What Women Want
Planning and Financing for Gender-Responsive Peacebuilding
As blueprints for post-conflict reconstruction and development, national planning frameworks matter to women. Planning models determine which policy objectives will be prioritized and how resources will be allocated. Planning to enhance women’s well-being is, inevitably, complex. For instance, women’s inability to access services in post-conflict settings often stems from a combination of physical insecurity, which constrains women’s mobility, and pervasive social norms that deprive them of equal opportunities. Developing strategies to address these problems requires a planning process attuned to social relations and gender issues. All too often, however, women’s needs are overlooked in planning processes, and thus translated into neither funds nor eventually, results. The importance of funding for securing results cannot be overemphasized, as noted by the United Nations (UN) Secretary-General, in his 2009 Report on Peacebuilding in the Immediate Aftermath of Conflict: “funding for women’s early recovery needs is vital to increase women’s empowerment and correct historical gender imbalances.”

This review of current patterns of planning and funding in post-conflict settings reveals a persistent gender bias, in which women’s needs and issues are systematically underfunded. The UN Secretary-General, in his 2010 Report on Women’s Participation in Peacebuilding, highlights the “sobering” shortcoming of UN-managed funds in financing women’s post-conflict needs. While establishing a correct proportion of funding for meeting women’s specific needs, advancing gender equality, and empowering women is ultimately a political process, the UN Secretary-General made a commitment to ensure “that at least 15 per cent of UN-managed funds in support of peacebuilding is dedicated to projects whose principal objective (consistent with organizational mandates) is to address women’s specific needs, advance gender equality or empower women.”

Two years on, some progress to achieving this commitment is discernible. UN entities and UN country teams are rolling out resource tracking methods to generate a baseline of spending on gender equality. The UNCT in Nepal is one example. It has allocated 9 per cent of its current peacebuilding portfolio to addressing women or girls’ specific needs. Moreover, the UN’s Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) has reached its first stated target of doubling its allocations to women’s empowerment by 2012, reaching 10 per cent.

This paper addresses a wide range of questions in the area of planning and financing for gender equality in post-conflict settings. It presents findings from several studies conducted by the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) on the extent to which women’s needs and issues are addressed in post-conflict planning frameworks.

The paper is divided into seven sections. The first outlines the critical methodology adopted. Section 2 reviews Multi Partner Trust Funds (MPTFs) projects, comparing cumulative results as of 2012 to the findings as of 2010. Sections 3 to 5 discuss the results from analyses performed, respectively, of three additional typical over-arching planning documents: United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs), Post-conflict Needs Assessments (PCNAs), and Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). Section 6 summarizes the main findings and explores common issues across all the frameworks. The last section recommends methods for improving gender mainstreaming in planning frameworks.
Box 1 – Calculation of budget allocated to address women’s needs and issues

The methodology is divided into two steps:

First, the content of all activities, indicators and budget lines was analyzed and classified according to whether these address women’s needs and issues. Since all planning frameworks differ in the way activities and indicators are clustered, the smallest cluster employed for budget allocation (for example, line item) was used in the context of this analysis. For each cluster (i.e., sector, sub-sector or any other categorization used), the following three estimated percentages were calculated:

» Activities that mention women’s needs and issues, calculated as a percentage of the total number of activities in the cluster;
» Indicators that mention women’s needs and issues, calculated as a percentage of the total number of indicators in the cluster; and
» Budget lines that mention women’s needs and issues, calculated as the percentage of the total budget for the cluster.

The second step was to calculate the budget specifically allocated to address women’s needs and issues by cluster, using the total budget for the cluster as the weighing factor (see Box 1).

Box 1 – Calculation of budget allocated to address women’s needs and issues

The level of funding for women’s needs and issues (B) is calculated as the weighted average of all percentages estimated to address women’s needs and issues by cluster (A), using the total budget allocated for each cluster as the weighing factor. This estimation offers a better approximation than simply estimating a non-weighted average as shown in the examples presented below.

\[
B_j = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( \frac{A_j}{N} \right) \times \left( \frac{X_j}{\text{total budget}} \right)
\]

where \( N \) clusters are the categories used to organize the budget.

Method A

| Cluster 1 | 70% (7/10) | 70% (of US$3 million) | 2.1 |
| Cluster 2 | 50% (1/2)  | 50% (of US$2 million)  | 1.0 |
| Cluster 3 | 10% (1/10) | 10% (of US$10 million) | 1.0 |
| Cluster 4 | 10% (1/10) | 10% (of US$10 million) | 1.0 |
| Cluster 5 | 5% (1/20)  | 5% (of US$5 million)  | 0.5 |
| All      | 30% (20/65)| 30% (of US$15 million) | 6.1 |

Method B

| Cluster 1 | 70% (7/10) | 10% (of US$3 million) | 0.3 |
| Cluster 2 | 50% (1/2)  | 10% (of US$2 million)  | 0.2 |
| Cluster 3 | 10% (1/10) | 10% (of US$10 million) | 0.1 |
| Cluster 4 | 10% (1/10) | 10% (of US$10 million) | 0.1 |
| Cluster 5 | 5% (1/20)  | 5% (of US$5 million)  | 0.05 |
| All      | 30% (20/65)| 5% (of US$15 million) | 0.75 |

Based on this example, using the "unweighted" average in Method A generates a result of 30% per cent, while using the total budget allocated for each cluster as a weight Method B produces a result of 7% per cent. Method A likely overestimates the level of funding for women’s needs and issues, while Method B produces a more realistic result.

In order to provide analysis and results by thematic area, the clusters were also aggregated according to six major thematic areas: economic recovery and infrastructure; security and rule of law; social protection and human rights; education, health, and governance and administration (see Box 2 for further clarification).

It is important to clarify from the outset that the methodology used for this analysis is subject to certain limitations. One of the most important is the methodology’s high dependency on the structure of planning frameworks within clusters, and their level of inclusion of women’s needs and issues. Planning frameworks with disaggregated categories or thematic areas will show a more accurate picture of the extent to which women’s needs and issues are considered. In contrast, when a planning framework has relatively few categories, bias in estimating the gender content at the level of activities and indicators is more likely to emerge. For instance, if there is even a single mention of women’s needs or issues in a relatively large category, according to the methodology used, the full amount budgeted to that category would be considered gender responsive. Conversely, the budget for the entire category would appear gender blind in the absence of any reference to gender or women’s needs and issues.

The above methodology was applied to a sample of planning frameworks across twelve countries covering over 3,000 activities and indicators, including six PCNAs, five PRSPs and six UNDAFs; in addition, over 200 project documents were analyzed from MPTFs and JPs across six countries (see Figure 1).

Box 2 – Example of application of methodology by thematic area

The following example shows the application of the methodology by thematic area, using activities as the analytical starting point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Activities that address women’s needs and issues (% total)</th>
<th>All activities (number)</th>
<th>Budget (US$)</th>
<th>Estimation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic recovery and infrastructure</td>
<td>25 1 4 30 30 7.50</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and rule of law</td>
<td>25 1 4 15 15 3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>25 1 4 15 15 3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>25 1 4 15 15 3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social protection and human rights</td>
<td>50 2 4 10 10 5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and administration</td>
<td>0 0 4 5 5 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 23.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section analyzes Multi-Partner Trust Funds (MPTFs) and Joint Programmes (JPs), which operate at much higher levels of proximity to implementation than do other over-arching planning frameworks that will be reviewed in sections 4 to 6, namely UNDAFs, PCNAs and PRSPs. More specifically, MPTFs are joint pools of resources to support national priorities and facilitate UN Entities to work and deliver in close coordination. JPs, on the other hand, are sets of activities contained in a common work plan and related budget, involving two or more UN entities and national partners. Both instruments tend to use the MPTF office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to play the role of administrative agent interfacing with donors, and are implemented through projects. For this reason, both instruments will be referred to hereafter as MPTFs.

MPTF project documents usually contain: situation analysis; strategies; lessons learned and proposed joint programmes (e.g., programme outcomes, integration and coordination, infrastructure building and conflict management mechanisms, participation of beneficiaries, sustainability of results); priority interventions and actions; results framework; management arrangements, monitoring, evaluation and reporting; and work plans and budgets.

This review analyzed 202 project documents covering six case study countries – Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Iraq, Sierra Leone, Sudan and Timor-Leste (see Annex 1). Overall, these projects amounted to US$ 1,024 million and were reviewed in two phases. 87 cases were analyzed as of June 2010 and 115 cases additionally available as of April 2012.

The overall results indicate that attention to gender-specific needs or issues in MPTFs has been and continues to be very low, under 8 percent: whether assessing activities, budgets or indicators (figure 2). Compared to results as of 2010, the proportion of project activities addressing gender-specific needs has dropped by almost half, from 11 percent to 6.3 percent. While this highlights a declining trend, results as of 2012 show some slight improvements in both project indicators and budgets targeting gender-specific needs or issues: from 6.9 percent to 7.7 percent in the case of indicators, and from 5.7 percent to 7.1 percent in the case of budgets.

This section explores in further detail the country and sector findings in the MPTF projects reviewed. It also provides an analysis of how the overall attention to gender issues has evolved across MPTF projects. This is done by comparing the results of all projects as of 2012 (302 cases) with the subset that was available as of 2010 (87 cases).

2.1 Country level analysis

These overall declining trends are also evident at the country level (figure 3). Across the six case study countries, all showed a decline in the gender-sensitivity in activities with exception of one country. The inclusion of women’s needs in indicator components of MPTFs improved in four of the six countries. Meanwhile, budget components of MPTFs are also showing a drop in gender sensitivity in four out of the six countries.

Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>As of 2012</th>
<th>As of 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities largely in decline. All of the six case study countries exhibited deterioration in the gender-responsiveness of activities in MPTFs – with the exception of Iraq, improving only slightly from 4.2 percent to 4.5 percent. Sudan saw the largest decline in the gender-responsiveness of activities – falling by two-thirds from 29.2 percent to 9.7 percent. Burundi saw a drop from 6.9 percent to 10.8 percent, while the Democratic Republic of the Congo fell from 16.6 percent to 10.9 percent. Sierra Leone saw a smaller decline from 7.4 percent to 6.9 percent, and Timor-Leste fell only slightly from 6.8 percent to 6.3 percent.

Most improvement in indicators. At the country level, MPTF indicator components show a large positive change in gender sensitivity. Iraq led in positive improvements with a seven-fold increase, from only 0.9 percent of indicators showing gender responsiveness as of 2010 to 6.0 percent as of 2012. The Democratic Republic of the Congo (from 6.9 percent to 8.9 percent), Sierra Leone (6.2 percent to 7.4 percent), and Timor-Leste (6.9 percent to 6.7 percent) saw similar but smaller increases in the proportion of indicators including women’s needs. Burundi and Sudan saw larger drops. The share of Burundi’s indicators responsive to women’s needs and issues declined from 15.4 percent as of 2010 to 8.5 percent as of 2012, while Sudan’s fell from 18.6 percent to 11.0 percent.

Most budgets declining. The extent of inclusion of women’s needs in Sudan’s MPTF budgets saw the largest decline, from 25.3 percent of 2010 to 7.8 percent as of 2012. Similarly, Burundi (from 10.4 percent to 6.6 percent), the Democratic Republic of Congo (18.5 percent to 12.1 percent), and Sierra Leone (from 12.1 percent to 12.1 percent) exhibited similar declines in the extent to which gender issues are included in project budgets. By contrast, Iraq saw the largest improvement, from 0.0 percent to 4.7 percent, followed by Timor-Leste which marginally increased its proportion of budgets including women’s needs and issues, from 8.9 percent to 8.9 percent.
Box 3 gives examples of women’s needs and issues that were addressed in MPTFs.

Economic Recovery and Infrastructure
- Provide business coaching/Enterprise-based apprenticeship program with special attention to women

Security and Rule of Law
- Establishment of female police officer-staffed family response units in police stations

Social Protection and Human Rights
- Vocational training opportunities available for adolescents with a special focus on girls and ex-child soldiers especially
- Civil Society (NGOs; Women’s Groups, CBOs, academia) trained on gender-sensitive planning and GBV to advocate for, scrutinize and monitor public expenditure
- Women’s CSOs trained on Gender Analysis, mainstreaming Gender Responsive Budget Monitoring, leadership/communication skills, project cycle management, computer skills

Health
- Train service providers: medical doctors, midwife, NGOs clinic staff, medical assistants, nurses and staff working at Family and Child Unit on Clinical Management of Rape
- Provision of Post-rape kits to health facilities (hospitals, clinics and Family and Child Unit) where providers have been trained
- Set up a mechanism for coordination on GBV work including the development of the referral pathway for survivors, SOPs in coordination with key actors on the prevention and response to Gender-Based Violence Issues
- Training for health care workers on the use of the Medical Forensic Protocol for Examination of Victims of Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Child Abuse

Governance and Administration
- Representation of women in conflict management mechanisms at state, county and community levels
- National and local referral mechanisms and services established and/or strengthened for protection of victims of human trafficking and domestic violence
- Detailed examination of sector breakdowns reveals a record of largely declining or unchanging trends in the inclusion of women’s needs and issues in MPTFs

Detailed examination of sector breakdowns reveals a record of largely declining or unchanging trends in the inclusion of women’s needs and issues in MPTFs.
2.3 Summary of findings

Two main challenges continue to constrain the extent to which women’s post-conflict needs and issues are being met by MPTFs. First, gender is designated as a cross-cutting issue within many projects, especially in Peacebuilding Fund projects. However, even as a cross-cutting issue, gender-specific issues often fail to translate into the logframe, which is the main planning tool for implementation. The effectiveness of gender mainstreaming will continue to be minimal unless it can translate into specific objectives, activities, and indicators where beneficiaries by gender can be assessed and monitored.

The second challenge is the widespread lack of sex-disaggregated data across project documents. Consistently monitoring gender-specific impacts and allocation of funds requires a level of sex-disaggregated data rarely available. Although the number of gender-specific issues has increased since 2010, this is often unconnected to the logframe and thus in budget analysis.

However, there are some improvements. First, there has been an increase in the identification of number of beneficiaries that are women. A good example of this is the Millennium Development Goal Fund in Timor-Leste (see box 4). However, in most projects, this identification still largely fails to translate to the logframe, including indicators, and costing levels.

Box 4—Good practice in disaggregating by beneficiaries in Timor-Leste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFICIARIES</th>
<th>Expected Number of Institutions reached to date</th>
<th>Expected Number of Women reached to date</th>
<th>Expected Number of Men reached to date</th>
<th>Expected Number of Individuals from Ethnic Groups reached to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>9,804</td>
<td>20,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>10,538</td>
<td>20,786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is no existence of Ethnic Group in Timor-Leste. The Government of Timor-Leste recognized equal rights and opportunities for all citizens.

Indirect beneficiaries: “The individuals, groups, or organizations, not targeted, that benefit, indirectly, from the development intervention.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFICIARY TYPE</th>
<th>Expected Number of Institutions reached to date</th>
<th>Expected Number of Women reached to date</th>
<th>Expected Number of Men reached to date</th>
<th>Expected Number of Individuals from Ethnic Groups reached to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,110</td>
<td>8,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,110</td>
<td>8,177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MDG Achievement Fund (2012).

The second major improvement has been the inclusion, within some project documents, of a gender marker. While these improvements are not yet widespread in the majority of project documents, they nevertheless illustrate areas of good practice and progress. Systematic mainstreaming of these improvements across all project documents is necessary—and will likely translate into more gender-responsive projects.
3. United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks

The UNDAF is used at the country level to coordinate UN system activities and to provide a coherent response to national priorities and needs. More generally, it is anchored to the framework of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). An UNDAF is conducted every two to six years, sometimes more often, depending on the country. In this sample, for example, two UNDAFs are included for the Republic of Sierra Leone for the periods 2005-2007 and 2010-2014; the Democratic Republic of the Congo for the periods 2006-2007 and 2008-2010; the Republic of Burundi for the periods 2003-2007 and 2010-2014; the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste for the period 2009-2013, and the Republic of Sudan for the period 2009-2012.

An UNDAF usually has the following sections: planning and preparation process; context and situation analysis; priorities and needs; thematic areas; activities, indicators and budget; monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

The preparation and implementation of an UNDAF takes a collaborative approach, promoting participation among stakeholders in a country’s development, including the government, international institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), bilateral donors, civil society and the private sector.

Among all the UN planning frameworks under consideration here, UNDAFs stand out for their high levels of gender sensitivity (see Box 5 for specific examples of women’s needs and issues addressed in UNDAFs). The extent of inclusion of women’s needs and issues in UNDAFs is between 29 and 35 percent at the activities, indicators and budget level (Figure 6).

In the UNDAFs analyzed for this review, the thematic areas with the highest degree of gender sensitivity at the activities and indicators level are health, education, and economic recovery and infrastructure (Figure 7). At the budget level, social protection and human rights also demonstrates a high degree of gender sensitivity, together with education, and economic recovery and infrastructure. Security and rule of law is the thematic area demonstrating the least gender sensitivity across all levels.

Two observations are worth highlighting: first, compared to the other planning frameworks that were analyzed in this review, UNDAFs show higher gender sensitivity in the area of economic recovery and infrastructure, accompanied by a relatively lower percentage of the total budget allocated to this area. Second, the thematic area of social protection and human rights receives a much higher proportion of the total budget in UNDAFs than it does in other planning frameworks considered here.

### Box 5 – Examples of women’s needs and issues addressed in UNDAFs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic recovery and infrastructure</td>
<td>Increased agricultural services and inputs, especially for women, internally displaced persons (IDPs), returnees, refugees and other groups with specific needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and rule of law</td>
<td>Ex-combatants, and women and children associated with armed forces and groups demolished and provided with reinsertion and reintegration support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Safe, inclusive, child-friendly learning spaces provided for basic education (including water and separate sanitary facilities), particularly for girls, nomads, children with special needs and children in conflict-affected and underserved areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Comprehensive health management information systems, including (birth, death) registration and maternal death audit, established at all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential integrated basic packages (comprehensive reproductive health care, nutrition, integrated management of child illnesses, expanded immunization services), adequate equipment and supplies, and referral facilities available at the community level, with a special focus on groups with specific needs (including IDPs, returnees and refugees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacities, including institutional infrastructure and human resources, to provide pre- and in-service training, including midwifery schools, created and/or strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and administration</td>
<td>Legislative and regulatory mechanisms promoting women’s political leadership and representation developed and implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Post-Conflict Needs Assessments

Post-Conflict Needs Assessments (PCNAs) are multilateral exercises undertaken by the UN, the European Union (EU), the World Bank (WB) and Regional Development Banks by the official request and leadership of the national government and with the cooperation of donor countries. Post-Conflict Needs Assessments (PCNAs) have different names at the national level and are processes used by countries emerging from conflict or after episodes of crisis to coordinate donors, collectively identify main recovery priority actions, and mobilize resources.

Government agencies, donors, international organizations and international financial institutions participate in the process. Other national stakeholders may also be consulted, such as civil society organizations, the private sector and political parties. After the assessment is completed, a donors conference is planned and held.

PCNA documents tend to be divided into two main sections: the narrative analysis and the Transitional Results Framework (TRF). The narrative analysis is generally organized according to thematic areas (these vary by country) and comprises the context, situation analysis, problem statement, and priority needs and actions. In most cases, budgetary needs are not mentioned in the narrative section, and if they are, they are only broadly included. In the TRF, outcomes, indicators and targets of the PCNA are further elaborated; in most cases, the TRF is also laid out by thematic area, following a similar organization to the narrative section. In the sample examined for this review, estimated budget needs were often identified within the TRF itself, where this was not the case, the budget was presented separately. PCNA documents can also include sections on the process of document preparation and consultation; and implementation, management and coordination mechanisms.

A 2010 analysis of six PCNAs showed that in the narrative section, gender issues are mentioned across the thematic areas, particularly in social protection and human rights, education, and health. However, in contrast to UNDAFs, gender issues are mentioned much less systematically in the results framework: less than 5 per cent of activities and only 2-3 per cent of budget lines were found to mention women’s needs and issues (see Figure 8).

Of the thematic areas, social protection and human rights, education and health were found to have the lowest degree of analysis and provision for women’s needs. This reflects a widespread presumption that economic recovery and infrastructure is gender neutral, based on the expectation that women and men benefit equally from investments in this area. Unfortunately, in most contexts this is not the case. For example, women may not benefit from temporary employment schemes if these do not address women’s labour constraints, such as childcare, nor do they benefit from infrastructure projects that lack toilet facilities for girls and women and/or are undertaken in markets where women are inactive. Specific examples of how women’s needs and issues were addressed in the PCNAs examined, broken down by thematic area, are highlighted in Box 6.

![Figure 8 – Extent of inclusion of women’s needs and issues in PCNAs (as percentage of the total budget)](image)

**Activities**

- Economic recovery and infrastructure: 4.0%
- Security and rule of law: 2.0%
- Social protection and human rights: 1.5%
- Education: 0.5%
- Health: 0.5%
- Governance and administration: 0.5%

**Budget**

- Economic recovery and infrastructure: 2.0%
- Security and rule of law: 0.5%
- Social protection and human rights: 0.5%
- Education: 0.5%
- Health: 0.5%
- Governance and administration: 0.5%

Note: Three cases analyzed did not have fully developed Transitional Results Frameworks; in these cases, analysis of activities was based on the narrative section. Information on indicators is not presented as it was only available in one of the six cases analyzed.


![Figure 9 – Extent of inclusion of women’s needs and issues in PCNAs by thematic area (as percentage)](image)

**Thematic area**

- Economic recovery and infrastructure
- Security and rule of law
- Social protection and human rights
- Education
- Health
- Governance and administration

**Example**

- Economic recovery and infrastructure: Creating temporary employment for women
- Security and rule of law: Disarmament and demobilization of ex-combatants, including women formerly associated with armed groups
- Social protection and human rights: Providing free legal aid clinics and building capacity of women’s organizations
- Education: Attracting, training and retaining female teachers
- Health: Building sanitary facilities in schools for girls and boys
- Governance and administration: Developing affirmative action programmes in the civil service

**Overall**

- In Somalia, a special women’s symposium was held to reflect gender priorities in the final PCNA document. Attended by 140 representatives, the symposium also drew on women’s contribution to peacebuilding and implementation of the framework.

Box 6 – Examples of women’s needs and issues addressed in PCNAs

This was found to have the lowest degree of analysis and provision for women’s needs.
5. Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers

Initiated by the World Bank and IMF in 1999, PRSPs describe a country’s macroeconomic, structural and social policies and programmes over a period of three or more years to promote growth and reduce poverty, as well as associated external financing needs and major sources of financing. They are prepared by member states through a participatory process, and often take on nationally specific names. The process involves government, civil society organizations, the private sector, sectoral experts, local communities, and international institutions such as the UN, World Bank, IMF and regional organizations.

A PRSP is usually structured according to the following sections: analysis of the poverty situation in the country; process of preparation; analysis of priority sectors and sub-sectors, goals and targets; macroeconomic framework; costing; implementation; and monitoring, evaluation and reporting. PRSPs attempt to bridge national public actions, donor support and development impact needed to meet the MDGs. As strategic planning frameworks with significant budgetary allocations, it is critical that they address and fund women’s specific needs and issues.

As with PCNAs, however, an analysis of five PRSPs reveals that women’s needs and issues received significantly more attention in the narrative section than at the planning level, in the logical framework. Low and diminishing levels of gender sensitivity were evident from activities (6 per cent) and indicators (5 per cent) to budget (2.6 per cent; see Figure 10).

Among the thematic areas, education, and social protection and human rights demonstrated the highest incorporation of women’s needs and issues at the level of activities and indicators. It is worth noting, however, that both the budget share and the absolute amount allocated to the social protection and human rights area comprise a very low percentage of the budget as a whole (see Figure 11). An analysis of PRSP budgets along thematic lines found education and health to be the most gender responsive.

Consistent with earlier findings in this review, economic recovery and infrastructure again attracts a sizeable proportion of total funds while doing little to target women directly. Box 8 shows specific examples of how PRSPs addressed women’s needs and issues.

### Figure 10 – Extent of inclusion of women’s needs and issues in PRSPs (as percentage of total budget)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Activities (percentage)</th>
<th>Indicators (percentage)</th>
<th>Budget (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic recovery and infrastructure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and rule of law</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social protection and human rights</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and administration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Estimation by UN Women.

### Figure 11 – Extent of inclusion of women’s needs and issues in PRSPs by thematic area (as percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Activities (percentage)</th>
<th>Indicators (percentage)</th>
<th>Budget (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic recovery and infrastructure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and rule of law</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social protection and human rights</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and administration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Estimation by UN Women.

### Box 7. Pakistan’s 2010-2011 Assessment

In 2010 the Government of Pakistan initiated an assessment under the PCNA framework, targeting two areas of the country—Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) and the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA). It was undertaken in partnership with the Asian Development Bank, the European Commission, the World Bank and the United Nations, and under the leadership of the KP Provincial Government, the FATA Secretariat, and the Pakistani Federal Government.

The Pakistan assessment benefitted from the support of a full-time gender adviser, with systematic support from the UN Women Pakistan Country Director and gender focal points from across the UN and partner entities. The outcome document reflects this. The narrative contains a gender conflict and social analysis and sex-disaggregated data in key areas including literacy, education, employment and population demographics. Gender equality is identified as one of three cross cutting issues because of “the extreme marginalization of women and girls in FATA and KP, and their very restricted ability to contribute fully to peace building”.

This emphasis in the narrative is translated to some degree into the outcomes, results, activities, and corresponding budgets. Of the 59 outcomes in the Transitional Results Framework, 28.8% can be categorized as gender-responsive, with 14.9% of outputs and 8.1% of all activities classified as gender responsive. Correlated to this, 6.1% of the budget is allocated to gender responsive activities. While this falls short of the UN’s stated 15% goal, it is above the 2.9% budget average noted in this paper.

### Box 8 – Examples of women’s needs and issues addressed in PRSPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic recovery and infrastructure</td>
<td>Improving women’s access to and management of factors of production, i.e., land, labour and capital, including in agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social protection and human rights</td>
<td>Offering skills training for widows, as well as poor and disabled women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Increasing female school enrolment and retention through scholarships, take-home rations and other incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Provision of emergency obstetric care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and administration</td>
<td>Development of gender-sensitive budgets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Main findings and relationships among planning frameworks

The findings presented above show clearly that although analysis of women’s experiences of conflict and consequent specific recovery needs is addressed to some extent in the narrative portion of the frameworks studied, this analysis is for the most part not translated into specific activities and indicators in results frameworks, even though it is ostensibly the source for the latter. Moreover, where activities and indicators do directly target women, they are not adequately matched with gender-responsive budget allocations.

Three specific trends regarding the gender content of strategic planning frameworks are revealed by the present study. First, planning frameworks that are more closely linked to implementation, such as MDTFs, display greater attention to gender sensitivity at all levels (activities, indicators and budgets) compared to more ambitious overarching frameworks such as PPSs and PCNAs. This is probably due to the smaller unit of analysis that makes their project specification details, e.g., project description, objectives, outputs, activities, stakeholders, whose relatively narrow focus allows for the identification of concrete activities and targeted stakeholders, including beneficiaries.

Second, the gender-responsiveness of budgets was consistently lower than that of indicators, which in turn lagged behind that of activities. With the exception of UNDAF, the highest proportion of budget allocation specifically targeting women was a mere 11 per cent, in the case of MDTFs. PPSs allocated the smallest proportion of funds directly to women and girls, with only 2 per cent of the budget being explicitly gender responsive.

UNDAF’s stand out starkly in contrast: about 30 per cent of the entire budget allocated to activities and indicators directly addressed women’s needs and issues. One reason for this difference could be that the development of an UNDAF routinely includes consultations with a broad range of stakeholders from both government agencies to civil society, including women’s rights advocates. Where women participate, they are able, for instance, to underscore the importance of incentivizing agricultural extension officers to target women clients, or providing more resources for water supply, both huge priorities for women. This would certainly explain the difference between UNDAF and PCNAs or MDTFs, in which the participation of national stakeholders is often more limited.

It is not, however, the whole story: PPSs are almost always developed through a broadly consultative process, and while women’s content is slightly higher than at the lowest level than that of PCNAs, it falls far below that of UNDAFs. That in the past PCNAs rarely undertook consultations specifically targeted to identify the needs and issues of women and girls may be a contributing factor. This is slowly changing as a result of consistent efforts by the UN to deploy gender expertise to PCNA processes. This is slowly changing as a result of consistent efforts by the UN to deploy gender expertise to PCNA processes.

Third, of the six thematic areas identified in this review, social protection, health and education showed the highest degree of gender-responsiveness in their corresponding activities, indicators and associated budgets, whereas economic and reproductive activities, access to and control over resources, and gender-based obstacles in access to services and post-conflict needs, including physical security, the risk of gender-based violence or the scarcity of income-generating activities for women.

7. Recommendations

In light of the limitations identified in this review, a number of recommendations can be made to develop a systematic approach to mainstreaming gender in planning frameworks:

a. Gender analysis should be included from the beginning of all processes to produce planning frameworks and should routinely include consultations with women and/or women’s organizations and women’s rights activists.

Robust gender analysis initiated from the beginning of planning processes is needed. A good practice for achieving this could be to conduct broad consultations to identify women’s needs and ways to address them, or if time and resources do not permit, at least to conduct targeted consultations with women’s organizations and women’s rights activists. Gender analysis in planning processes should acknowledge differences in economic and reproductive activities, access to and control over resources, and gender-based obstacles in access to services and post-conflict needs, including physical security, the risk of gender-based violence or the scarcity of income-generating activities for women.

b. Ensure that adequate expertise is available to those undertaking a planning exercise to support their incorporation of gender issues in planning frameworks.

The availability of adequate expertise to assess gender-specific needs and issues, as well as to integrate gender is mainstreamed throughout the planning process, must be a priority. This expertise should be available from the beginning of the process, as it is difficult to incorporate analysis or recommendations from gender specialists once the assessment process has already begun. Mandating gender analysis throughout the process and ensuring adequate expertise is available and utilized will help to ensure that women’s needs and issues are fully reflected in planning frameworks.

Engaging more women as experts is also needed. The relative dearth of women in policymaking partly explains why more funding is not devoted to issues of high priority for women. Women participating in expert groups, if they exist, need to be automatically equated with the availability of expertise on gender equality issues.

c. Specifically target the areas of economic recovery and infrastructure, and security and rule of law, for improved gender sensitivity in planning frameworks.

Targeted efforts should be made to address gender-specific needs and issues in areas that receive the highest levels of funding, such as economic recovery and infrastructure, and security and rule of law. These efforts could include specific reviews in economic recovery and infrastructure-related activities in these areas to indeed benefit men and women equally. Guidance should be developed to highlight good practice on how to incorporate gender issues within these thematic areas, including what specific activities are good practice in addressing women’s needs, and effective indicators for monitoring mainstreaming efforts. Incorporating a full-time gender expert within the relevant clusters may also be beneficial.

d. Gender should be both a cross-cutting issue and a major outcome or sub-outcome in logical frameworks.

The identification of gender as a cross-cutting issue in post-conflict planning and financing has not been matched with a framework that facilitates incorporating a gender perspective in budget allocation and implementation planning. Addressing women’s needs and issues need must go beyond the narrative, and the gap between assessment, planning and implementation must be closed.

A key recommendation in this regard is that gender needs should be identified as both a cross-cutting issue and as a major outcome or sub-outcome. In other words, women’s needs and issues need to be more routinely incorporated into logical frameworks and budget levels within each of the thematic areas. Without such clarity in purpose and costing, it will be difficult to monitor progress and ensure adequate funding.

e. Use gender-disaggregated data.

Gender-disaggregated data are needed to consistently measure and evaluate financing for gender-specific needs in countries emerging from conflict. The TRFs and logical frameworks provide an existing monitoring framework where gender-disaggregated information can be easily called for. To adopt TRFs and logical frameworks to better incorporate gender issues, all sectors need to consider the beneficiaries (e.g., women and girls, along with other target groups) at each level of the TRF or logical framework—from outcomes, activities and indicators to specific budget allocations.

f. Set a minimum level of expenditures on gender issues.

A core recommendation of the UN Secretary-General’s 2010 Report on UN Women’s Activities in Peacebuilding is that UN entities to work towards “a goal of ensuring that at least 15 per cent of UN-managed funds in support of peacebuilding is dedicated to projects whose principal objective (consistent with organizational mandates) is to address women’s specific needs, advance gender equality or empower women.”

Box 9. Principles and Practices for integrating Gender Equality into PCNAs

In April 2011 the UN, World Bank and European Commission came together with the objective of agreeing on a common set of measures to be incorporated into PCNA processes to support the better incorporation of men and women’s different needs and priorities into PCNA outcome documents, including results frameworks, targets, budgets and indicators. The following measures were agreed.

• Ensure assessment team includes at least one gender expert.
• Consult with civil society organizations and with women’s groups specifically.
• Promote gender balance in assessment teams.
• Ensure systems for the collection of sex-disaggregated data.
• Ensure gender analysis is incorporated into any pre-assessment planning process.
• Encourage the inclusion of reservations of employment opportunities for women, public service providers (health, agriculture extension, teachers, etc.) during the assessment and in the outcome document.

The Yemen Joint Socio-Economic Assessment (JSEA) was the first assessment carried out under the PCNA principles after the agreement of these measures. A Gender and Peacebuilding Expert was deployed to the assessment core team and worked with sector clusters to collect and analyze sex-disaggregated data, which was lacking in humanitarian response systems. Although the core and sector clusters achieved a good gender balance and members of the assessment team met with women’s groups, data collection faced key challenges linked to the inability to move outside the capital, which hindered primary data collection. As a result, much of the gendered conflict analysis had to rely on interviews with key informants which were in many cases dismissed as not representative.

While the outcome document is not yet final, and will likely not include a Transitional Results Framework, there is an indication that these efforts have helped the Government of Yemen to produce a gender-responsive assessment which includes sex-disaggregated data across all sectors, a description of the impact of the conflict on women in all sectors and specific section dedicated to a gender analysis of the conflict.
The current low level of expenditure in planning frameworks allocated to address gender-specific needs illustrates the difficulty of prioritizing gender needs without mandating a proportion of funds for this purpose. The most logical way to redress the current funding imbalance is to implement the commitment suggested by the UN Secretary-General to a minimum level of expenditures explicitly targeting gender issues. The goal of 15 per cent, however, should be accompanied by an effort to mainstream gender in the remaining 85 per cent of the managed funds. A precedent for this approach exists: UNDP’s Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery has implemented a minimum requirement of 15 per cent of programme expenditures to advance gender equality.

g. Establish a gender marker to identify funding for gender issues.

A gender marker was initiated in 2007 by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee, to track funding for projects and programmes that include gender equality as a significant or principal objective. In 2009, the UN Secretary-General called for all UN-managed funds to institute a gender marker. Shortly thereafter, a gender marker pilot was conducted for humanitarian appeals and funding mechanisms within the UN.

Tracking funding for gender equality has a double benefit: it generates an estimate of funding allocated to gender equality; it also ensures that practitioners gain a better understanding of how to incorporate gender equality objectives within a project, as this is required to assess projects and programmes, and implement the marker. It is important to perform independent and random audits of the marking system to ensure its adequate and coherent application. A specific gender report, modeled on the gender marker, could also routinely accompany planning frameworks.

Sources


documents used for analysis of Multi-Partner Trust Fund projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of projects used in calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>As of June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This review analyzed 202 project documents covering six case study countries – Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Iraq, Sierra Leone, Sudan and Timor-Leste. Overall, these projects amounted to US$1.024 million and were reviewed in two phases, 87 cases were analyzed as of June 2010 and 115 cases additionally available as of April 2012. In the case of Iraq, all estimations for projects as of 2010 were based on a sample of 25 of 184 projects amounting to $200 million out of $1.335 million. The only exception was the aggregated budget analysis that covered all 184 projects.

### Endnotes:

4. While Integrated Strategic Frameworks are becoming a more commonly used UN planning tool they are not addressed in this paper.

### Annex:

#### United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks


### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of projects used in calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>As of June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### United Nations Development Group


### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of projects used in calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>As of June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This review analyzed 202 project documents covering six case study countries – Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Iraq, Sierra Leone, Sudan and Timor-Leste. Overall, these projects amounted to US$1.024 million and were reviewed in two phases, 87 cases were analyzed as of June 2010 and 115 cases additionally available as of April 2012. In the case of Iraq, all estimations for projects as of 2010 were based on a sample of 25 of 184 projects amounting to $200 million out of $1.335 million. The only exception was the aggregated budget analysis that covered all 184 projects.

### Endnotes:

4. While Integrated Strategic Frameworks are becoming a more commonly used UN planning tool they are not addressed in this paper.