norway	1,086,125,000	2.16	Approaching
Sweden	1,544,932,000	1.395	Unsatisfactory
United Kingdom	4,913,885,000	0.27	Unsatisfactory
United States	14,184,877,000	0.005	Unsatisfactory
EU Institutions	6,902,258,000	0.113	Unsatisfactory
Agency	**Total Assistance in fragile states, 2019 (USD)**	**Percentage of total allocated to women's rights organizations and movements and government institutions**	**Rating**
UNDP	2,324,279,331	2.3	Approaching
UNFPA	488,719,082	3	Satisfactory
UNHCR	2,135,655,460	No data	Missing
UNICEF	3,770,948,793	2.3	Approaching
WFP	5,623,938,826	No data	Missing

Rating key: Red = Unsatisfactory or Missing: Less than 50% to target/no data; Yellow = Approaching: From 50% to 74% of target; Green = Satisfactory: 75% of target or above.

Funding women-led organizations:
Delivering both aid and transformative change

Women-led organizations identify their own challenges, devise methods of solving them and define project activities and goals. A four-year, Canadian government-funded program in South Sudan called Women's Voice and Leadership (WVL) launched in 2017 and adopts an explicit feminist approach. WVL issues grants for core funding to the organizations to spend it as they see fit. Organizations are selected for grants by the WLO-led advisory committee.

One of the women-led organizations is Crown the Woman (CREW), which ensures women and girls can contribute to nation-building economically, socially and politically. Since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, CREW has been raising awareness on COVID-19 and violence against women and girls through social media, radio talk-shows and awareness and educational material.

"We have been able to connect survivors of rape, domestic violence and child marriage to services like medical treatment, psychosocial services and legal services, among others," says a member of CREW. CREW also mobilized women and male allies to protest against the gang rape of an 8-year-old girl and to demand justice for her and other victims of gender-based violence (GBV), successfully petitioning the Ministry of Gender, Child and Social Welfare and the South Sudanese parliament.

Women's rights organizations in Palestine, with CARE support, have had a similar impact. They have scaled up critical emergency services during the COVID-19 crisis, including setting up hotlines for marginalized communities in hard-to-reach areas of the country and providing legal and psychosocial support to survivors of domestic violence/GBV, which has increased during the COVID-19 pandemic. These same organizations also push for lasting policy changes. When the Palestinian Authority proposed a new, and largely gender blind, Civil Service Law, Women's Legal Aid and Counselling mobilized and successfully intervened with the Ministry of Women's Affairs. This led to the legislation being halted in the cabinet in order to allow for further consultation with civil society organizations on the addition of gender sensitivity principles into the new law.

©Ollivier Girard/CARE

©Georgina Goodwin/CARE

B. Funding for Gender Equality Programming in Crisis Settings

The UN Secretary General's report on the outcomes of the World Humanitarian Summit noted that the commitment on gender-responsive programming "received the highest number of alignments to a core commitment by Member States."[39] The UN and donors consequently launched initiatives to better design and monitor programs to ensure compliance with these gender commitments. The UN Inter Agency Standing Committee (IASC) produced an updated Gender with Age Marker (GAM) in 2018, which has helped increase attention to gender in interventions and encouraged "collaboration, coordination and accountability" around gender-responsive programming.[40] Donors such as the European Commission Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO)[41] have developed gender policies and their own gender-age markers, and the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs has committed to systematically assessing whether all aid supports gender equality and inclusiveness.

Despite these efforts, most donors and UN agencies reviewed fall significantly short of ensuring that 15% of their funding or programs have gender equality as a principal goal. Only UNICEF has surpassed the target and Japan is the only donor making progress toward it.

Gender analysis and consultation: Basic and fundamental to crisis response

Reflecting an effective approach to gender in emergencies that elevates women's leadership, in response to Typhoon Mangkhut in the Philippines in 2018, ECHO funded a consortium with CARE, ACF, Oxfam, Plan and implementing partner Cordis. The project was accompanied by a training package, including gender sensitization for households, gender equality and women's involvement in decision-making and public spaces. As part of this, households were asked to discuss and decide which family member should be registered and receive cash transfers on behalf of the household. As a result, women were as likely to receive the assistance as men. In government assistance projects in contrast, where those discussions did not take place, men remained the primary recipients of assistance.[42]

More progress has been made in ensuring that the different needs of women, men, boys and girls are taken into account in humanitarian programs. Encouragingly, about half of top donors mainstream gender into the overwhelming majority of funded programs and projects in humanitarian settings. The data shows Canada, Japan, the Netherlands and Sweden are close to reaching the goal of all humanitarian funding being gender sensitive or mainstreamed. The UK is making progress, with over 50% of its funding rated as gender sensitive. Of UN agencies, UNDP and UNICEF scored highly. Data was not available for UNFPA, UNHCR and WFP on the selected database.

Measuring funding flows, especially given limited available data, is an imperfect instrument to rate individual actors on their commitments to gender equality in humanitarian responses. Some donors may provide significant un-earmarked funding, which may affect the amount coded by the gender policy marker. There can also be discrepancies in the methodologies used by different donors and agencies when reporting to OECD and IATI, as compared with their individual self-reporting.[43] For example, Canada's efforts in humanitarian assistance have focused broadly on gender-responsive programming to align with its ultimate objective, which is to save lives and alleviate suffering.

Overall, however, the findings in this report are validated by numerous inter-agency and UN studies which show that "programs focused on women and girls are disproportionately underfunded compared to the overall response and that targeted programs have the lowest levels of coverage."[44] Sectors that address gender-based violence, reproductive health and child protection are funded at 33%, 43% and 50%, respectively, compared with an average funding of 61% for UN appeals overall.[45] This limited funding to gender equality and empowerment of women and girls renders such efforts deprioritized and "disconnected from operations."[46]

There are a variety of different definitions and classifications of gender in aid programs and funding and these terms are often used interchangeably. In this report, CARE is using OECD codes and the same IATI codes on gender to measure the actual funding flows from individual donors and agencies. Different UN agencies and entities use different classifications, as does CARE, but they roughly correlate in the following way:

OECD/IATI gender marker	UN Women/UNFPA	CARE	UN Financial Tracking Service	Summary definition
Principal	Targeted	Transformative Responsive	Targeted	Gender equality is a principal focus of the funding/project
Significant	Tailored	Sensitive	Mainstreamed	The different needs of women, men, girls and boys are assessed and met

Indicator 2: Allocate 15% to targeted gender equality programming in humanitarian settings

Donor	Total humanitarian spend 2018/2019 (USD)	Percentage gender equality programs/projects	Rating
Canada	660,763,000	0.009*	Unsatisfactory
Denmark	359,351,000	2.64	Unsatisfactory
France	108,500,000	1.61	Unsatisfactory
Germany	2,646,290,000	0.4*	Unsatisfactory
Japan	589,325,000	9.23	Approaching
Netherlands	288,936,000	4.43	Unsatisfactory
Norway	513,450,000	5.8*	Unsatisfactory
Sweden	493,808,000	0	Unsatisfactory
United Kingdom	1,738,748,000	0.21	Unsatisfactory
United States	7,087,249,000	0.014	Unsatisfactory
EU Institutions	2,006,697,000	1.78	Unsatisfactory
Agency	**Total humanitarian spend 2019 (USD)**	**Percentage gender equality programs/projects**	**Rating**
UNDP	946,757,747	1.03**	Unsatisfactory
UNFPA	Spending not coded as humanitarian on IATI**	No data	Missing
UNHCR	4,415,286,000	No data	Missing
UNICEF	3,799,708,861	68.15	Satisfactory
WFP	6,642,776,108	No data	Missing

Rating key: Red = Unsatisfactory or Missing: Less than 50% to target/no data; Yellow = Approaching: From 50% to 74% of target; Green = Satisfactory: 75% of target or above.

For this indicator, CARE has analyzed OECD data which is marked as "gender principal" as a proportion of humanitarian expenditure. According to OECD criteria, projects should be marked gender principal where "gender equality is the main objective of the project/program and is fundamental in its design and expected results. The project/program would not have been undertaken without this gender equality objective."[47]

*CARE used 2018 OECD data for donors, except those marked with a single asterisk in the table — Canada, Germany, Norway and Sweden — which are based on updated 2019 OECD data. CARE used IATI 2019 data for UN agencies. IATI and OECD use the same coding and definitions.

**This number illustrates the potential discrepancy between reporting to a public database, such as IATI used in this report and UN reports, as well as variance due to IATI's coding of "humanitarian activity" which in some situations may be more limited in scope and scale compared to broader funding to fragile states. For example, UNDP notes that based on its internal database, its spending on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment programming in fragile states is 9.6% of total program spending in those countries, an increase from 7.7% in 2018. UNFPA stated that 15.1% of their programs in 2019 were gender targeted, and 94.6% either targeted or mainstreamed, although this is not disaggregated by crisis and non-crisis contexts.[48]

COVID-19 pandemic:
Women lead amidst erosion of rights, reduced support

The COVID-19 pandemic is having a profound impact on the livelihoods, mental health and food security of women and girls.[49] An 18-year-old Rohingya refugee from Myanmar told CARE that since the outbreak of the pandemic **"many issues have increased . . . quarrelling between husbands and wives has increased. There are other problems too . . . Our children's education is at risk. Women have lots of problems at home and support for women's protection has decreased."** [50] In Afghanistan, CARE found **"that women are bearing the most significant burden of caring for their families; they have limited freedom of movement; face limited decision-making power at home and in the community; and experience an increased level of gender-based violence. All the secondary impacts of COVID-19 . . . are severely and disproportionately affecting women and girls."**[51]

Despite the even greater challenges women face as primary caretakers and unprotected workers in informal and hard-hit sectors, they continue to rise up, adapt and lead. In West Africa, women in savings groups are organizing to share information, make and sell masks and soap, arrange for handwashing stations in towns and markets and work to keep markets open. In Palestine, CARE found women were more likely to adapt their businesses to COVID-19 realities than men were.[52]

Yet support for this leadership has not been adequate. Overall, less than 2% of tracked humanitarian funding for COVID-19 has reached local and national actors directly, and only a fraction of that reaches women-led organizations.[53]

In Asia, local women-focused organizations received "*zero direct donor contribution . . . through the COVID-19 Global Humanitarian Response Plan*" by mid-July. Furthermore, less than 1% of the total raised for the GHRP had been allocated to national or local NGOs, with likely only a fraction of that going to women's rights or women-led organizations.[54] A 2020 survey of 18 women-led and women's rights organizations in crisis contexts found that little to no new or additional funding for COVID-19 response was provided through the UN system. The groups surveyed highlighted the **"existential threat to their organization's ability to keep functioning beyond monthly salaries for staff, with gender and women's rights funding amongst the first to be cut or reprioritized."**[55]

©Josh Estey/CARE

©Nancy A/CARE

Indicator 3: Ensure all programs in humanitarian settings account equally for the needs of women and girls and men and boys

Donor	Gender-sensitive programs 2018/2019 (principal + significant)	Rating
Canada	96.11*	Satisfactory
Denmark	2.64	Unsatisfactory
France	2.45	Unsatisfactory
Germany	23.44*	Unsatisfactory
Japan	78.23	Satisfactory
Netherlands	76.72	Satisfactory
Norway	53.69*	Approaching
Sweden	89.24*	Satisfactory
United Kingdom	54.19	Approaching
United States	1.05	Unsatisfactory
EU Institutions	32.45**	Unsatisfactory
Agency	Gender total 2019 (principal + significant)	Rating
UNDP	83.8	Satisfactory
UNFPA	No data	Missing
UNHCR	No data	Missing
UNICEF	90.74	Satisfactory
WFP	No data	Missing

Rating key: Red = Unsatisfactory or Missing: Less than 50% to target/no data; Yellow = Approaching: From 50% to 74% of target; Green = Satisfactory: 75% of target or above.

Under OECD coding, such funding includes programs that promote gender equality as their core objective "gender principal" (see above) and those that consider "gender equality is an important and deliberate objective, but not the principal reason for undertaking the project/program" ("gender significant").[56] IATI and OECD use the same coding and definitions.

*CARE used 2018 OECD data for donors, except those marked with a single asterisk (*) in the table — Canada, Germany, Norway, Sweden — which are based on updated 2019 OECD data. CARE used IATI 2019 data for UN agencies. Note that IATI data is updated on an ongoing basis.

**Note that the Directorate General of European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO), the principal European institution for EU humanitarian relief, has a different gender analysis of its funding. A report published this year on the implementation of its Gender Marker found that in "2016 and 2017, 89% of all DG ECHO-funded actions integrated gender and age considerations either 'strongly' (mark '2') or 'to a certain extent' (mark '1')."[57]

Nothing about us, without us

Local women-led and women's rights organizations are best placed to know who in communities is not receiving enough support, including what barriers women and girls and other vulnerable groups face in a given humanitarian context. They understand what survivors of GBV need to access support and how women and girls struggle to find food, water and firewood for cooking; manage their periods; access sexual and reproductive health services; and so forth. By having more women in humanitarian organizations across the board, in particular those from crisis-affected communities, women's and girls' specific needs are a lot more likely to be addressed in the response. Their capacities, capital and potential to respond can be tapped into and supported as the architects of their own relief and recovery, rather than as passive recipients.

One example of this is Voices and Partnerships against Violence, a three-year GBV project funded by the U.S. State Department's Bureau of Population Refugees and Migration (BPRM) and implemented by CARE and local women-led organizations in four countries: Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Jordan and South Sudan.

The women-led CSO partners involved in the project have strengthened capacity to undertake and participate in GBV assessments, to conduct gender analysis and humanitarian needs assessments. They also now have increased their participation and influence in key humanitarian forums and platforms at local, national and global levels. For example, women CSO partners in DRC have stepped into leadership roles in GBV sub-clusters at sub-national level. The project has enabled women CSOs to mobilize and advocate toward humanitarian actors, donors and government on key GBV priorities, including increased funding and support for women's groups.

©Nancy Farese/CARE

C. Leadership and Equal Participation

The leadership and full, equal and meaningful participation of women, women-led groups and women's rights organizations are critical to successful crisis response. Their absence renders aid interventions less effective overall, non-responsive and potentially harmful to women's and girls' priorities. A UN Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) review found that when local women's groups were consulted, specific provisions for GBV mitigation and response, women's livelihoods and sexual and reproductive health were more likely to be included in final strategic response plan. While on average 55% of humanitarian response plans included these provisions, that number rose to 70% when local women's groups meaningfully participated in their design.[58]

This section of the report looks at four indicators to measure the leadership and equal participation of women and women's organizations in conflict and humanitarian contexts, namely:

- the engagement of women's rights and women-led organizations as UN implementing partners;
- their involvement in clusters, key humanitarian decision-making forums;
- the percentage of senior UN humanitarian staff in humanitarian contexts who are women;
- the percentage of all UN staff who are women.

Indicator 4: Ensure 25% of implementing partners are women's organizations by 2020

Implementing partners — organizations which deliver assistance or services with or on behalf of the UN or international NGOs — make up a significant part of overall aid efforts in crisis contexts. While recent efforts to reimagine such relationships are underway, women's rights and women-led organizations often face particular challenges as implementing partners, because they are "treated as the delivery arm of larger NGOs" and "their expertise and knowledge . . . is not actively engaged in program design, implementation and accountability mechanisms."[59] Yet, it is primarily women-led and women's rights organizations who can often reach the most marginalized populations and authentically and powerfully represent women's voices in crisis and aid response.

None of the UN agencies contacted in advance of this report were able to report how many of their implementing partners were women's rights organizations or women-led organizations, as they do not currently systematically track this data.

Agency	Total number of implementing partners	Implementing partners that are national organizations	Implementing partners that are women's organizations in 2020	Rating
UNDP	No data	No data	Unknown	Missing
UNFPA	1,462	1,222	Unknown	Missing
UNHCR	No data	No data	Unknown	Missing
UNICEF	1,368	876	Unknown	Missing
WFP	800	453	Unknown	Missing

Rating key: Red = Unsatisfactory or Missing: Less than 50% to target/no data; Yellow = Approaching: From 50% to 74% of target; Green = Satisfactory: 75% of target or above

Pooled funds: an opportunity to build on best practice

Pooled funds offer one opportunity for donors to quickly scale up support to local and national women-led and women's rights organizations. The Women's Peace and Humanitarian Fund (WPHF) was specifically set up to support grassroots civil society organizations, so far funding over 200 organizations.[60] A promising vehicle, the Fund still has a relatively small budget and is reportedly significantly oversubscribed. In Asia, the WPHF received 512 proposals from women's organizations, but could fund only three of them.[61]

In recent years, UN OCHA has included women's rights organizations on the advisory boards to some UN Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs).[62] Given the CBPFs channel significantly more humanitarian funding than the WPHF, and typically are more accessible to local and national organizations than direct funding from donors, initiatives such as this could make a significant difference.

Inclusion of more representatives from women-led and women's rights organizations in CBPF advisory boards may also help address challenges that local and national women's organizations face, which often include being sidelined in male-dominated processes, while ensuring networks of women's organizations have access to relevant funding information.[63]

Indicator 5: Ensure women's groups make up half of national humanitarian response cluster members by 2020

Given the multitude of national authorities, international agencies and local civil society actors engaged in crisis response, coordination is key to ensuring that people in need get timely aid and duplication is avoided. Humanitarian clusters, normally led by a UN agency and co-led by an international NGO, play a critical coordination, leadership and accountability role and work "to strengthen system-wide preparedness and technical capacity to respond to humanitarian emergencies."[64]

Clusters also inform the decision-making of key UN leaders and bodies (i.e., Humanitarian Coordinators and Humanitarian Country Teams), coordinate needs assessments, develop sectoral response plans and advocate with national authorities, donors and other key stakeholders on issues identified by their members.[65]

In recent years, clusters have led in integrating gender equality into humanitarian responses.[66] National and global cluster members often take the initiative to consult with and meaningfully engage women's organizations, and all work with numerous local and national partners.[67] Some national-level clusters are inclusive of local and national women-led and women's rights organizations. The Global Education Cluster, for example, provided CARE with information which showed that the Education Cluster was co-led by a national women-led organization in Jordan, that 50% of national level partners in Palestine are women-led or women-focused organizations, and that such groups have registered an impressively high level of participation in Ukraine and Afghanistan.

Overall, however, there seems to be insufficient prioritization of partnerships (or at the very least of tracking of such partnerships) with women's rights and women-led organizations at field cluster level. None of these clusters track and report on which of those partners are women's rights organizations.

Cluster	Total partners	National NGOs	Number of women's rights organizations/ women-led organizations in 2020
CCCM[68]	157	82	Missing
Education	678	457	Missing
Food Security	Incomplete/no data	Incomplete/no data	Missing
Health[69]	1,430	506	Missing
Nutrition	819	310	Missing
Protection	Incomplete/no data	Incomplete/no data	Missing
Shelter	Incomplete/no data	Incomplete/no data	Missing
WASH	1,734	594	Missing

Rating key: Red = Unsatisfactory or Missing: Less than 50% to target/no data; Yellow = Approaching: From 50% to 74% of target; Green = Satisfactory: 75% of target or above.

Indicator 6: At least 40% of leadership positions in humanitarian contexts are held by women

Following initiatives such as the UN System Wide Action Plans on Gender Equality, there has been an increased number of women in leadership positions in humanitarian contexts. Thirty-seven percent of UN Humanitarian Coordinators — the key UN decision-makers at country level in humanitarian responses — are women.[70] In contrast, in 2010, only 20% of Humanitarian Coordinators were women.[71] Individual UN agencies have also taken action to ensure gender parity at senior executive level.[72]

Based on data published in 2019 in an authoritative biannual UN report, senior women staff constituted more than 40% in only two of the UN agencies analyzed for this report. However, UNDP, UNHCR and WFP come very close to reaching that target.[73] Given progress toward achieving gender parity in UN agencies, CARE anticipates that when updated data is published this year, more if not all of these agencies will have achieved the 40% goal.

	Senior Non-HQ staff			
	Men	Women	Percentage women	Rating
UNDP	128	77	37.6	Unsatisfactory
UNFPA	28	29	50.9	Satisfactory
UNHCR	68	43	38.7	Unsatisfactory
UNICEF	39	31	44.3	Satisfactory
WFP	57	32	36	Unsatisfactory

Rating key: Red = Unsatisfactory: Less than 40% women in leadership positions; Green = Satisfactory: 40% or more

Investing in women multiplies impact

CARE's Gender Equality and Women and Girls' Empowerment Programme II, 2016-2020, worked with and for poor women and girls in some of the world's most fragile states: Burundi, DRC, Mali, Myanmar, Niger and Rwanda. It has reached more than 1,161,800 women and girls (mainly through Village Savings and Loan Associations, or VSLAs), extended leadership training to 66,500 and funneled 53% of all funds to partners.[74]

One woman in Siribala commune, Ségou region, Mali told CARE that **"before the arrival of the project, I was only a housewife with no importance in the eyes of the community. Really! . . . [Now] I participate in the family expenses with my husband, he respects me more because I contribute a lot, I carry out my income-generating activities and I have profits and I also save."**

Supporting women's meaningful participation in decision-making processes is a fundamental aspect of the program. In Mali for example, this has resulted in 66 women members of a CARE-supported network being part of and actively contributing to the work of the 26 local Peace & Reconciliation Committees. Alongside men and local leaders, they have prevented and managed local tensions within and between communities. Women are also supported to present themselves as candidates for local elections, and 475 VSLA women were successful. In Niger, one woman out of every two elected to a local council in the program's intervention area during the 2011 election reported they were a member of a VSLA group or network.

Importantly, governments in the program countries have in the current period increasingly recognized the VSLA method as an efficient approach for women's economic empowerment and women's empowerment more generally.

Indicator 7: Guarantee at least 30% of UN staff at all levels are women by 2020

All of the UN agencies with published information on staffing have well over 30% women employees.[75] These staffing levels include headquarters and non-headquarters staff and are not broken down by crisis- and non-crisis-affected countries, which may skew the results in favor of agencies with presence in more countries where they only implement development programs. Nonetheless, such gender parity reflects robust progress and impressive political will.

Agency	Percentage of all staff who are women	Rating
UNDP	50	Satisfactory
UNFPA	50.3	Satisfactory
UNHCR	44	Satisfactory
UNICEF	48	Satisfactory
WFP	44	Satisfactory

Rating key: Red = Unsatisfactory: Less than 30% of all staff are women; Green = Satisfactory: 30% or more of all staff are women.

CARE: Self-assessment yields mixed results

Six of the seven indicators in this report are relevant to CARE as well as donors and UN agencies. CARE funds women's rights and women-led organizations, has implementing partners, aspires to gender-transformative programming and has thousands of staff working in crisis-affected countries around the world. In its recently adopted 2030 Vision, CARE commits to accountability mechanisms to better track and report on progress toward providing quality, gender-focused and localized humanitarian assistance to 10% of those affected in major crises, reaching at least 50 million people by 2030. CARE self-assessed based on year 2020 data.

Indicator 1: Missing

CARE is currently working on updating its monitoring systems to determine the overall funding percentage allocated to women's rights or women-led organizations, but is currently unable to provide such detailed data. While CARE USA set aside 24% of its humanitarian assistance budget directly to local implementing partners, it lacks the disaggregation capacity to determine what portion of that went to women's groups. An analysis of a subset of CARE's COVID-19 funding in 2020 revealed that only 1% went directly to women's rights or women-led organizations in conflict and humanitarian settings.

Indicator 2: Satisfactory

Using CARE's Gender Marker, the proportion of CARE's humanitarian programs which are gender responsive or transformative was 19%.

Indicator 3: Satisfactory

83% of CARE humanitarian programs were gender sensitive.

Indicator 4: Satisfactory

66% of CARE's 766 humanitarian partners were women's rights organizations or women-led organizations.

Indicator 6: Unsatisfactory

Only 34% of CARE's senior staff in humanitarian settings were women. However, 44% of CARE's overall senior staff in all settings (humanitarian and development) were women.

Indicator 7: Satisfactory

34% of CARE's total staff in humanitarian settings were women.[76]

Recommendations

Despite progress in terms of policy frameworks and commitments at the international level, international donors and UN agencies have not sufficiently prioritized resourcing and elevating gender equality and the leadership of women and women's organizations in crisis-affected countries. The analysis speaks to a wider need to "democratize" and reform the wider sector, including in ways that support localization more broadly and specifically in terms of investing in women-led organizations. This reform will also require substantial changes within INGOs funding and partnership modalities, and CARE is no exception. Progress has been incremental and partial, and the substantial impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic pose a real risk that any gains will be reversed.

With COVID-19 pushing record numbers of people toward humanitarian assistance, **aid to crisis response is more critical than ever**. Because women and girls are typically most affected by crises, they must lead efforts to prevent and respond to them. When women and girls lead, entire communities benefit and more effective and sustainable solutions prevail. **Now more than ever, funding and influence must flow into women- and girls-led crisis response, for effective, long-lasting, intergenerational impact.**

Donors should:

- Explicitly commit to the resourcing and leadership targets from the World Humanitarian Summit High-Level Roundtable on Women and Girls, or comparable gender-specific, time-bound benchmarks.

- Develop a time-bound plan to meet the targets, with annual public reporting on progress.

- Substantially increase contributions to the Women's Peace and Humanitarian Fund and other pooled funds, such as country-based pooled funds, and include targets for funding for women-led and women's rights organizations.

- Hold INGOs and UN agencies accountable for the quality and inclusivity of diverse partnerships and collaboration with women-led and women's rights organizations.

Donors, UN agencies and INGOs should:

- Incorporate the seven gender-specific commitments in this report, or comparable gender-specific benchmarks into the next iteration of the Grand Bargain, at a minimum.

- Systematically track and report funding to and partnerships with women-led and women's rights organizations, including through reporting to IATI and the OCHA Financial Tracking Service (FTS), and publish overall funding figures in annual reports. This should be based on commonly agreed definitions for women-led and women's rights organizations.

- Increase the amount and quality of humanitarian funding that goes to women's and girls' organizations, ensuring that this includes flexible, multi-year funding for core operational and management costs, creative direct funding avenues, reduced bureaucratic hurdles and unduly burdensome application and reporting requirements, and technical support.

- Harmonize gender and age markers to establish a common framework for assessment and better tracking of funding and projects.

- Ensure that women's organizations are equitably represented and have an equal voice in the management and advisory committees of donor, UN and NGO managed pooled funds.

- Recognize that girls have their own specific rights and needs in humanitarian settings and require age-appropriate policy responses.

- Include budget lines in project and response funding that mandate adolescent girls' direct involvement in humanitarian responses. Tailored approaches should include youth organizing in communities and displacement settings, as well as girls' meaningful participation in humanitarian planning, implementation, evaluation and decision-making.

UN agencies and INGOs should:

- Establish multi-year action plans and annual reporting to transform the organizational culture of humanitarian agencies on gender equality and women's meaningful participation and accountability to women in crisis-affected communities. This may take the form of conducting organizational gender and diversity audits, from which plans can be developed.

The UN Inter-Agency Standing Committee[77] should:

- Require the inclusion and meaningful participation of local and national women's groups in humanitarian coordination, decision-making and accountability processes. Specifically, that:

  o Humanitarian Country Teams include at least one local or national women-led or women's rights organization;

  o Global and national level clusters prioritize increasing partnership with and membership of women-led and women's rights organizations, and that 50% of national partners are women's organizations; and

  o Humanitarian Country Teams and clusters ensure active participation of women's organizations in the development and validation of Humanitarian Needs Overviews and Humanitarian Response Plans.

- Monitor and report on these measures and include these indicators in the IASC Gender Accountability Framework.

©Laura Noel/CARE

©Laura Noel/CARE

Endnotes

[1] United Nations Office of the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Global Humanitarian Overview 2021, https://gho.unocha.org/.

[2] See e.g., IDMC, *Hidden in Plain Sight: Women and Girls in Internal Displacement*, March 2020, p.12, https://reliefweb.int/report/world/hidden-plain-sight-women-and-girls-internal-displacement ; See also WOMEN_AND_GIRLS-CATALYSING_ACTION_TO_ACHIEVE_GENDER_EQUALITY_0.pdf (agendaforhumanity.org) (Disasters kill more women than men, and hit women's livelihoods hardest).

[3] UN Secretary General Report, Women, Peace and Security (2020) https://undocs.org/en/S/2020/946; CARE, Women's Equal Voice and Leadership Position Paper (2020), https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/media/k2/attachments/CARE_Womens-equal-voice-and-leadership-position-paper_2020.pdf]

[4] Aid in fragile and conflict-affected countries continued to increase, with $20.5 billion per year between 2017 and 2018, compared with $18 billion per year between 2015 and 2016… between 2010 and 2018, bilateral aid targeting gender equality and empowerment of women in fragile and conflict-affected situations stagnated at 0.2% of total bilateral aid". Report of the United Nations Secretary-General, *Women and peace and security,*
25 Sept. 2020, p. 31, https://undocs.org/en/S/2020/946.

[5] CARE International, *Women Responders: Placing Local Action at the Centre of Humanitarian Protection Programming*, 2018 https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/media/k2/attachments/CARE_Women-responders-report_2018.pdf.

[6] The roundtable gathered key international actors and governments seeking to define strategic initiatives to achieve gender equality and women's empowerment in humanitarian crises, resulting in part, in a series of indicators aligned to the UN Agenda 2030 Sustainable Development Goal 5 on gender equality and the Women, Peace and Security Agenda of the UN Security Council *High-Level Leaders Roundtable: Women and Girls: Catalysing Action to Achieve Gender Equality,* World Humanitarian Summit, May 2016, https://agendaforhumanity.org/sites/default/files/resources/2017/Jul/WOMEN_AND%20GIRLS-CATALYSING_ACTION_TO_ACHIEVE_GENDER_EQUALITY_0.pdf. The UN Deputy Secretary General, in opening the roundtable, stated that "these goals are critical to meeting this Summit's objectives". *Deputy Secretary-General's opening remarks to the High-Level Leaders' Roundtable on "Women and Girls; Catalyzing Action to Achieve Gender Equality",* United Nations, 24 May 2016, https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/dsg/statement/2016-05-24/deputy-secretary-generals-opening-remarks-high-level-leaders-0.

[7] The donors are of the eleven OECD Development Assistance Committee members who contribute the most toward humanitarian assistance.

[8] UN Women describes the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit as part of global norms and standards on gender and humanitarian action. UN Women, *Global Norms and Standards: Humanitarian action*, https://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/humanitarian-action/global-norms-and-standards. See also, UN Women & UNFPA, Final Report Funding for Gender Equality and The Empowerment of Women And Girls In Humanitarian Programming, June 2020, p. 17, funding-for-geewg-in-humanitarian-programming-en.pdf (unfpa.org) cites these indicators as international commitments to gender equality and empowerment of women and girls, stating that: "At the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul in 2016, signatories pledged increased support for local women's groups (raising levels of funding to women's groups from 1% to 4% by 2020); universal access to sexual and reproductive health (SRH); GBV prevention; gender responsive humanitarian programming; and full compliance with humanitarian policies, frameworks and legally binding documents. They set a target of 15% for gender equality and women and girls' empowerment programming in humanitarian settings. They committed to apply the IASC, ECHO and other gender and age markers to 100% of humanitarian funding allocations by 2018, and that funding would be allocated only to actions that explicitly included a gender analysis with Sex and Age Disaggregated Data (SADD) by 2018."

[9] The phrases "women's groups" or "women's organizations" are used in this report to include women-led and women's rights organizations, as well, where appropriate, girls-led organizations.

[10] CARE International, *Women Responders: Placing Local Action at the Centre of Humanitarian Protection Programming*, 2018, https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/media/k2/attachments/CARE_Women-responders-report_2018.pdf.

[11] Attendees made around 446 commitments at this roundtable. The summary outcome reports noted gender was an "overarching theme" of the World Humanitarian Summit and that they hoped it would be a "watershed moment", but they did not specify which actors committed to which indicators. *Commitment to Action*: World Humanitarian Summit, pp.5-6, https://agendaforhumanity.org/sites/default/files/resources/2017/Jul/WHS_commitment_to_Action_8September2016.pdf. The UN Secretary General's report on the outcomes of the conference called on all stakeholders to "develop and make publicly available specific plans and concrete and time-bound targets to implement them," *Report of the United Nations Secretary-General, Outcome of the World Humanitarian Summit,* August 2016,
paras 29-30, https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/sg_report_on_the_outcome_of_the_whs.pdf. Subsequent initiatives, such as the *Grand Bargain*, failed to include most of these gender specific indicators.

[12] UN Women describes the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit as part of global norms and standards on gender and humanitarian action. UN Women, *Global norms and standards: Humanitarian action*, https://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/humanitarian-action/global-norms-and-standards. See also, UNFPA & UN Women & UNFPA, Final Report Funding for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls in Humanitarian Programming, June 2020, p. 17 cites these very indicators as international commitments to gender equality and empowerment of women and girls, stating that: "At the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul in 2016, signatories pledged increased support for local women's groups (raising levels of funding to women's groups from 1% to 4% by 2020);…They set a target of 15% for gender equality and women and girls' empowerment programming in humanitarian settings. They committed to apply …gender and age markers to 100% of humanitarian funding allocations… and that funding would be allocated only to actions that explicitly included a gender analysis with Sex and Age Disaggregated Data."

[13] Note for example that the UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM-WIDE REPORTING RESULTS UN-SWAP 2.0 SUMMARY, ANALYSIS AND KEY INSIGHTS FROM 2019, likewise marks "missing data" as red, the worst performing on the color scale (red=missing, yellow=approaching, green=meets; blue=exceeds expectations).

[14] Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD.stat available at https://stats.oecd.org/ All data accessed in October 2020 and rechecked February 2021.

[15] A UN Women desk review found six mechanisms for tracking Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women and Girls in humanitarian funding. OECD's international development database was spotlighted for its ability to track gender-equality coded funding across a broad range of funding sources, housing the most complete and reliable data of the reviewed databases. UNFPA & UN Women, *Funding for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Woman and Girls in Humanitarian Programming,* June 2020, p. 21, https://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2020/funding-for-geewg-in-humanitarian-programming-en.pdf?la=en&vs=4409; Similarly, Development Initiatives' highly-respected, annual Global Humanitarian Assistance Report largely relies on OECD data to analyse humanitarian trends (i.e., the OECD database is deemed a credible source for development and humanitarian aid. See reports at https://www.devinit.org/resources/global-humanitarian-assistance-report-2020/#downloads.

[16] For this reports CARE analyzed overall ODA to fragile states and calculated a percentage by applying the code *"15170: Women's rights organisations and movements, and government institutions".* UN Women notes that the code "can allow for tracking of funding to women's organizations, but it does not seem to be used when tracking humanitarian aid flows". UNFPA & UN Women, *Funding for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Woman and Girls in Humanitarian Programming,* June 2020, https://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2020/funding-for-geewg-in-humanitarian-programming-en.pdf?la=en&vs=4409.

[17] The OECD defines fragile state as "those failing to provide basic services to poor people because they are unwilling or unable to do so". *OECD Glossary,* https://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=7235. Its database categorizes the following states as fragile: Libya, Burundi, Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Angola, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Lesotho, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Togo, Haiti, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Venezuela, Cambodia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Myanmar, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Iran, Iraq, Syrian Arab Republic, West Bank and Gaza Strip, Yemen, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands.

[18] International Aid Tracking Initiative (IATI) d-portal, available at https://d-portal.org/ctrack.html#view=main. All data accessed in October 2020 and rechecked February 2021.

[19] Grand Bargain signatories as of Sept. 23, 2020, published March 4, 2020, Grand Bargain Signatories | IASC (interagencystandingcommittee.org).

[20] IATI data was accessed October 2020 and rechecked February 2021. IATI data is updated on an ongoing basis.

[21] "Financing was one of the primary obstacles brought up by civil society activists to the work they do, regardless of where that work takes place. In a similar manner, the 2015 Global Study on WPS indicates that "despite the wealth of evidence highlighting the benefits that investing in women can bring in terms of conflict prevention, crisis response and peace, the failure to allocate sufficient resources and funds has been perhaps the most serious and persistent obstacle to the implementation of the women, peace and security agenda over the past 15 years." Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, UNSCR 1325 at 20 Years: Perspectives from Feminist Peace Activists and Civil Society (Oct. 2020), https://www.wilpf.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/WILPF_UNSCR-1325-at-20-Years_Web.pdf.

22 A recent study notes that "data on the amount of funding required, requested and received for programming for women and girls is significantly lacking. UN Women & UNFPA, *Funding for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Woman and Girls in Humanitarian Programming,* June 2020, https://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2020/funding-for-geewg-in-humanitarian-programming-en.pdf?la=en&vs=4409.

23 The 2020 Inter Agency humanitarian evaluation on gender equality and empowerment of women and girls found that the lack of data makes it "difficult to hold humanitarian actors accountable." *Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls*, October 2020, https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/admin-resource/1._IAHE_GEEWG-final_report-2021.pdf.

24 See for example, UNSC Resolution 1889, paras. 6, 9 and 19, http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/1889; UNSC Resolution 2122, para. 7, http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/2122; UNSC Resolution 2242, paras. 3 and 16, http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/2242.

25 Inter-Agency Standing Committee, *Transparency*, at https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/greater-transparency.

26 UN Women, Guidance Note, *How to promote gender-responsive localization in humanitarian action* (2020), p. 37. http://media.ifrc.org/grand_bargain_localisation/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2020/12/Guidance-note-how-to-promote-gender-responsive-localization-in-humanitarian-action.pdf *citing* WS2 Localisation (2019). Core commitment indicators and target-results (CCTRI) at http://media.ifrc.org/grand_bargain_localisation/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2019/03/CCTRI-Localisation-Workstream.pdf.

27 For example, the Grand Bargain Workstream 2 on localisation proposed "working definitions" for both women-led and women's rights organizations. *See*, *Core Commitment Indicators and Target-Results* http://media.ifrc.org/grand_bargain_localisation/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2019/03/CCTRI-Localization-Workstream.pdf.

28 A more recent definition promoted by UNFPA to be included as part of the UN Partner Portal to enable cross-agency tracking, added the phrase "at both board and staff level" to nuance the level of senior leadership required for the designation of women-led organizations, to read: *A women-led organization is one whose leadership is principally made up of women, demonstrated by 50% or more occupying senior leadership positions* **at both board and staff level.** (Based on the Grand Bargain definition and UN Women definition).

29 See e.g., CARE, *Where are the women? The conspicuous absence of women in COVID-19 response teams and plans, and why we need them,* June 2020 https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/publications/why-we-need-women-in-covid-19-response-teams-and-plans.

30 The UN has required all its programs and funds to "incorporate gender perspectives into humanitarian, crisis response and recovery plans as one of its key responsibilities" and has launched "System Wide Action Plans" on gender equality and empowerment of women and girls. *Mainstreaming a gender perspective into all policies and programmes in the United Nations system* (2019), para 74, https://undocs.org/en/E/2019/54. The Inter Agency Standing Committee (IASC), the highest level humanitarian coordination and policy forum in the UN system, updated its gender policy and for the first time developed an accountability framework to ensure its implementation.

31 Sweden issued a SEK 1 billion strategy on gender equality between 2018-2022, *see at* https://www.government.se/49e41f/globalassets/government/dokument/utrikesdepartementet/summary---new-strategy-for-global-gender-equality-and-womens-and-girls-rights-20182022.pdf; Canada "recognizes that supporting gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls is the best way to build a more peaceful, more inclusive and more prosperous world", *Canada's Feminist International Assistance* Policy, p.8, https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/assets/pdfs/iap2-eng.pdf.

32 Full list of partners to the Call to Action on Protection from Gender-Based Violence and other information is available at https://www.calltoactiongbv.com/partners.

33 Although there is no standard definition of localization, signatories to the Grand Bargain agreed to make "principled humanitarian action as local as possible and as international as necessary". In practice this means providing greater support to, and recognizing the role played by, "National and local responders comprising governments, communities, Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies and local civil society." See the Grand Bargain Localisation Workstream website for more details at https://media.ifrc.org/grand_bargain_localisation/.

34 For example, in its 2019 annual report, UNHCR stated that it had achieved its Grand Bargain goals as "$752.6 million was provided to 915 local and national responders, including $575 million to 709 NGO partners." *UNHCR 2019 annual report,* p. 13, https://reporting.unhcr.org/sites/default/files/gr2019/pdf/GR2019_English_Full_lowres.pdf.

35 Overseas Development Institute, *Grand Bargain annual independent report 2020*, June 2020, p.13, https://www.odi.org/publications/17044-grand-bargain-annual-independent-report-2020.

36 Report of the United Nations Secretary-General, *Women, Peace and Security,* Sept. 2020, p. 31, https://undocs.org/en/S/2020/946.

37 The OECD database categorizes the following states as fragile. Libya, Burundi, Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Angola, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Lesotho, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Togo, Haiti, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Venezuela, Cambodia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Myanmar, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Iran, Iraq, Syrian Arab Republic, West Bank and Gaza Strip, Yemen, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands.

38 Note that some UN agencies, such as UNDP report only one sector as primary on the IATI portal, while women's groups can be funded under other primary sectors, such as agricultural development or democratic participation, which may not be fully reflected in the IATI data as currently tracked. However, as this report shows under Indicator 4, the UN agencies reviewed do not currently track how many of their implementing partners are women's rights organizations and as such will likely be unable to track funding to such groups.

39 Report of the Secretary-General, Outcome of the World Humanitarian Summit, Aug. 23, 2016, https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/sg_report_on_the_outcome_of_the_whs.pdf.

40 *Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls,* July 2020, p. 39, https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/admin-resource/1._IAHE_GEEWG-final_report-2021.pdf. The UNW & UNFPA study on Gender in Humanitarian Aid, noted serious discrepancies between GAM coding allocations and what is recorded in the OCHA FTS, deemed the most comprehensive resource for tracking humanitarian funding, but not actual funding flows. UN Women & UNFPA, *Final Report Funding for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls in Humanitarian Programming* (2020), section 4.3, p. 47+.

41 *See e.g.,* European Commission, *Gender: Different Needs, Adapted Assistance*, July 2013, https://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/gender_thematic_policy_document_en.pdf; European Commission, *Gender-Age Marker: Toolkit,* https://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/gender_age_marker_toolkit.pdf. The new EU Gender Action Plan for External Action 2021-2024 released on 25 November 2020 aims for EU external action to be at least gender-responsive and where possible gender-transformative. However, for humanitarian aid it maintains the 2013 policy objectives to promote a gender-sensitive approach, and where possible, aim for gender-responsive.

42 CARE, *Making Gender Central to EU Humanitarian Action: CARE reflections and recommendations on ECHO gender policy and programming,* August 2020, p.8 https://www.careinternational.org/files/files/202009%20CARE%20Reflections%20and%20Recommendations%20on%20ECHO%20gender%20policy%20and%20programming.pdf

43 For example, **Norway** highlighted that they count their significant contributions to UNFPA as gender focused, given the mandate of this UN agency, which may account for why Norway's own calculations differ from those reported to OECD. See *Implementing Norway's National Action Plan 2019-2022: Women, Peace and Security, Annual Report 2019*, p. 20, https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/1e3345054cdd4fa1ad7c915dd0ef673d/norway-annual-report-wps-2019-2022-final.pdf. In preparing this report, UN agencies also pointed out further efforts they had made on gender responsive programming and how their own data was not reflected on IATI. **UNFPA** stated that 15.1% of their programs in 2019 were gender targeted, and 94.6% either targeted or mainstreamed, although this is not disaggregated by crisis and non-crisis contexts, see https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/board-documents/ANNEXES_-_SFR_2019_FB_1-17.pdf. **UNDP** stated that its gender equality programming was more significant than that highlighted in this report card, and **UNHCR** highlighted its gender policy with minimum requirements for programme cycles available, and the efforts undertaken by the agency to implement this policy. See, *UNHCR Age, Gender and Diversity Accountability Report 2018-2019,* https://www.unhcr.org/publications/brochures/5f04946d4/unhcr-age-gender-diversity-accountability-report-2018-2019.html?query=agd%20accountability%20report.

44 UNFPA & UN Women, *Funding for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Woman and Girls in Humanitarian Programming,* June 2020, p. 9, https://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2020/funding-for-geewg-in-humanitarian-programming-en.pdf?la=en&vs=4409.

45 UNFPA & UN Women, *Funding for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Woman and Girls in Humanitarian Programming,* June 2020, p. 55, https://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2020/funding-for-geewg-in-humanitarian-programming-en.pdf?la=en&vs=4409.

46 *Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls, p. 29,* https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/2768%20UNOCHA%20Report%20121120.pdf.

47 OECD, *Handbook on the OECD-DAC Gender Equality Policy Marker,* p.6. https://www.oecd.org/dac/gender-development/Handbook-OECD-DAC-Gender-Equality-Policy-Marker.pdf. Reporting to the OECD using this marker is mandatory.

[48] Report of the Executive Director, United Nations Population Fund Statistical and financial review, 2019 ANNEXES, https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/board-documents/ANNEXES_-_SFR_2019_FB_1-17.pdf.

[49] CARE International, *She Told Us So: Rapid Gender Analyses: Filling the Data Gap to Build Back Equal,* September 2020, https://care.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/RGA_SheToldUsSo_9.18.20.pdf.

[50] CARE et al, *In the Shadows of the Pandemic: the gendered impact of COVID-19 on Rohingya and Host Communities*, October 2020, p. 16, http://www.careevaluations.org/wp-content/uploads/In-the-Shadows-of-the-Pandemic_Gendered-Impact-of-COVID19-on-Rohingya-and-Host-Communities_October2020.pdf.

[51] CARE, *Rapid Gender Analysis, COVID-19, Afghanistan,* July 2020, p.2, https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/images/in-practice/RGA-and-measurement/GiE_Learning_RGA_Afghanistan_COVID-19_July2020.pdf.

[52] CARE, *Evolving Trends: Women in COVID-19*, http://www.careevaluations.org/wp-content/uploads/RGA-Trend-Update-July-1.pdf.

[53] Based on data extracted from OCHA Financial Tracking Service (FTS) on Nov. 23, 2020. Total funding for the Global Humanitarian Response Plan for Covid-19 amounted to $3,706,192, 883. Funding for local and national organizations and local/national private organizations amounted to $65,296,756 or 1.76% of overall funding.

[54] Gender in Humanitarian Action, *Closing the Funding Gap for Women-Focused Organizations Responding to COVID-19 in Asia and the Pacific,* https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/GiHA%20Gender%20and%20Funding%20in%20COVID-19.pdf.

[55] Action Aid et al., *Humanitarian Funding, Partnerships and Coordination in the COVID-19 crisis: Perspectives from local women-led organizations and women's rights organizations*, https://charter4change.files.wordpress.com/2020/07/wlo-covid19-joint-policy-brief.pdf.

[56] Ibid.

[57] European Commission, *Gender-Age Marker Assessment Report 2016 and 2017*, June 2020, p.7, https://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/gender-age-marker-report-online.pdf.

[58] Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), *Gender Accountability Framework Report*, 2019, pp.8 and 22, https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/2020-02/IASC%20AF%20Gender%20Report%202018%20with%20Recommendations%20Table.pdf.

[59] *UNFPA & UN Women, Funding for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Woman and Girls in Humanitarian Programming,* June 2020 https://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2020/funding-for-geewg-in-humanitarian-programming-en.pdf?la=en&vs=4409.

[60] Report of the United Nations Secretary-General*, Women, Peace and Security,* September 2020, p. 33, https://undocs.org/en/S/2020/946.

[61] Gender in Humanitarian Action, *Closing the Funding Gap for Women-Focused Organizations Responding to COVID-19 in Asia and the Pacific*, August 2020, p.4 https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/GiHA%20Gender%20and%20Funding%20in%20COVID-19.pdf.

[62] Action Aid et al, *Humanitarian Funding, Partnerships and Coordination in the COVID-19 crisis: Perspectives from local women-led organisations and women's rights organisations*, July 2020, p.5, https://charter4change.files.wordpress.com/2020/07/wlo-covid19-joint-policy-brief.pdf.

[63] Grand Bargain Localisation Workstream, *Desk review on enhancing the potential of pooled funds for localization*, September 2020, p.14, https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/18276/pdf/final_gbw2_pooled_funding_for_localisation.pdf.

[64] United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, *Humanitarian Coordination Leadership,* https://www.unocha.org/our-work/coordination/humanitarian-coordination-leadership.

[65] OCHA, *What is the Cluster Approach?* https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/coordination/clusters/what-cluster-approach.

[66] The Inter Agency evaluation on gender found that leadership at global levels by clusters "are creating dividends at the country level and have thus far provided the "backbone" for gender to be reflected in cluster- and agency-specific actions.*" Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls,* October 2020, p. 38, https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/admin-resource/1._IAHE_GEEWG-final_report-2021.pdf.

[67] The Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls called for on the IASC to "ensure ongoing support to HCs [humanitarian coordinators] and HCTs [humanitarian country teams] to strengthen meaningful participation of women in humanitarian decision making" including the "inclusion of at least one women-led national NGO/group on HCTs in a long-term strategic role. If this is problematic, it should establish a robust consultation mechanism with women's organizations in the country to inform strategic decision making." *Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls*, October 2020, https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/admin-resource/1._IAHE_GEEWG-final_report-2021.pdf.

[68] CCCM stands for Camp Coordination and Camp Management, see https://emergency.unhcr.org/entry/47946/camp-coordination-and-camp-management-cccm-cluster-iasc.

[69] These numbers do not include partners of the Syrian Arab Republic health cluster as these are not included in the Global Health Cluster website.

[70] *Interagency Standing Committee, List of Humanitarian Coordinators*, October 2020, https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/documents/files/information_products_-_october_2020_-_list_of_hcs.pdf

[71] *Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls*, October 2020, p. 22.

[72] UNHCR senior executives and director level positions are now gender balanced, for example. See *UNHCR Age, Gender and Diversity Accountability Report 2018-2019*, p.46, https://www.unhcr.org/publications/brochures/5f04946d4/unhcr-age-gender-diversity-accountability-report-2018-2019.html?query=agd%20accountability%20report.

[73] Data drawn from *Improvement in the status of women in the United Nations system: Report of the Secretary-General* Appendixes 1 and 4, July 2019e https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2019/07/improvement-in-the-status-of-women-in-the-united-nations-system-2019, valid as at December 2017. CARE has defined "senior" in this report as those employed by the UN, on any contract type, who are above professional grade 5 (P5).

[74] CARE Norway, Gender Equality and Women and Girls' Empowerment Programme II (Final Report), https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/NORAD-GEWEP-II-2019-Final-Report-with-annexes-1-6-ID-43617.pdf.

[75] *2019 UNDP Annual report*, p. 14, https://annualreport.undp.org/assets/UNDP-Annual-Report-2019-en.pdf; for WFP, see https://www.wfp.org/gender-parity (accessed 28 October); for UNHCR see *UNHCR: 2019 Global Strategic Priorities Progress Report*, p.94, https://reporting.unhcr.org/sites/default/files/2019%20Global%20Strategic%20Priorities%20Progress%20Report.pdf (UNHCR notes that this is an average of "41% of staff and 52% of affiliates"); for UNICEF, data as of 31 December 2019, accessed 28 October 2020 https://www.unicef.org/careers/diverse-and-inclusive-workforce-part-unicefs-dna.

[76] CARE defines senior staff as all those who are part of leadership bodies in CARE country offices, such as members of executive management teams (EMT), heads of units, etc.

[77] Based on recommendations issued by the *Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls*, October 2020, https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/admin-resource/1._IAHE_GEEWG-final_report-2021.pdf.