“We need long-term financial support—not driven by donor priorities for projects—in order to build our capacity to participate and address the structural inequalities which drive conflict in our region.”

Participant at the Asia-Pacific regional civil society consultation for the Global Study
HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 1325
Urges Member States to increase their voluntary financial, technical and logistical support for gender-sensitive training efforts, including those undertaken by relevant funds and programmes

Resolution 1888
Requests that the Secretary-General continue to direct all relevant United Nations entities to take specific measures to ensure systematic mainstreaming of gender issues within their respective institutions, including by ensuring allocation of adequate financial and human resources within all relevant offices and departments and on the ground

Resolution 1889
Urges Member States, United Nations bodies, donors and civil society to ensure that women’s empowerment is taken into account during post-conflict needs assessments and planning, and factored into subsequent funding disbursements and programme activities
Resolution 2106

Recognizing the importance of providing timely assistance to survivors of sexual violence, urges United Nations entities and donors to provide non-discriminatory and comprehensive health services, [...] encourages Member States and donors to support national and international programs that assist victims of sexual violence such as the Trust Fund for Victims [...]; and requests the relevant United Nations entities to increase allocation of resources for the coordination of gender-based violence response and service provision.

Resolution 2122

Encourages concerned Member States to develop dedicated funding mechanisms to support the work and enhance capacities of organizations that support women’s leadership development and full participation in all levels of decision-making, regarding the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000), inter alia through increasing contributions to local civil society.
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. The scarcity of funds for the WPS agenda is in line with the enormous global funding gap for gender equality more generally. Research shows a consistent, striking disparity between policy commitments to gender equality and women’s empowerment, and the financial allocations to achieve them.

The lack of prioritization, and failure to effectively use this tool for change is demonstrated no more clearly than by looking at global spending patterns. As described in Chapter 8: Preventing Conflict, 15 years on, the world continues to pour resources into short-term militarized responses rather than investing in conflict prevention, social justice and inclusion. As the data in this chapter reveals, of the aid that is being channeled to fragile and conflict-affected states, it is still negligible amounts that are being routed towards furthering gender equality and women’s participation, or meeting women’s needs.

The High-Level Review provides a unique opportunity for ensuring robust and predictable financing for the implementation of the full WPS agenda beyond 2015—a priority recommendation emphasized in regional and country consultations and in other contributions to the Global Study. A number of recommendations related to financing this agenda have been put forward, including within the framework of the New Deal for building peaceful societies, established at the High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness held in Busan in December 2011.2

These include:

- emphasizing the application of gender analysis in needs assessments, planning and monitoring of budgets;

- attaching dedicated budgets to national implementation frameworks such as national action plans;

- consistently using tools such as gender markers to assess performance and improve accountability for financing gender equality; and

- allocating more resources to support and build the capacity of women’s organizations operating in conflict and post-conflict settings.

None of these recommendations are particularly new, and many have been echoed in Security Council outcomes. However, as this chapter shows, their implementation has been patchy and incomplete.

TRENDS IN DONOR SPENDING

Recent reports by the OECD3 and the UN Secretary-General on women, peace and security4 find that fragile states and economies, including conflict-affected countries, lag far behind other developing countries in achieving the MDGs and their gender-related targets.5 Data shows that fragile countries and economies are currently home to 43 per cent of the world’s population living in absolute poverty.6 In 2012, an estimated 50 per cent of out-of-school children of primary school age lived in conflict-affected areas,7 and according to 2013 estimates, maternal mortality ratios were 2.5 times higher in conflict and post-conflict countries than in the same set of developing countries.8

In conflict and post-conflict settings, domestic finance is often either completely depleted or vastly insufficient to address the risks to sustainable development resulting from fragile situations. Alternative sources of development finance, such as private finance or technology and innovation investments are equally scarce. As a result, donor funds make up the bulk of financing. These are, however, generally focused on emergency response, such as humanitarian assistance, during the crisis itself, leaving little left over for rebuilding the state and establishing peace dividends for society until stability is secured. Beyond official development assistance (ODA), other types of interventions, such as sustainable debt financing, also facilitate the mobilization of resources for public and private investment, which in turn affect domestic resource allocation and impact food, health, education, energy, infrastructure and other areas of importance for sustainable development, many of which affect women disproportionately.9
While it can be argued that the picture is not entirely bleak—data shows that ODA to gender equality in fragile states and economies is on an upward trajectory—in reality, this growth rate originates from a near negligible starting point; meaning that despite growth, only a tiny proportion of aid to fragile states and economies addresses women’s specific needs.

Data analysis of bilateral sector-allocable ODA from OECD-DAC members shows that support for gender equality and women’s rights in fragile states has grown by 10 per cent on average per year since 2008. Since the adoption of the MDGs, aid to gender equality in fragile states and economies has quadrupled, from USD 2.6 billion per year in 2002-03 to USD 10.3 billion in 2012-13. Nevertheless, in 2012-13, just 6 per cent of all aid to fragile states and economies targeted gender equality as the principal objective. In the case of peace and security specific aid, this figure was only 2 per cent. This suggests that while OECD-DAC members are making efforts to integrate gender equality into their interventions in fragile contexts, few are investing substantially in dedicated programmes to advance gender equality and women’s rights.

The few that are, represent strong examples of progress within these overall figures. For example, Sweden has significantly increased its share of aid targeting gender equality in conflict-affected and fragile states to about USD 1.47 billion in 2014—five times higher than in 2000. Canada reports the largest share of aid to fragile states and economies targeting gender equality as a principal objective (43 per cent in 2012-13). In addition, Portugal, Korea and Japan reported the largest increases in aid to gender equality in fragile states and economies since 2008.

Nevertheless, in 2012-13, just 6 per cent of all aid to fragile states and economies targeted gender equality as the principal objective. In the case of peace and security specific aid, this figure was only 2 per cent.

FOCUS ON
Making funding decisions using gender equality criteria

Canada’s Global Peace and Security Fund contributes to projects in fragile and conflict-affected states in support of international peace and security. The Fund’s efforts to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls were notably enhanced through the adoption of Canada’s National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security in 2010, which sets out a specific requirement for project funding to be assessed against their contribution to gender equality. The Fund’s Project Assessment Team evaluates whether or not proposals further the implementation of Canada’s commitments on women, peace and security by asking applicants to specifically address the question: “How will this project address the different needs of women, men, boys and girls?” The impact of these measures has been significant. Evaluating projects’ support for women, peace and security is now a standard procedure. Over the three-year period for which reports have been published, the proportion of projects with a gender focus increased from approximately 12 to 85 per cent.
Unpredictability of gender equality focused aid

The priority given to gender equality varies enormously across fragile contexts. OECD-DAC data shows that 67 per cent of aid to Nepal targeted gender equality in 2012-13 compared with just 14 per cent of aid to Iraq. Additionally, more than 50 per cent of aid to gender equality in fragile states and economies was concentrated in just 8 countries in 2012-2013, although the list of main aid recipients has shifted significantly in the past six years. This highlights the fact that long-term support to women, peace and security interventions continues to be limited.

Part of this volatility relates to the overall context of fragile state aid. According to the World Bank, on average, aid flows to post-conflict countries and fragile states are more volatile than flows to countries that are neither fragile nor post-conflict, although large variations do exist between countries. Unpredictable aid flows make it difficult for countries to plan development strategies effectively, with particular impacts on women, peace and security. Here the double bind of unstable aid alongside limited resources has an aggravating effect on efforts to meet women’s needs. Besides increasing aid predictability, other ways to enhance the effectiveness of aid allocated to gender issues in conflict and post-conflict settings include ensuring its timeliness, untying aid, aligning it to national priorities and targeting aid orphans and underfinanced sectors. Although the global share of aid that is untied has risen from 68 per cent in 2006 to 79 per cent in 2012, national governments and civil society organizations still run into significant obstacles to access aid. Innovative approaches to financing and other types of interventions in fragile countries aim at addressing some of these issues.

Which sectors are prioritized?

OECD-DAC data shows that most bilateral aid in support of gender equality in fragile states and economies goes to social sectors such as education and health, while significant financing gaps remain in the economic and productive sectors, and the peace and security sector. Peacebuilding and state building processes

Sectoral distribution of aid targeting gender equality in fragile states and economies (2012-13 average commitments, 2012 prices)
“It is a continuing frustration that the level of rhetoric for gender equality, and the level of ambition expressed, is not evidenced in financing. We must not miss the chance to achieve radical change – moving from treating women’s issues as side issues or peripheral to the business of the UN, to making women and girls the missing answer to creating a peaceful and just world.”

Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka, UN Under-Secretary-General and Executive Director, UN Women
offer a critical window of opportunity to address gender inequalities and rebuild states that are responsive, inclusive and accountable to all members of society, including women and girls. Despite this, only 28 per cent of OECD-DAC members’ aid to peace and security in fragile states and economies had a gender equality focus in 2012-13, and only 2 per cent targeted gender equality as a principal objective. Within the peace and security category, the top receiving areas of gender equality focused aid were civilian peacebuilding, conflict prevention and resolution, followed by security system management reform. However, only 4 per cent and 1 per cent (respectively) targeted gender as a principal objective.

To date, no international norms exist for tracking global peace and security spending and its gender focus. Agreeing on such global norms and targets would greatly enhance the quality of international efforts to prevent and reduce crises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY PEACE AND SECURITY ISSUES</th>
<th>% OF AID TARGETING GENDER EQUALITY</th>
<th>USD MILLION, AVERAGE 2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security system management and reform</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian peace-building, conflict prevention and resolution</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration and Small Arms and Light Weapons control</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of land mines and explosive remnants of war</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-DAC countries

The overall context of donor spending has shifted in the past decade and a half, with emerging donors playing an increasingly important role in aid delivery to...
conflict countries.27 The United Arab Emirates, Turkey and the People’s Republic of China are estimated to be among the largest non-DAC providers in absolute terms. Moreover, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates are among the most generous non-DAC providers to fragile situations in terms of percentage of their gross national income (GNI).28 Four out of the top 10 recipients of gross bilateral ODA provided by the United Arab Emirates in 2012-13 are currently considered fragile states, and together received USD 239 million.29 In the case of Turkey, 5 out of its top 10 recipients are fragile states and received USD 1,645 million.30 Data was, however, not available on whether or not this funding promoted gender equality. It is important that all aid providers, including non-DAC providers, record the gender focus of all aid contributions.

INCREASING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF AID

More inclusive, innovative interventions driven by developing countries’ priorities are necessary to speed up transition to stability and inclusive development in fragile contexts. Furthermore, as the number of emergencies, protracted conflict and countries who move in and out of conflict increases, there is a need to bridge the gap between humanitarian and development aid, with increased investment in resilience, conflict resolution and peacebuilding that more firmly targets long-term development outcomes.

One model for more effective aid support is the New Deal for Peace and Engagement in Fragile States.31 Established at the High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness held in Busan in December 2011, the New Deal is a country-led approach to aid designed to provide support in transitions from instability to development, and to serve as a platform for strengthened relations between donors and affected countries. It aims to identify each country’s peacebuilding and state-building priorities, and then build a country-led context-specific plan. To implement this, donors are expected to partner and contribute to a financing compact.

Gender equality and the participation of women are critical to the realization of the New Deal. Its emphasis on country leadership, local ownership and multi-stakeholder collaboration, and the opportunity it offers to drive forward a more inclusive agenda, make it imperative that women are included and their voices are heard. While implementation of this initiative has not had as much support as initially expected, civil society has managed to mobilize and integrate gender in some cases, such as Afghanistan and South Sudan.32

The role of development banks

Evidence shows that 20 fragile and conflict-affected states met at least one of the 18 MDG targets ahead of 2015.33 Financial assistance has played an important role in these achievements. Besides bilateral official development assistance, multilateral donors such as development banks are key enablers of development. For instance, the International Development Association (IDA)—the World Bank’s fund for the poorest countries—has provided over USD 28.5 billion to fragile and conflict-affected states since 2000 and committed to raise the share of IDA financing to these states by 50 per cent.34 The proportion of the World Bank’s allocations that are ‘gender informed’ has grown substantially since fiscal year 2010.35 The Bank’s strategic targets of “60 per cent of all IDA lending operations, and 55 per cent of all Bank lending operations being gender-informed” were met in 2014.36

In the case of fragile states, the gender focus of the Bank’s allocations has increased substantially. In 2010, 57 per cent of allocations were gender informed, and the figure rose to 97 per cent in 2014.37 This shift is comparable to that of allocations to non-fragile states, which increased from 54 to 94 per cent over the same period. However, total allocations to fragile states are still much lower than those to non-fragile countries. In fiscal year 2014, for instance, USD 3.38 million was allocated to gender informed interventions in fragile states, compared to USD 34.15 million in non-fragile states.

The largest gender informed allocation to a single post-conflict or fragile country in fiscal year 2014 was received by Iraq (USD 355 million), followed by Myanmar (USD 281.5 million) and Mali (USD 280 million).
Under its Policy on Gender and Development, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) committed to support a larger number of projects that address gender equality. Efforts focus on both mainstreaming gender in all ADB-financed projects and programmes, and increasing the number of loans that directly address gender disparities. An analysis of project, loans and grants records approved by the ADB in 2014 for interventions in fragile states in Asia and the Pacific shows that the majority of the rated allocations, 54 per cent, (USD 2.49 million) were tagged as interventions with effective gender mainstreaming. However, only 14 per cent of rated funds (USD 638,000) were allocated to projects focused specifically on promoting gender equality, while almost 30 per cent (USD 1.32 million) had no gender elements.

While the largest USD amount approved for allocation by the ADB in 2014 to a single fragile state in Asia and the Pacific was USD 1.56 million to Sri Lanka, countries receiving the largest gender-focused allocations were Bangladesh and Nepal.

Other development banks are not yet applying gender markers consistently and therefore it is not possible to adequately assess the gender focus of their interventions. The African Development Bank (AfDB), for instance, is planning to introduce a gender marking system in the course of 2015 to tag operations on the basis of their potential impact on gender equality. Three markings are envisaged: “potentially high, medium and low gender impact,” depending on whether or not gender equality is a distinct development outcome of each operation.

**Donor conferences: Translating assessment of needs into financial commitments**

Donor conferences are critical for focusing global attention on a country’s post-conflict priorities. However, despite the repeated acknowledgement of women’s central importance to reconstruction, women civil society leaders and organizations have often been marginalized by the donor assistance pledging process. In his 2010 report on women’s participation in peacebuilding, the Secretary-General called on UN entities, regional organizations, international financial institutions and Member States involved in organizing donor conferences to provide meaningful opportunities...
for women’s representatives to participate in such crucial events, including access to all conference documentation, space on the agenda to present issues of concern and assistance in convening preparatory meetings and developing policy papers.45

A sample review of 22 major donor or engagement conferences that have taken place since 2010, covering 11 conflict or post-conflict situations, show mixed results in living up to this call.46 For example, with regard to conferences addressing priorities for peacebuilding in Afghanistan, women civil society representatives were formally invited to convey their priorities at some, while at others they were left out of formal proceedings even though they were prepared and present at the location of the conference.47 While data availability is uneven, initial findings of this sample review suggest a strong correlation between conferences that have clear channels for participation for women’s civil society representatives, the backing of gender expertise, and outcomes of donor pledges targeting gender equality interventions. This demonstrates the important role that women’s organizations and the use of gender analysis in preparatory planning can play in fundraising for such interventions and for women’s needs in particular.

**RESOURCE TRACKING OF THE UN SYSTEM’S IMPLEMENTATION OF WOMEN, PEACE AND SECURITY COMMITMENTS**

Reporting on the UN System-Wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP) shows that UN entities have made limited progress in resource tracking and allocation for gender-focused interventions. Only 15 (24 per cent) out of 62 entities reporting data in 2015 currently have systems to track resources for gender equality and women’s empowerment.48 Among those, departments of the UN Secretariat, making up about 40 per cent

Only 15 (24 per cent) out of 62 entities reporting data in 2015 currently have systems to track resources for gender equality and women’s empowerment
of all UN entities, lag behind significantly, with very few entities tracking their resources spent on gender. As such, it has remained the weakest performing indicator of the UN-SWAP for three consecutive years of reporting. Efforts are underway to support the establishment and roll-out of gender marker systems across more UN entities, although much more intense action is necessary if the UN system expects to achieve most UN-SWAP targets by the 2017 deadline set by the UN Chief Executives Board.

**Gender markers**

Notably, a growing number of entities working in conflict-affected and crisis settings are using gender markers. At present, conflict and post-conflict specific gender-marked data is annually reported by five different UN entities. UNDP, the UN Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) and UNICEF have reported data since the adoption of the UN indicators and monitoring frameworks on women, peace and security in 2010.49 Data from the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC)50 has been available since 2012 and UNFPA initiated marking and reporting in 2014. Differences in methodology, however, limit full comparability across UN entities, and over time.51

Although available figures on the proportion of allocations focusing on gender show a generally upward trend since 2011, it is clear that much stronger efforts are needed. In particular, the goal of allocating a minimum of 15 per cent of UN-managed funds in support of peacebuilding to projects whose principal objective is to address women’s specific needs and advance gender equality—as set out in the UN Secretary-General’s Seven-Point Action Plan on Gender Responsive Peacebuilding—remains largely unmet. For instance, in interventions by the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), this proportion has fluctuated significantly from the 2011 figure of 2.1 per cent, to more positive results recorded in 2012 and 2014—the years the Fund was running its Gender Promotion Initiative (GPI) and emphasizing the funding of projects targeting women’s empowerment and gender equality. In 2014, the figure was 9.3 per cent or a total of USD 8.22 million.53 While special measures such as the GPI are important, there is also a risk that they isolate or pigeon-hole gender programmes and funds, making them the subject of separate, stand-alone actions, rather than dedicated
programmes that are effectively mainstreamed into the full range of programming undertaken by all entities in post-conflict contexts.

The UN’s 15 per cent financing target for peacebuilding interventions, although far from being reached by all entities responsible, has been instrumental in driving more determined action, and more systematic monitoring of progress. As recognized by the Advisory Group of Experts for the 2015 review of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture, a major additional push is now needed not only to meet, but preferably surpass the Secretary-General’s financing targets related to gender equality and the implementation of the WPS agenda.\textsuperscript{55} The report highlights the 15 per cent gender marker as one of the core measures which will help the UN to redefine and reorient its work toward the UN Charter’s vision of saving “succeeding generations from the scourge of war.”\textsuperscript{56} Also necessary will be much stronger leadership for gender-responsive planning and budgeting; monitoring and evaluation; and an investment in technical expertise.

**Challenges in methodology and reporting systems**

“To ensure women and girls, boys and men have equal access to and benefit from humanitarian assistance—we must ‘follow the money.’ We need to know how we spend money and who benefits.”

Valerie Amos, Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator

Much larger sums are allocated to interventions that target gender equality as a ‘significant objective.’ This means that such interventions advance gender equality and women’s empowerment, although this is not the intervention’s principal objective. It also means that gender equality considerations are considered mainstreamed across the interventions.

The current gender marking systems in use are not sophisticated enough to identify the proportion of funds within those marked as ‘significant,’ that actually further gender equality. Some interventions might thus have a much larger gender impact than others, with funds concentrated on certain types of sectors. There are currently no tools available to monitor actual spending, and staff capacity to track and analyze this type of data is limited in most entities. Moreover, while some UN entities such as UNFPA screen the totality of their allocations to fragile countries for gender focus utilizing markers, others—especially emergency response and humanitarian interventions—encounter challenges in gender marking, which results in an unreliable picture of whether commitments to gender equality are being met.

Since 2012, the proportion of unmarked humanitarian aid channeled through UN entities has remained at around 60 per cent and, where markers were used, a significant proportion of aid was coded as “unspecified” (23 per cent in 2014).\textsuperscript{57} It is therefore not only challenging to identify which humanitarian and emergency areas received more attention, but the data also indicates that the gender focus was, in general, extremely low. For instance, Syria, South Sudan and the Philippines received the greatest proportion of humanitarian assistance targeting gender principally in 2014, and it still only amounted to one per cent of total humanitarian aid to each of these countries.\textsuperscript{58}

Other UN entities working in conflict and post-conflict
settings, such as the UN Secretariat’s Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Political Affairs, do not use gender markers as their operations are not project-based, and slightly more sophisticated marker systems would be required to capture the gender focus of their interventions. Available data indicates that the total peacekeeping funding for the fiscal year 2014/15 amounted to USD 8.47 billion,$59 while the annual budget for special political missions was approximately USD 590 million.$60 These large volumes remain unmarked for gender-focus and therefore unaccounted for in gender-focused aid monitoring systems. The establishment of adequate methodology and reporting systems to track the gender focus of non-project based allocations, including in field missions, is key to hold all UN entities accountable for gender commitments.

**FUNDING ALLOCATED TO CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS WORKING IN CONFLICT AND POST-CONFLICT SETTINGS**

This Study has detailed the body of evidence on the relationship between women’s participation and the effectiveness of peace and security efforts. In the immediate aftermath of conflict, there is a brief moment of opportunity to strengthen women’s rights and leadership, and through this, accelerate post-conflict recovery and stability. Yet, this is precisely the period when countries experience funding shortfalls, with women’s organizations and the critical work they do the most adversely affected. The dearth of funds is aggravated by the fact that when funds are made available, they are often released late in the day, after their immediate need and when other ODA flows are re-established. Bridging this gap, in resources and time, would unleash a powerful tool for furthering women’s leadership and as a result, the gains to peace and security the evidence tells us will follow.

The crucial contribution of women’s organizations—including those working at the grassroots level—to conflict resolution and peacebuilding has been explicitly recognized in Security Council resolution 2122 (2013), which calls on Member States to develop dedicated funding mechanisms and increase their contributions to women’s organizations at the local level. Some initiatives are now underway. For example, the United States has begun providing small grants as a mechanism to channel support and resources directly to women-led civil society organizations at critical times in their countries’ recovery as a core crisis response.$61

However, much stronger efforts are needed in this area. OECD-DAC data shows that in 2012-13, only USD 130 million of aid went to women’s equality organizations and institutions—a tiny amount of the USD 31.8 billion of total aid to fragile states and economies over the same period, and representing just one per cent of gender equality focused aid to fragile states and economies.$62

A 2011 cross-regional survey supported by the Association of Women’s Rights in Development (AWID) of over 1,000 women’s organizations and close to 50 women’s funds revealed that the median annual income of these organizations doubled between 2005 and 2010.$63 However the average budget of these organizations was only USD 20,000 and only 7 per cent of respondents reported 2010 budgets over USD 500,000.$64 The majority reported challenges to mobilizing resources and having to cut activities or staff due to funding limitations. Furthermore, women’s organizations rely primarily on project support rather than on long-term flexible funding. In fact, 48 per cent of respondents reported never having received core funding, and 52 per cent never having received multi-year funding.$65 The implications of this are that many of these

*Furthermore, women’s organizations rely primarily on project support rather than on long-term flexible funding. In fact, 48 per cent of respondents reported never having received core funding, and 52 per cent never having received multi-year funding.*
small organizations spend a disproportionate amount of their time on donor-related activities—such as writing funding proposals in tight timeframes for small amounts of money, and donor reporting—which takes valuable time away from their actual programming.

Similar findings emerged from the global civil society survey undertaken as a contribution to this Global Study and the 2015 High-Level Review of the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000). Lack of resources ranked highest among the barriers encountered by civil society organizations (39 per cent), followed by lack of trust and cooperation with governments, and gaps between international policies and local level realities (each 29 per cent). Most organizations reported receiving the largest amount of funding for work on advocacy, followed by technical capacity building (43 per cent). In contrast, only 11 per cent of organizations indicated that the majority of their funding supports core-functioning/institutional capacity building. Other funding-related challenges identified by respondents included ineffective funding allocations; donors’ focus on numerical targets and ‘quantity rather than quality;’ money given to large organizations rather than grassroots ones; uncoordinated and erratic funding; shifting donor interests interfering with long-term planning; conditions set by donors on funding; and problems associated with civil society organizations becoming donor-driven rather than community-driven, which at times fuels competition between organizations.

“We have small annual budget and most of the actions and our work on WPS is voluntary. We need core support also, and that is the situation with many women organizations in Serbia. Funding in most cases is for [a] limited time, 6 months or year, so [we] can't plan actions on [a] long-term basis.”

Respondent to the civil society survey for the Global Study, working in Serbia

In terms of sources of support from the UN system, the survey revealed that almost two thirds (63 per cent) of civil society organizations receive support from UN Women for their work on women, peace and security, showing the importance of the entity’s role in providing direct resources and technical support despite its limited resources. Approximately one in four organizations received support from UNDP (26 per cent), followed by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (18 per cent), UNFPA (16 per cent) and UNICEF (16 per cent). Ten per cent had not received support from any UN entity for their women, peace and security work.

Proportion of respondents who selected each of the following categories in response to survey question: “Which of the UN agencies have been most supportive of your work on WPS initiatives?” (Multiple choices possible)
Barriers to accessing resources

In addition to limited funding, new challenges in accessing resources have emerged as a result of evolving global trends and threats. In early 2015 the Women Peacemakers Program (WPP), together with Human Security Collective (HSC) contacted partners in ten countries to gain insight into the multiple ways the counter-terrorism agenda is affecting their work for peace and women’s rights. Responses show that post 9/11 counter-terrorism measures have impacted civil society’s operational and political space in several ways. Several respondents reported that their governments are trying to control, limit, or stop critical civil society work through the development of new NGO legislation, as recommended by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) in its Anti-Money Laundering/Countering Financing of Terrorism standard. This new legislation, in some cases, puts restrictions on receiving funding support. For example, a 2013 study by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and the Norwegian Refugee Council showed that counter-terrorism measures adopted or expanded by donor States over the past decade have had negative impacts including halts and decreases in funding; blockage or suspension of programmes; and limitations on financial transactions. However, it is too infrequently acknowledged that such anti-terrorism financing rules have a particular—and in many cases—additional adverse impact on women and women’s organizations. As noted by one respondent from the Middle East and North Africa region:

“Sometimes we are facing difficulties during the money transfer process, it takes a long time for us to receive the funds, and some correspondent banks reject the amount. Recently a new system has been introduced: there is a limit on the amount we can withdraw on a weekly basis from the bank. This means we cannot pay all our organizational expenses on time, such as staff salary, rent, activity expenses... Everyone is calling us for their money, and we have to promise them that we will pay them next week... Sometimes we are taking loans from other people just to cover our expenses. The banks should have a special system for dealing with NGOs, especially when they also provide humanitarian services.”

Other challenges to access funding have to do with donors increasingly preferring to channel funds via large organizations capable of producing grant proposals according to their demanding guidelines, as well as able to absorb rigorous reporting and auditing requirements.

Multilateral sources of funding

Special Funds such as the UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women, the UN Fund for Gender Equality, and the UN Fund for Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict have been important multilateral sources of support for work on gender equality, women’s rights and empowerment. While these funds are supporting a growing number of projects in conflict and post-conflict settings, a sizable gap exists between available funds and demand, funding to address the gap for women’s organizations in particular before ODA flows resume, and funding which specifically addresses the challenges associated with the specific application to the women, peace and security agenda as a whole, in particular women’s leadership and participation elements, and a focus on civil society.

In response, the Global Acceleration Instrument on Women, Peace and Security and Humanitarian Action has been established—a new multi-stakeholder initiative by Member States, UN entities and civil society that holds a promise for dedicated and scaled-up financing for the implementation of the women, peace and security agenda. Beyond financing, the instrument will act as a collective platform for coordination, knowledge and experience exchange.
To address the stark financing gaps long recognized as a major obstacle to the implementation of the women, peace and security agenda as well as women’s engagement in humanitarian action, a Women, Peace and Security Financing Discussion Group (FDG) was established in June 2014. Composed of representatives from donors, conflict-affected Member States, UN entities and civil society, this unique multi-stakeholder body met over the course of a year to consider strategies for dedicated and scaled-up financing support.

After exploring a number of options and mapping existing financing instruments, the FDG agreed to support the establishment of a Global Acceleration Instrument (GAI) on Women, Peace and Security and Humanitarian Action, a pooled funding mechanism that aims to re-energize action and stimulate a significant shift in the financing for women’s participation, leadership and empowerment in crisis response, and peace and security settings. The new fund will be a flexible and rapid financing mechanism that supports quality interventions that respond to shifting contexts and the sudden onset of both crises and emergencies. It will also strengthen the capacity of civil society to seize key peacebuilding opportunities. The fund aims to bridge the funding gaps that occur between the signing of a peace agreement and the resumption of ODA flows—a critical period when a country is rebuilding for the future, but lacking the necessary financial resources to do it. Investing in women’s organizations and civil society in this crucial period has been shown to support inclusivity and nation-building and increase the peace dividends across a broader constituency of society.

The GAI will feature a multi-stakeholder governance structure that allows Member States, civil society and the UN to participate in decision-making on an equal footing, to demonstrate transparency and effectiveness of collective and consultative strategic planning and resource utilization.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Moving progress beyond 2015: Proposals for action

**Member States, the UN and civil society should:**

✓ Set specific numerical targets such as the UN target of allocating 15 per cent of peacebuilding funds to projects whose principal objective is to address women’s specific needs and advance gender equality.

✓ Establish systems across all financing actors to promote transparency and accountability, by tracking whether financial allocations further gender equality in a fully comparable manner, including in peace, security and emergency contexts. To achieve this, build the capacity of all actors to monitor and evaluate the impact of funding.

✓ Increase predictable, accessible and flexible funding for women’s civil society organizations working on peace and security at all levels, including through dedicated financing instruments such as the new Global Acceleration Instrument on Women, Peace and Security and Humanitarian Action.

✓ Support women’s participation in donor conferences to ensure interventions appropriately target the needs of women on the ground.

✓ Build the capacity of national governments in fragile and conflict-affected settings to undertake gender-responsive budgeting and ensure coherence of national planning with gender equality objectives.

✓ Undertake participatory gender and conflict risk analysis (including vulnerability analysis) to inform the design, costing and implementation of all interventions in conflict-affected contexts.

**Donor States and groups should:**

✓ Adopt the UN’s 15 per cent gender-funding target for peacebuilding interventions within their own aid flows to conflict-affected contexts, with this percentage being the first, not final, target.

**Civil society should:**

✓ Improve coordination of donors’ aid activities to ensure a more even distribution of gender equality-focused aid across all fragile states and economies.

✓ Significantly increase allocations to dedicated financial mechanisms that promote gender equality, women’s human rights and empowerment, such as the UN Fund for Gender Equality, the UN Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women, the UN Fund for Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict (UN Action) and the new Global Acceleration Instrument on Women, Peace and Security and Humanitarian Engagement.

✓ Revise the structure of budgeting from being ‘project’ based to be aimed at long-term capacity building, not only of State entities but also of non-State entities.
The UN should:

✓ Accelerate efforts to attain and then surpass the Secretary-General's 15 per cent ‘gender marker’ for financing of peacebuilding approaches that promote gender equality. Its achievement should be written into the Secretary-General’s performance compacts with senior UN leaders on the ground, in mission and non-mission settings, and backed up with an enhanced system for monitoring and tracking achievement.\(^7\)

✓ Allocate US 100 million or a symbolic 1 per cent of the value (whichever is higher) of the total budget for peace operations to the Peace Building Fund;\(^78\) and further ensure that, of this contribution, a minimum of 15 per cent is allocated to peacebuilding approaches that promote gender equality.
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