



STOP RAPE NOW

UN ACTION AGAINST SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN CONFLICT

Review of the UN Action Multi Partner Trust Fund



Table of Contents

| | | |
|------|---|-----------|
| I. | Executive Summary | 3 |
| II. | Background | 8 |
| III. | Introduction..... | 8 |
| IV. | Findings..... | 10 |
| 1. | To what extent did the MPTF meet its objectives?..... | 10 |
| 2. | What is the added value of the UNA MPTF? | 20 |
| 3. | Are there any aspects in which the fund fell short of its expectations? | 21 |
| 4. | Did the MPTF facilitate closer collaboration and joined up work of UN Agencies? | 23 |
| 5. | Were the MPTF projects catalytic?..... | 26 |
| 6. | Were the project results sustainable? | 27 |
| 7. | Did some UNA members resort to the MPTF more than others? | 29 |
| 8. | How effective were the governance and management arrangements of the Fund? | 30 |
| 9. | What was the role of the MPTF in the context of other funding mechanisms? | 36 |
| V. | Recommendations for consideration when designing the next phase of the MPTF | 38 |
| | Annexes | 42 |

Review of the UN Action Multi Partner Trust Fund

I. Executive Summary

UN Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict (UNA) commissioned a review of its Multi-Partner Trust Fund (TF), which was established in January 2009 to mobilize funds to support a range of projects and the UNA Secretariat. As the current phase of the TF expires on 31 December 2019, the review aims to learn lessons and draw recommendations that can inform the creation of the next phase of the trust fund. It identifies areas of success and areas in which the fund fell short of its expectations and opportunities that might have been missed. It will make practical and strategic recommendations to its stakeholders for consideration when designing a new phase of the TF. The following highlights the key findings of the review, which was conducted between March and July 2019:

Strengths / Achievements of the UNA MPTF

1. Galvanized UN Action by funding a small Secretariat, which was tasked with supporting and coordinating the UNA Focal Points, the Steering Committee and the UNA Strategic Framework.
2. Increased the visibility of conflict-related sexual violence (CRSV) and supported advocacy for a normative / policy framework including Security Council resolutions 1820 (2008), 1888 (2009), 1960 (2010), 2106 (2013), 2242 (2015), 2331(2016) and 2467 (2019) – which formally established the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict (SRSG-SVC), the team of experts on rule of law and sexual violence in conflict (TOE), and women protection advisers (WPAs).
3. Operationalized the OSRSG-SVC, the TOE, and the WPAs by paying salaries and providing resources for travel, technical advice, and small projects.
4. Connected UNHQ and the field by helping to fill budgetary gaps to develop important guidelines, materials, and policy frameworks to operationalize and coordinate the work on CRSV including the implementation of various Security Council resolutions (SCRs) and joint communiqués.
5. Reduced competition and increased the coherence, efficiency, and effectiveness of projects by pooling funds that could be used by several agencies for multi-sectoral projects that filled funding gaps and catalyzed opportunities that would not have been possible without the TF. CRSV is a complex and politically sensitive issue that requires a multi-sector, holistic response. When harnessed effectively, the TF did encourage better coordination and collaboration between UN entities by leveraging the particular areas of expertise of each agency.
6. Enabled UN agencies to test innovative ideas and provide proof of concept.

Areas for improvement

1. A common strategy and objectives that comprise UN Action, OSRSG SVC and the TOE and spells out complementary roles and responsibilities of each entity needs to be articulated.
2. The UN Action Secretariat's staffing structure is inadequate to implement all roles foreseen for the Secretariat, which include coordination of the network, catalyzing a coordinated, comprehensive, coherent response to CRSV, providing Secretariat support for the network and its chair, the SRSG-SVC as well as supporting the programmatic management and oversight of the TF.
3. Due to the lack of robust monitoring, evaluation, and reporting it is difficult to measure the TF's contributions beyond the identifying individual project outputs. Furthermore, the network missed out on opportunities to learn from projects. It will also be hard to measure the overall achievement of the fund.
4. A lot of progress has been made in terms of political awareness and the establishment of a robust normative/policy framework reflected in SCRs on conflict-related sexual violence and joint communiqués. However, interviewees reflected that more needs to be done to translate these commitments to actual implementation. Reflected in the small size of the overall TF, its TORs and small amount of funds allotted to each project, this can not be the responsibility of the TF alone. The implementation of resolutions and joint communiqués needs to be supported by signatories, the UN system and civil society as a whole, with the TF supporting to kick-start initiatives through catalytic funding.
5. There is a lack of awareness of the TF in NYHQ and in the field in general, and in particular regarding purpose of the fund, how much money is available in the fund, and what projects are funded, despite a public website of the fund¹.

Recommendations

General Recommendations:

UNA needs the commitment of principals at the highest level and revitalization in order to maximize the use of the MPTF. It needs clear goals, strategies to reach those goals, and better ways to measure progress and show results. The following steps may assist in this process.

- 1) With the recently updated Theory of Change of UN Action, determine how the MPTF can support UNA to serve its function and achieve its objectives.
- 2) Develop a multi-year strategy for UN Action and the MPTF and finalize the results framework with specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-oriented (SMART) Objectives.
- 3) Revise the TORs for each component of the UNA MPTF including the UNA Secretariat, Steering Committee, Focal Points, Resource Management Committee (RCM).
- 4) Ensure that the Secretariat is fit for purpose and has the necessary human resources to serve its core function, roles and responsibilities.

¹ <http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/UNA00>

- 5) Integrate UNA's strategic planning process to promote joined-up and well-sequenced actions by the SRSV-SVC, TOE, and the UNA network. This includes concentration on an updated set of priority countries and emerging situations of concern. UN missions and UNCTs of listed countries need to be on board in shaping the support required including the determination of gaps that the MPTF can help to fill.
- 6) Determine how the MPTF can be harnessed to reinforce global and country level efforts to address CRSV. This should result in a revised strategy, TOR, and results framework for the MPTF. It should also include an accountability and compliance mechanism that ensures that all entities benefitting from the MPTF share programmatic efforts and financial expenditure in a timely and transparent manner.
- 7) Once all of the above is complete, the OSRSV-SVC, the UNA Secretariat, and the TOE should develop an integrated advocacy, external relations, and resource mobilization and partnerships strategy.
- 8) Enhance communication and build relations between UNHQ and the field to maximize the effectiveness of entities at each level. This should include clearly defining the role and expectations of the OSRSV-SVC in relation to the UNA entities at the country level particularly in relation to country-level analysis, strategy, prioritization, and proposal design and approval. This should be a transparent and collaborative process.

Recommendations on increasing the impact of funding

- 9) Priority countries should be decided by the UN Action Steering Committee in close consultation with the UN Action Focal Points. The RMC should ensure that projects focus on these priority countries and that project fits into a larger country-level strategy on CRSV.
- 10) Funded projects should fit into the ongoing UN country-level response. Therefore, project proposal templates need to be updated to ensure that project plans articulate the links to such larger strategies and that sustainability plans are included

Recommendations on strengthening collaboration and coordination and learning

- 11) A joint planning framework and regular communication between UNA (Secretariat and RMC), OSRSV-SVC, and TOE on country priorities is essential. It is important to note that UN Action focal points will support the development of the joint planning framework and will be involved in country-specific discussions.
- 12) Focal Points should be properly orientated regarding all aspects of the MPTF by the MPTF Office and the UN Action Secretariat. Focal Points should be responsible for communicating information regarding the MPTF within their agency to colleagues in HQ and the field on a regular basis.
- 13) The Secretariat should brief the Focal Points and the RMC members prior to and after the proposal submission process the outcome of RMC meetings. The meeting notes from the RMC review process should be provided to the focal points.
- 14) Knowledge products developed by projects should consistently be made available and reviewed by the network to enhance shared learning. A repository of such documents should be maintained and accessible to all UN Action Members.

Recommendations for strengthening the catalytic potential and sustainability of MPTF projects

- 15) Project proposals should clearly articulate if and how the projects are anticipated to be catalytic. Then, M&E and other reporting tools including final reports, impact evaluations, etc. should explain the catalytic effects of the project. In addition, in some instances, greater financial resources and longer timeframes should be allocated per project if the MPTF projects are expected to have a significant catalytic effect.
- 16) The UN Action Secretariat and UN Action Focal Points of the related agencies should monitor the sustainability of the project throughout the project implementation. If concerns arise, the RMC and focal points of the respective agencies should be informed. If no solution can be found internally in due time, donors should be informed. In that regard, it is recommended that the UN Action Secretariat and the RMC also has regular conversations with donors.
- 17) Focal Points meetings should include regular updates on the funds available in the trust fund and encouraged to share the information on the fund with their counterparts in the field. Focal points also need to proactively and in a coordinated manner identify gaps in CRSV response in countries of concern and encourage their country offices to address these concerns, if needed via submitting a project proposal to the MPTF.

Recommendation for Governance Arrangements:

- 18) One of the key steps to address many of the concerns raised would be to ensure adequate staffing of the UN Action Secretariat relevant to its function. This needs to include a: Lead Coordinator (P-5); Coordination and Programme Officer (P-4); Grants Manager and M&E Specialist (P-3); a Research and Knowledge Manager (P-3) and an administrative assistant. Additional CRSV programme experts could be seconded from UN Action member entities on a rotating basis to drive specific initiatives of the network. The TOR for the Secretariat and each of these positions should be revised including its roles, functions, and responsibilities.

Recommendation for the proposal review process

- 19) The review process should start with the submission of a project concept note, or lighter document for consideration by the RMC to demonstrate proof of concept and whether it fits UN Action's priorities and country strategies. Following a positive outcome of this initial review, the submitting entities would be invited to submit a long-form proposal.
- 20) The templates for the long-form proposals need to be updated to require log frames for tracking the project's impact; a context analysis to help situate the proposed projects into the larger context of CRSV; a description how activities are coordinated with other humanitarian plans or initiatives; and a Do-No-Harm and risk analysis.
- 21) The RMC also needs to produce standardized budget guidance including value-for-money indicators, percentage of project costs can be staff costs and ensure that project timelines and budgets are realistic in relation to the proposed project.
- 22) The UN Action Secretariat should allow adequate time for the RMC to review proposals.
- 23) RMC members need to be aware of and manage their institutional and sector bias in order to serve the entire UNA network, rather than their individual entity or sector particularly when providing constructive feedback and deciding which proposals should be accepted – the exclusion of the focal point from the decision-making process has been a way to manage that.

- 24) The RMC should also consider to keep the link with external technical experts and donors as needed and to reinstate the annual donors' conference where the impact of projects and lessons learned could be discussed. This would increase the substantive and political debate, enhance donor interest and engagement with UNA and the MPTF.

Recommendation for Project Evaluation and Lessons Learning:

- 25) The UN Action Secretariat should provide feedback on the effectiveness of implementation, challenges, progress towards outcomes and impact, and learning. In order to do so, the UN Action Secretariat needs to invest a significant amount of time into following up with each project, regular check-ins, joint monitoring visits and frequent results-based project-reporting (at least every six months). This will help the Secretariat, the RMC members and focal points to learn from what worked and what did not in order to apply learning to help strengthen future proposals and projects both conceptually and operationally. This would mean that the UN Action Secretariat needs to recruit a full-time M&E expert for this work.
- 26) In addition, the UN Action Focal Points for the agencies implementing a project should participate in the monitoring and provide technical advice to their field counterparts where needed. This would allow to increase learning from different projects, enhance coordination between agencies at the HQ level and improve the technical advice provided to project entities in order to maximize the complementarities of various UN agencies.
- 27) According to the MOU of the MPTF, agencies who receive funds are supposed to use their procedures for monitoring and evaluation. The Secretariat should ensure that those evaluations are shared and lessons are learned and incorporated. In addition, the Secretariat should share the best practices and lessons learned via both internal UN discussions and larger forums that include participants from outside the UN, including donors.

Recommendation on engagement with donors:

- 28) UNA and OSRSG-SVC leadership should consistently engage with the donors to explain how the UN Action network works in complementarity to OSRSG SVC and remains essential for addressing CRSV. An integrated resource mobilization and partnerships strategy across UNA, OSRSG and the Team of Experts would be useful in that regard. Furthermore, UN Action should transparently engage donors to discuss not only project results but also challenges and setbacks. The revival of the annual donor meetings should be considered.
- 29) The UN Action RMC should contextualize how the MPTF fits into the larger financial landscape. This investment would be beneficial for determining global funding gaps, prioritizing projects, and increasing the sustainability of the projects supported by the UNA MPTF. It may also have a positive impact on the overall effort to address CRSV at the global and country level.
- 30) UN Action should use the global attention in 2019 and in particular around the 10-year anniversary of SCR 1888 to present its unique added value and engage with donors

II. Background

United Nations Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict (UNA) was created following the Brussels Call to Action in 2006 to provide system wide coordination on prevention and response to conflict-related sexual violence (CRSV) with the goal of ending sexual violence during and in the wake of armed conflict. Endorsed by the Secretary-General's Policy Committee in June 2007, it represents a concerted effort by the UN to “work as one” – amplifying advocacy, improving coordination and accountability, and supporting country efforts to prevent conflict-related sexual violence and respond effectively to the needs of survivors. The network currently includes 14 UN entities as members². UNA is chaired by the SRSG on Sexual Violence in Conflict (SRSG-SVC) and supported by a Secretariat, located in the Office of the SRSG-SVC (OSRSG-SVC).

In January 2009, UNA established a Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) to mobilize funds to support a range of projects and the Secretariat. Administered by the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTFO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the MPTF supports the joint projects of UNA as outlined in its annual Strategic Framework in the following priority areas³:

- 1. Support to country-level action:** The network provides strategic support to UN Missions and Country Teams in priority countries to address CRSV;
- 2. Advocacy for Action:** Action to raise public awareness and generate political will to address conflict-related sexual violence;
- 3. Knowledge generation,** with the goal of deepening our understanding of CRSV and the needs of survivors and to develop guidance on emerging issues of concern.

Its Terms of Reference and Operational Guidance as well as relevant project documents can be found at the website of the [MPTF Gateway](#)⁴.

In November 2011, the MPTF expanded its scope to include support the United Nations Team of Experts on the Rule of Law and Sexual Violence in Conflict (TOE).⁵ A mid-term review of the TOE was recently completed, therefore this review will only cover the UN Action window of the Multi-Partner Trust Fund.

III. Introduction

As the current trust fund expires on 31 December 2019, UN Action undertook a review of the trust fund to learn lessons and draw recommendations that can inform the creation of the next phase of the trust fund. The review seeks to establish to what extent the MPTF has met its objective. It identifies areas of success and areas in which the fund fell short of its expectations and opportunities that might have been missed. It will make practical and strategic recommendations to its stakeholders for consideration when designing a new phase of an MPTF.

² DPO, DPPA, IOM, OCHA, OHCHR, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNODC, UNODA, UN Women and WHO. OSRSG-CAAC also participate as observers.

³ See UNA Multi-Donor Trust Fund – Terms of Reference

⁴ <http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/UNA00>

⁵ The TOE was established under Operative Paragraph 8 of Security Council Resolution 1888 (2009).

Scope: The review covers the period from the inception of the MPTF in December 2008 to date. It is important to note that this review has solely focused on the trust fund, which as a system is governed by the UN Action Secretariat, the Resource Management Committee (RMC), the Steering Committee, the SRSG as its chair, and the UNDP MPTF Office as administrative agent. It is not an evaluation or a review of UNA as a whole.

Questions: Per the Terms of Reference (TOR) for this review, the following questions constitute the scope of this review.⁶

1. Did the MPTF facilitate closer collaboration and joined up work of UN Agencies at the national and international level? If so how? If not, why not? How can this be improved?
2. Were projects catalytic? If so how? If not, why not? How can this be improved?
3. Were the project results sustainable? If so, how? If not, why not? How can this be improved?
4. What was the value added of the MTPF? How can it have a greater value added?
5. What has been the added value for UN Action member entities of working through the MPTF?
6. Did some UN Action member entities resort to the MPTF for funding more than others and if so, why?
7. How effective were the governance and management arrangements of the Fund? How can this be improved?
8. Are there any aspects in which the fund fell short of its expectations? If so, which? How can that be addressed in the future?
9. Were there opportunities over the past ten years in the CRSV agenda which the fund did not address? Were there gaps that it could have addressed? How can this be improved?
10. What was the role of the fund in the context of other funding mechanisms that address CRSV? What role can it have in the future in relation to these other funding mechanisms?
11. What are the opportunities for the next phase of an MPTF? Are there specific areas that it can and should address?

Methodology and Timeframe: The review process, which was conducted from January 22 to April 22, 2019, included the following phases:

- | | |
|----------|---------------------------------------|
| Phase 1. | Desk review (See Annex A) |
| Phase 2. | Interviews (See Annex B) |
| Phase 3. | Data analysis & synthesis of findings |
| Phase 4. | Presentation of draft report |
| Phase 5. | Final report and debrief |

⁶ Based on these general guidelines for the review, templates were developed for interviews with various stakeholders. These are provided in Annex C.

IV. Findings

1. To what extent did the MPTF meet its objectives?

Since its inception the MPTF has made progress toward addressing the myriad of issues related to CRSV. For example, the MPTF contributed to the development of a robust normative / policy framework and the UN's institutional architecture for addressing CRSV including the passage of multiple Security Council resolutions (SCR) and the formation of the SRSG on SVC and the Team of Experts (TOE). More specific examples of achievements are provided throughout the report.

However, exact measuring of results is difficult due to the nature of CRSV, the stigma surrounding it and the difficulty of measuring prevention. In addition, for most of the period of the MPTF, UNA did not add indicators of achievements to its strategic framework that would allow measurement of results. Only in 2016 was a results framework developed.⁷ Since this time several of the project proposals included more robust results frameworks.

In addition, the trust fund lacked a conscious strategy towards monitoring and evaluation that also inhibited the measurement of results. For example, the majority of the projects funded by the MPTF lack mid-term or final evaluations. This can be explained by the fact that many of the projects funded by UNA are very small, hence mid-term or final evaluations may be prohibitively expensive. For most of the projects, the final reports of the projects indicate whether or not the activities took place and with what level of success. For the review, these project documents and interviews with those who were closely involved in the fund provided valuable insights, lessons learned, and recommendations.

The MPTF was effective in making progress toward addressing the myriad of issues related to CRSV that are outlined further below. For example, during UNA's inception phase, the TF was very important and effective for several reasons including that it:

- Provided interested donors with a pooled-funding mechanism to support a politically sensitive topic and it encouraged multi-donor, cross-agency, and multi-sectoral projects.
- Galvanized UNA by funding a small Secretariat, which was tasked with supporting and coordinating the UNA Focal Points and Steering Committee in implementing the UNA Strategic Framework.
- Increased the visibility of CRSV and advocated for a robust normative / policy framework including SCR 1820 (2008), 1888 (2009), 1960 (2010), 2106 (2013), 2242 (2015), 2331(2016) and SCR 2467 (2019) – which formally established the SRSG-SVC, the TOE⁸, and the WPAs.
- Operationalized the OSRSG-SVC, the TOE, and WPAs by paying salaries and providing resources for travel, technical advice, and small projects.
- Connected UNHQ and the field by helping to fill budgetary gaps to develop important guidelines, materials, and policy frameworks to operationalize and coordinate the work on CRSV including the implementation of various SCRs and joint communiqués.

⁷ See Annex D

⁸ The TOE, which consists of representatives of DPO, UNDP, and OHCHR is completely dependent on extra-budgetary funding, which are currently provided by the TF.

- Enabled UN agencies to test innovative ideas and provide proof of concept.

It is also worth noting that the lack of a specific strategy, action plan, and indicators of achievement in the beginning may have been beneficial for UNA to develop organically as opportunities arose without being constrained by a rigorous framework. This was certainly the case during the first few years. However, with the establishment of the OSRSG-SVC, the TOE, and the formation of a robust normative / policy framework including multiple Security Council resolutions, more structure and better articulated strategy for UN Action would have increased the focus, effectiveness, and the ability of the fund to show results and setbacks. For example, while it is possible to show the outputs and some outcomes of individual projects, there is room to better articulate how these fit into a wider strategy at the global level. UN Action has started this process with developing a new Theory of Change that was adopted in May 2019. It would also be important to articulate how the outputs and some outcomes of individual projects fit into the country strategy on addressing CRSV, which is often articulated in Joint Communiqués and Implementation Plans developed in countries of concern.

Recommendation: Develop a multi-year strategy and finalize the results framework with Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-Oriented (SMART) Objectives.

The following section highlights the use of the funds towards the three priorities.

Advocacy for Action

Support for the UNA Secretariat has been a major focus of the MPTF, accounting for a total of about \$8.9 million or 41% of the approved budget⁹. While the Secretariat facilitates all of the pillars of the UNA strategy, it arguably contributes most directly to advocacy and coordination across the UN entities and other stakeholders. The UNA's advocacy has led to a number of achievements, some of which the MPTF directly influenced through specific projects or indirectly through its support to the Secretariat. These include:

- 1) Advocating for normative / policy change leading SCR 1820 (2008) and subsequently 1888 (2009) and 1960 (2010).¹⁰ The MPTF directly and indirectly enabled effective advocacy for SCR 1888 and 1960 -- for example, MPTF funds supported UNA members and the Center for Humanitarian Dialogue to convene a high-level colloquium on addressing CRSV in peace negotiations that influenced provisions of 1888.¹¹¹²
- 2) Advocating successfully for a dedicated SRSG on SVC.¹³ The MPTF also directly supported the OSRSG-SVC to begin operating as soon as it was mandated by providing funds to hire staff immediately.¹⁴
- 3) Drafting the Annual Report of the Secretary General on Sexual Violence in Conflict, which has shaped Security Council resolutions on Sexual Violence in Conflict.

⁹ When speaking about the budget of the MPTF, as the review focuses on the UN Action window of the fund, funds earmarked for the TOE are excluded.

¹⁰ O'Gorman, Eleanor. Review of UNA Against Sexual Violence in Conflict 2007-2012 – Final Report. Cambridge, UK. January 2013. (hereafter UNA Evaluation, 2013).

¹¹ UNA003 Project report.

¹² Additional SCRs passed since the formation of the TF include: 2106 (2013), 2242 (2015) and 2331(2016).

¹³ UNA Evaluation 2013.

¹⁴ UNA011 Project report.

- 4) Generating momentum for CRSV to be integrated into the mandates and reporting of relevant UN missions and agencies.¹⁵ For example, the MPTF has supported Senior Women Protection Advisors in three Peace Operations.
- 5) UNA's advocacy also raised the visibility of CRSV and helped various UN agencies understand its relevance to their mandates. The MPTF resources then enabled UN agencies to explore how to operationalize CRSV, largely through knowledge-building projects such as DPA's *Guidance for Mediators: Addressing Conflict-Related Sexual Violence in Ceasefire and Peace Agreements*.
- 6) The 2013 evaluation of UNA states that the advocacy products "were produced with specific target audiences in mind [and they were] of very high quality and reflect thought in design and impact." For example, a poster was produced with a peacekeeping focus and the slogan 'No Security Without Women's Security' for the launch of the Inventory of Peacekeeping Practices developed on behalf of UNA by UN Women and DPKO.¹⁶
- 7) The MPTF supports the Secretariat to maintain the UNA website, www.stoprape.now, as a repository for advocacy resources and news and an interactive site that encourages solidarity with survivors and it disseminates various advocacy materials and briefings.

While the detailed advocacy strategy is beyond the scope of this review, the Stop-Rape-Now campaign with its clear message and powerful pose has huge potential for use in social media for engaging individuals. It could also be explored how to use the campaign for attracting more unconventional donors (the private sector, high-wealth individuals) to contribute to the next phase of the MPTF.

Recommendation¹⁷: The creation of the new MPTF, which coincides with the 10-year anniversary of SCR 1888 (2009), provide an opportunity to revisit and update UN Action's advocacy approach, including the Stop-Rape-Now Campaign.

Knowledge generation¹⁸

Prior to the formation of UN Action, the issue of conflict-related sexual violence was largely wrapped in silence and there was a need to deepen knowledge and analysis around the issue of CRSV as a particular subset of gender-based violence (GBV). It was also important to determine how to frame the specific issue of CRSV conceptually. The work of UNA and the MPTF provided resources for external experts, the production of guidance materials, and space for dialogue and building consensus around the issue of CRSV. Broadly speaking, in several cases, it is clear that this has enabled various agencies to begin operationalizing the CRSV mandate. In addition, a series of other valuable knowledge products were produced over the years. The following are examples of progress linked with MPTF-support to knowledge-building:

¹⁵ UNA Evaluation 2013.

¹⁶ Additional examples include the *Stop Rape Now* website, the *Get Cross* campaign, and communications support to the UN Missions in Liberia and DRC.

¹⁷ The recommendations provided in the 2013 Review of UNA remain relevant. For example, the review states: "Given the quality of the advocacy strategies, products and relationships that have been developed so far by UNA there is scope for much greater reach and impact with more people undertaking advocacy efforts and disseminating this excellent information and advocacy products."

¹⁸ Approximately \$2,917,519 USD (7%) in UN Action funds were allocated to supporting knowledge generation.

- 1) *Guidance for Mediators: Addressing Conflict-Related Sexual Violence in Ceasefire and Peace Agreements.* Prior to the formation of UNA and the MPTF, there was very little awareness and guidance on the topic of CRSV. For example, even though sexual violence was often used as a tool of war, it was rarely discussed during mediation, peace negotiations and ceasefire arrangements.

Project #UNA003 – *Addressing CRSV in Peace Negotiations: Implementing SCR1820* via UNIFEM, DPA, UNDP, DPKO, and OCHA (May - June 2009) – Approved budget \$99,992 USD (Expenditure \$99,992)

Project # UNA016 – *Building sustainable peace and security for women: Strengthening capacity to address CRSV issues in mediation and peacemaking* via DPA (Dec 2010 – April 2013) – Approved budget \$199,341 USD (Expenditure \$199,214)

Recognizing this gap, the MPTF first supported a high-level colloquium convened in partnership with the Center for Humanitarian Dialogue involving 74 participants. Based on the colloquium, UNIFEM and DPA developed five sets of guidance notes that were distributed via DPA’s Peacemaker website. According to project reports the recommendations from the colloquium influenced provisions of SCR1888, which strengthened the implementation of SCR1820. A year later, DPA’s Policy and Mediation Division used the MPTF to support the publication of *Guidance for Mediators: Addressing Conflict-Related Sexual Violence in Ceasefire and Peace Agreements*. In addition to the publication, the MPTF supported the development of a training module and DPA began implementing the guidance in CAR through the deployment of an expert in 2012 to reinforce national mediation support to the UN’s Integrated Peacebuilding Office in CAR (BINUCA). The expert engaged in outreach and consultations with women’s groups and helped draft the Ceasefire Agreement and Declaration of Principles (2013) which included three concrete SVC provisions. Since its publication, over 16 bi-annual staff trainings were completed as well as annual high-level seminars for mediation actors in the UN, member states, regional organizations, and NGOs, resulting in over 500 people trained, which has raised awareness and helped policy makers, mediators, and other practitioners apply the guidance in their work.¹⁹ According to interviewees, this practical and user-friendly guidebook has been “instrumental in raising the issue of CRSV by mediators during peace negotiations”. After the publication and roll-out of the guidebook, references to CRSV rose from approximately 3 to 12 peace agreements since 2012. CRSV is mentioned more often in ceasefire agreements as criteria for breach of the agreements.

- 2) *GBV Information Management System (GBVIMS)*. The GBVIMS was created in 2007 to harmonize collection and sharing of data on GBV incidents reported to service providers in humanitarian settings was intended to be a simple system to collect, store and analyze GBV data and to enable the safe and ethical sharing of GBV incidents reported to service providers. SCR 1960 established Monitoring, Analysis and Reporting Arrangements (MARA), the aim of which is to provide the SC with timely and reliable information on CRSV incidents. Given the critical gap in quality and ethical data, and the potential of the GBVIMS to support MARA reporting, UN Action funded the GBVIMS between 2012 and 2014. For example, the MPTF supported an inter-agency GBVIMS team that has developed practical guidance/technical tools and provided remote and hands-on technical support to introduce and operationalize the GBVIMS. By the end of 2015, the MPTF had supported a team to provide in-country technical support in eight countries and remote support to an additional seven countries – and the system had been rolled-out to various degrees in over 25 contexts.²⁰ In 2017, the GBVIMS global team supported over 20 countries with both ongoing implementation and new roll-outs. An external evaluation of the GBVIMS from 2008 to 2012 highlighted generally positive results, including several examples that point to

¹⁹ See <https://peacemaker.un.org/resources/mediation-guidance>.

²⁰ UNA022 Project Report and UNA051 ProDoc. UNA051 is ongoing and the final report is not available.

how GBVIMS data have been used to improve safety, advocate for improved service provision, reorient programming or raise funds.²¹ However, many still struggle with analyzing GBVIMS data to understand trends and to improve responses – an issue that the ongoing MPTF-funded project aims to tackle. In addition, conversations around if and how data collected by humanitarian actors using the GBVIMS can contribute to MARA reporting -- while still upholding the basic safety and ethical principles that underpin the GBVIMS -- have been complex, particularly because in some countries these were rolled-out concurrently. With ongoing MPTF support, the GBVIMS team is also working to address this issue, by developing guidance and protocols relating to information sharing between GBVIMS and MARA, and supporting a few countries to implement data sharing, with plans to expand support to additional countries.²²

Translation and Launch of Guidance Note on Reparations for Conflict-Related Sexual Violence. This project aimed to translate and disseminate a guidance note on reparations for CRSV, which was developed by UN Women and OHCHR at the request of the SG’s Policy Committee. The guidance note was successfully translated into French, Spanish and Arabic and launch events were held in New York, London, Tunis and Sarajevo. The result of the project was that UN entities, member states and civil society partners are more aware of the Guidance Note and its key principles and they have developed concrete recommendations for how it could be implemented in local contexts.

Project #UNA033 via UN Women and OHCHR (Jan 2014 – Jun 2016) \$90,950 USD

3) Strengthening medical and psycho-social support to survivors. Several MPTF projects have improved knowledge or helped develop approaches to respond to the medical and psycho-social needs of survivors. Some examples of projects focused on medical and psycho-social support to survivors include:

- *Psychological interventions for adult survivors of conflict-related sexual violence.* The project aimed to develop a manual with the goal of providing specific guidance for paraprofessionals to address common mental health problems related to CRSV in adults.

Project #UNA034 via WHO, UNHCR, and UNFPA (May 2014 – May 2016)- Budget: \$395,900 USD

The objectives included: 1) Developing a psychological intervention that would be suitable for treatment of common mental health problems (anxiety, depression, acute stress) in adult survivors of CRSV; 2) Developing an intervention that could be delivered in a way that did not over-target or stigmatize survivors; and, 3) Developing an intervention that would be more scalable than conventional counselling interventions which require extensive training and supervision. To meet these objectives, WHO in collaboration with partners developed a course called Self Help Plus (SH+), which is a 5-session course delivered in a large group format (up to 30 participants) using pre-recorded audio sessions that are complemented with an illustrated book. The course provides psycho-education on topics such as stress management. The project led to the development of SH+ as a scalable psychological intervention for CRSV survivors that is inexpensive to deliver and does not require specialized expertise, compared with other psychological interventions. Piloting with South Sudanese refugees in northern Uganda showed that SH+ was safe, feasible and shows promise as an intervention for use in humanitarian settings. The pilot also showed that

²¹ International Solutions Group, Evaluation of the Gender Based Violence Information Management System (GBVIMS), 2014.

²² UNA051 ProDoc

SH+ was feasible but did not test whether SH+ was effective in helping survivors manage psychological health problems. The next step was to test SH+ in randomized controlled trials to ensure the intervention is effective. The first pilot was conducted in northern Uganda with supplementary funding and WHO was seeking funding for another trial in Syria. Pending positive results, WHO will publish SH+ on its website along with guidance for implementing it and will work with its partners on dissemination. If successful, SH+ can potentially reach far greater numbers of people with fewer resources than existing interventions.²³

- *Scientific Research Planning Meeting on Aligning HIV and Sexual Violence Prevention and Response.* This project supported a scientific planning meeting that brought together an interdisciplinary group of more than thirty scientists, clinicians, social scientists and policy makers to identify priority research questions and explore the physiological co-factors of sexual violence that increase the risk of HIV acquisition and progression among women and girls. An outcome of the meeting was the Greentree White Paper on Sexual Violence Genito-Anal Injury and HIV which sets out priorities for research, policy and practice. This paper was published in the November Special Issue of AIDS Research and Human Retroviruses. This was the first AIDS publication in the field in over 25 years and the recommendations were taken up in the United States Government AIDS policies.

Project #UNA019 - UNAIDS (March 2011 – June 2012) – Approved budget \$69,550 USD (Expenditure \$69,550)

- *Strengthening the medical-legal response to sexual violence in conflict settings.* This project aimed to improve national system capacity for the collection and use of forensic evidence of sexual violence in conflict-affected settings in order to reduce impunity. The objectives were to (1) provide guidance, based on lessons learned, about what policies and system components need to be in place for appropriate integration of sexual violence forensic evidence collection; and, (2) enable country level actors in the range of sectors related to collection and use of forensic evidence to analyze policies and systems and services, address bottlenecks and plan in a coordinated way. The project led to the publication and dissemination of the WHO/UNODC/UNA Toolkit: *Strengthening the medico-legal responses to sexual violence.*²⁴ An experts meeting was held in 2013 with participants from 12 countries to review lessons from previous efforts and inform the toolkit. Once the toolkit was developed it was field-tested in Kenya. Then, UNODC used the MPTF to implement the guidance in Somalia and WHO was exploring further piloting in DRC.

Project #UNA028 via WHO (Apr 2012 – Dec 2015) - Budget \$197,950 USD (Expenditure \$197,950)

Comments and recommendations to improve knowledge generation:

In general, it would be recommended that the UNA Secretariat and Focal Points be more proactive in sharing information and learning from current and former projects at the global level and within and across countries. It is unclear if and where the publications, toolkits, and research that have been developed through MPTF resources are available. Knowledge products funded through the trust fund should consistently be made available and reviewed by the network to enhance shared learning. It is also important that knowledge products developed in the past are reviewed and redistributed among the network agencies staff or publicly if appropriate. Information sharing should also include debriefs with

²³ It is unclear if and how SH+ is being used at this time. It is also unclear if any evaluations have been conducted to see if it has been effective beyond the initial trials.

²⁴ See <https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/violence/medico-legal-response/en/>

current and former experts and staff to ensure that the institutional memory and learning from their experiences is not lost and mistakes are not repeated. For example, the WPA in Côte D'Ivoire was not asked to provide a briefing on her experience to UNA, the SRSGs or other WPAs. She did, however, draft an end of assignment report that is captured for future WPAs.

Recommendation: Knowledge products developed by projects should consistently be made available and reviewed by the network to enhance shared learning. A repository of such documents should be maintained and accessible to all UN Action Members.

The MPTF should also be used to enhance partnerships with academics and scholar-practitioners to conduct targeted research to better understand the problem definition and to develop the evidence base for CRSV interventions. For example, an interviewee recommended more research related to non-state actors *including violent extremist groups* (i.e. Nigeria, South Sudan, Syria, Iraq) that often have regional and cross-border implications. Additional recommendations included more research focused on the root causes of CRSV including structural and gender inequalities, the legal policy environment, and harmful social norms; greater understanding of the role of men and boys who are survivors and are potentially at a high risk of becoming perpetrators; the ability and willingness of men and boy victims to access services; as well as CRSV and the LGBTI community.

To complement the work of the MPTF, a limited number of working groups amongst the focal points could be set up on specific topics related to CRSV to promote the development of knowledge and guidance products. The reason for this is that the discussion in monthly focal points meetings is so broad that the development of specific knowledge products would benefit from more focused attention by a few members who take the lead and ensure buy in and contribution from the network. This is something to be discussed with the focal points.

Support to country-level action

Around \$6,024,000 USD (approximately 36% of the approved budget) in UN-Action funds²⁵ were allocated to supporting country-level action over a period of approximately ten years.²⁶ This is a very small amount of resources spread across several fragile and conflict-affected countries including: Bangladesh, South Sudan, Myanmar, Iraq, CAR, Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, Jordan, Lebanon, Somalia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, DRC, Uganda, Libya and Chad. Considering this limited budget and the relatively short length of each project, the MPTF made progress in this priority area, for which there is mostly anecdotal evidence due to the limited availability of results-based written reporting.

A strength of the MPTF in some contexts was that it enabled UN missions to establish in-country capacity to implement the CRSV mandate where this would not have been possible with assessed contributions. In addition, the MPTF helped to provide continuity and sustain focus on CRSV issues by filling gaps in situations in which momentum might have otherwise been lost due to transitions, such as mission draw-downs or other circumstances that might result in temporary gaps in staff or resources. For example, in

²⁵ This term refers to all funds in the MPTF that are not earmarked for the TOE

²⁶ When speaking about the budget of the MPTF, as the review focuses on the UN Action window of the fund, funds earmarked for the TOE are excluded. The TOE's expenditure for country level support was approximately \$24,730,607 over a ten-year period.

Côte d’Ivoire, the MPTF provided continuity by supporting the deployment of a WPA to UNOCI and the continuation of her work through a related project in subsequent years. A mission draw-down is a scenario in which UN Action and the MPTF can make an important impact to ensure that ongoing work on CRSV is being handed over and supported by UN Agencies.

Even if the MPTF projects are meant to fill gaps and to be catalytic, some form of mixed methods (qualitative & quantitative) monitoring and evaluations should be used to determine if the projects achieved their intended impact and the extent to which the projects fills gaps and make a contribution to larger and on-going projects being implemented by the UNA members at the country level.

The following highlights a few strategic areas supported by UN Action’s Trust Fund projects:

- 1) **Implementation of the MARA.** SCR 1960 requested that the SG “establish monitoring, analysis and reporting arrangements (MARA) on CRSV including rape in situations of armed conflict, post-conflict and other situations of concern.”²⁷ The MPTF supported the application of the MARA by providing specialized personnel to set up the mechanism and harmonize analysis on CRSV in several countries. According to interviews and project reports MARA has helped to get the issue of CRSV more focused in SG reports – both country-specific reports and the CRSV-specific report.

- 2) **Senior Women’s Protection Advisors (WPA).** The MPTF supported the strategy of deploying WPAs in UN political missions and peacekeeping operations to increase their capacity to implement the CRSV mandate. In 2012, the United Nations Mission to South Sudan (UNMISS) was the only peacekeeping operation with a WPA. A major constraint was that DPKO decided that WPA posts needed to be funded with extra-budgetary resources. Therefore, in 2012, the MPTF supported a HQ-level SGBV Policy Officer in DPKO who, among other things, worked with the UN Operation in Côte d’Ivoire (UNOCI) and the UN Organization Stabilization Mission in the DRC (MONUSCO) to develop proposals for WPA positions that were subsequently funded by the MPTF. In 2017, the MPTF supported deployment of a WPA to Iraq (UNAMI). Although these posts should be supported with long-term and reliable funding from mission budgets and assessed contributions, the MPTF helped ensure missions in three countries had the initial capacity to put CRSV on their agenda, in a context in which this otherwise would not have been feasible. In addition, after the initial funding from the MPTF, the SWPA posts in MONUSCO, UNAMI were included in the regular mission budget. WPAs appear to have been instrumental in strengthening policy commitments, institutional mechanisms, capacity of national stakeholders, and coordination across the UN system to progress the CRSV mandate in these countries. The following are some examples highlighting how WPAs have contributed to country-level progress:

- **Côte d’Ivoire** – The MPTF’s support to UNOCI helped build high-level commitment within the security forces (*Forces Republicaines de Côte d’Ivoire - FRCI*), and cooperation with UNOCI and the UNCT, to prevent sexual violence. One of the outcomes enabled by the WPA’s efforts was the establishment of a joint FRCI/CNDHCI/UNOCI human rights mechanism that jointly reviews human rights violations, including CRSV committed by the armed forces, resulting in much closer

WPA in Côte d’Ivoire (UNOCI) via DPKO and OHCHR (Project # UNA031) – Aug 2014 – Dec 2016 – \$465,343 USD

²⁷ See <https://www.un.org/sexualviolenceinconflict/tools-for-action/mara/>

monitoring and reporting of CRSV. The WPA also supported the FRCI to implement CRSV commitments such as incorporating it into its code of ethics. Linked with MPTF-funded efforts, the FRCI have adopted a zero-tolerance policy towards rape and the number of documented cases involving FRCI was limited in 2016. The armed forces have also increased their commitment to sensitize and ensure accountability of their personnel and the government has strengthened its policy commitments, including creating a National Committee on CRSV.

- **DRC** – In 2012, the MPTF approved funds to deploy a WPA to MONUSCO to strengthen monitoring, analysis, and investigation of CRSV incidents by MONUSCO’s Joint Human Rights Office (JHRO) and to coordinate the MARA.

WPA in DRC (MONUSCO) via DPKO and OHCHR (Project # UNA027) – June 2012 – Oct 2015 –Budget \$254,262 USD (Expenditure \$225,002 USD)

- **Iraq** – In 2017, a WPA was deployed to UNAMI to support the mission leadership in strengthening coordination between the UN, the Government of Iraq (GOI) and other actors including religious leaders and humanitarian agencies towards implementing the Joint Communiqué on CRSV signed between the GOI and SRSVC in 2016. The WPA’s technical assistance and training for senior and technical government officials has led to increased visibility and awareness of CRSV, evidenced by the appointment of CRSV focal points in the Federal and the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI) Government as well as in key ministries in Baghdad and Erbil. The WPA also established the MARA working group, enabling regular reporting by UNAMI to the SG. The WPA’s role appears to have complemented and facilitated other MPTF-supported initiatives to strengthen responses to CRSV related to ISIL fighters, including support to UNDP and UN Women to strengthen legal aid and support services to at risk populations as well as two TOE deployments in 2017, which assessed responses to CRSV related to ISIL.²⁸

WPA in Iraq (UNAMI) – via UNAMI & UNOHCHR (Project # UNA048) – Feb 2017 – Feb 2018 –Budget \$243,988 USD (Expenditure \$165,118 USD)

3) **Strengthening multi-dimensional support to survivors.** Multiple MPTF projects strengthened support services for survivors, including medical, psycho-social and legal aid services. Overall, the available project reports point to improvements in the quality and sensitivity of care and access to legal aid and other support services by conflict-affected populations in key countries of concern. The following are some examples:

- **Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH)** – The MPTF supported two projects in BiH. The first project focused on (1) Supporting the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees (MHHR) to develop a comprehensive programme/policy framework to adequately address treatment of survivors of sexual violence during the 1992-95 conflict; (2) Reviewing obstacles within BiH justice sector and services currently being provided and support development of Municipal Action Plans; and,

Project #UNA037 – Seeking Care, Support and Justice for Survivors of Conflict Related Sexual Violence in BiH via UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women, and IOM (Sept 2015 – Aug 2017) – Approved budget \$750,009 USD (Expenditure \$553,091)

²⁸ UNA Against Sexual Violence in Conflict Fund (2018).

(3) Supporting regional (Balkans) women's networking and global advocacy. With the support of the MPTF, the project was able to assist the MHHR to develop a draft programme, which the project report described as groundbreaking.

- The second project brought together a larger group of UN entities that successfully advocated together for Government support to adopt a comprehensive approach for dealing with survivors of CRSV and to identify and addressing gaps in existing care, support and justice system. It builds on the previous project by supporting the UNCT Joint Programme to enhance the legal status of, and provide redress to, survivors of CRSV by advocating for equal access to reparations, ensuring further development and expansion of services in the health and economic sectors, improving access to justice, and combatting stigmatization towards survivors of CRSV. With the support of the MPTF, the UNCT was successful in (1) getting legislation amended and commissions established to grant survivors of CRSV the status of "civilian victims of war" and to increase survivors' access to rights and services; (2) Improving the quality and sensitivity of care and support services including by providing training and resources to health care, psychosocial support and justice sector professionals; and, (3) Increasing awareness and alleviation of stigma including through pilot activities in three communities and a wide ranging awareness raising campaign involving civil society, religious leaders, youth, etc. This advocacy work resulted in religious leaders of the Orthodox, Islamic, Jewish and Catholic communities signing a landmark declaration denouncing stigmatization of male and female survivors of CRSV. For UN Action's MPTF, it was the first support to a joint comprehensive programme on CRSV and as such merits an in-depth review to learn lessons which might be useful for other contexts.

- **Iraq** - The MPTF project supported legal aid teams operating in IDP camps in Baghdad and the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI), as well as a mobile unit focusing on IDPs displaced from Mosul who had experienced physical and psychological trauma, including sexual violence, under ISIL control. The project strengthened the capacity of legal aid providers in monitoring, case management, and service delivery such that SGBV cases could be handled more effectively as part their legal assistance. A total of 13,147 IDPs and refugees (10,668 women and 2,479 men) in KRI received legal aid and social services -- among those who benefited were 641 GBV survivors. In Baghdad 843 IDPs (748 women and 95 men) received legal aid and social services. In this context, 'one-stop-shop' service centers that offered multiple services in one place as well as the use of mobile units was key to improving women's access, especially due to constraints on women's ability to travel freely.

Project # UNA044 – Enhanced Access to Justice and Protection of Women and Girls from Conflict Related Violence (CRSV) through the Provision of Legal Aid Services in Iraq via UNDP & UN Women (Jan 2017 – May 2018) Approved budget \$495,437 USD (Expenditure \$494,457)

- **Lebanon and Jordan** - The MPTF supported several projects to increase protection, social support and legal services focusing primarily on Syrian refugees and host communities.²⁹ (Limited reporting available as projects are ongoing)

- **DRC** – The MPTF supported UNICEF's work with the Ministry of Health to coordinate implementation of the multi-sectoral service pillar of the DRC National SGBV Strategy. Among

²⁹ UNA039 focuses specifically on case management services and social support for LGBTI refugees from Syria in Jordan, UNA047 includes focus on strengthening the police and justice system capacity to protect both refugee and host community populations affected by the Syrian conflict in Lebanon, UNA050 focuses upon strengthening legal assistance and support services to Iraqi and Syrian refugee populations in Jordan.

the positive outcomes, these efforts have improved the quality standards of service providers and enabled better monitoring and tracking of survivors accessing care. UNICEF reported its partners provided services to over 15,868 survivors in 2012.

Comments and recommendations to improve Country-Level Support:

The MPTF's country-level support appears to have been most catalytic in contexts such as Côte d'Ivoire, Iraq, BiH, and perhaps DRC where its engagement has been sustained over time, where UN Action projects complemented the TOE and vice versa, where the MPTF helped the UN mission put in place sufficient capacity in country (i.e. through deployment of a WPA) or where that capacity already existed, and where there was a clear, context-specific framework for CRSV response/prevention and commitment from national stakeholders. It is consequently suggested to focus on a number of priority countries. Furthermore, a lesson learned from the Joint Programme in Bosnia should be conducted to see whether such joint programmes can, via UN Action Members, also be encouraged in other countries.

In order to fund the most pertinent intervention, UN Action together with OSRSG SVC and the TOE should conduct country-level CRSV analyses to ensure that the projects fit into a larger country strategy on addressing CRSV and/or other initiatives in place to address GBV. Such strategies are oftentimes framed by a Joint Communiqué on CRSV or a GBV sub-cluster strategy and described in the Implementation Plan thereof. This will help to identify priorities and help to ensure that projects fill a gap that other funding mechanisms will not support in the necessary time-frame. The MPTF should not be used for simply topping up existing UN agency projects unless the strategic added-value can be clearly articulated".

Particularly in country-level support, it is important to verify that projects are realistic and fit for purpose and to plan for sustainability of the projects' results. For example, psychosocial, medical, and other services and support for survivors will likely take more than six months to a year. This can be done by requesting to specify how gaining buy-in and political will is going to be incorporated into the project's implementation plan and specify contingencies or alternatives if the various stakeholders' political interests change during implementation.

Recommendation: The MPTF should focus on a number of priority countries, which should be decided by the UN Action Steering Committee after consultation with the UN Action Focal Points. The RMC should ensure that projects focus on these priority countries and that projects fit into a larger country-level strategy on CRSV. Furthermore, the project proposal templates need to be updated to ensure that project plans articulate the links to larger strategies and that sustainability plans are included.

2. What is the added value of the UNA MPTF?

The MPTF has been important for several reasons. First, the formation of the MPTF provided interested donors with a pooled-funding mechanism with a very low administrative fee, to support an issue topic that was politically sensitive and not, previously, a priority for many donors. In addition, rather than individual donors funding individual projects, the MPTF helped to reduce competition between UN agencies and increased the coherence, efficiency, and effectiveness of projects by pooling funds that could be used by several agencies for multi-sectoral projects.

Second, the MPTF helped to maintain momentum and formalized UNA within the UN system by funding a Secretariat including a coordinator as well as a staffing structure that reflected the programmatic needs of UN Action. For example, Project # UNA004 (Dec 2009 – Dec 2014) funded three staff, which enabled the Secretariat to support and coordinate the UNA Focal Points and Steering Committee members in implementing the UNA Strategic Framework.

Third, the MPTF provided resources to support UNA’s Advocacy Strategy. For example, Project # UNA001 (Jan 2009 – 2010) was used to develop and maintain the website (<http://www.stoprapenow.org>) and to produce and distribute advocacy products.

Fourth, UNA within a very short period of time, was able to advocate for SCR 1888, which established the position of SRSG-SVC. The MPTF was then used to support the creation of the office of the SRSG SVC via project #UNA011 (June – Dec 2010) soon after the passage of the resolution by providing funding for three core staff to support the SRSG-SVC in her work incl. formulating a priority agenda for addressing CRSV, acting as Chair of UN Action and undertaking field missions to obtain commitment from parties to conflict to address CRSV.

Fifth, the MPTF enabled UNA and in particular its chair, the SRSG-SVC, to advocate for and set up the Joint Programme of the United Nations Team of Experts on the Rule of Law / Sexual Violence in Conflict (TOE) as stipulated in SCR 1888 (2009). The TOE, which consists of representatives of DPO, UNDP, and OHCHR is completely dependent on extra-budgetary funding, which is currently provided by the MPTF. Stated by an interviewee, “This arrangement would not have worked out without the MPTF”.³⁰

Sixth, the MPTF provides catalytic funding for joint projects at the UNHQ and the field level to connect UNHQ and the field, operationalize SCRs, fill budgetary gaps, and enable UN agencies to test innovative ideas and show proof of concept to encourage more long-term funding. Stated by an interviewee, “The MPTF allowed for new ideas to be put forward and it encouraged people to come together who may not normally come together [for example, the projects implemented in BiH and in Jordan]. [In addition] there is always a shortage of funds – so the unrestricted, extra-budgetary funds enable flexibility and encourages innovation.”

Seventh, the MPTF has usually been able to react quickly, as projects can be submitted and reviewed on a rolling basis throughout the year.

Eighth, the fund supported UNA members to develop important guidelines, materials, and policy frameworks to operationalize and coordinate the work on CRSV at the global and country level including the implementation of various SCRs. For example, DPA’s *Guidance for Mediators: Addressing Conflict-Related Sexual Violence in Ceasefire and Peace Agreements*.

3. Are there any aspects in which the fund fell short of its expectations?

The effectiveness of any trust fund is directly related to the capacity of the entities that use it and their ability to work together to apply the funds to effect positive change. It appears that the initial success of UNA in establishing the SRSG-SVC, the OSRSG-SVC, and the TOE has also led to a challenge in defining a common strategy and objectives, as well as complementary roles and responsibilities of each

³⁰A Mid-term Review (2015-2019) of the TOE was completed in July 2018.

entity so that they operate as a system. In addition, most of the original members of the Secretariat and the UNA Focal Points have transitioned, which is normal over a ten-year period of time. However, it has resulted in a loss of institutional memory within the Secretariat and the network. Challenges also arose since the post of Coordinator has been vacant for over a year. Interviews brought to light a lack clarity on the purpose of UN Action and the MPTF by some focal points. This missing shared sense of purpose resulted in lower levels of engagement from some entities. It is encouraging that a new Coordinator has just joined the network and will engage in strategic planning process for the network soon.

A strength of many trust funds is their flexibility and minimal number of administrative and reporting requirements. However, this is also a weakness of many trust funds because they lack adequate oversight, accountability, monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and sharing of learning during and after projects are completed. Some UN entities, who have been funded by the MPTF, use their own monitoring and evaluation processes for their specific projects. However, their findings and reports may not be provided to the Secretariat or captured on the MPTFO's website. Thus, the opportunities and incentives for sharing learning and improving the relevance and effectiveness of program design and implementation are limited particularly during the period of implementation and immediately after. This hinders the Secretariat's ability to provide updates to the UNA Focal Points, Steering Committee, and the OSRSG-SVC and the relevant entities including current and potential donors. Stated by an interviewee, "Learning and impact of the projects are not being used to benefit UNA itself... As agencies we do not benefit from the individual projects from a learning and advocacy perspective... It is a global fund, but once the funds are disbursed – there is no follow up or cross-learning from a thematic or country perspective... It would be very helpful for UNA entities to learn about projects collectively." Several interviewees including donors also stated that they had received very limited documentation from any projects, so it is hard to see tangible results. As an interviewee stated, "One of the liabilities over the years is that we have essentially had a weak to non-existent M&E system. I don't feel like I have a sight of the granular details of the projects impact and the learning." As a result, UNA members, the OSRSG-SVC, and the donors are unaware of the overall achievements of the fund and the bigger picture of what it is contributing to. A reason for this might be was that the Secretariat has not been fully staffed in over a year, and even with full staffing, there is room to reconsider the need for a dedicated grants management and M&E officer. In addition, as mentioned above, UNA needs to consistently use and report against a results framework that is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time bound and that overarches all projects funded. Weaknesses in this regard have resulted in decreased donor support to UNA.

Recommendation: According to the MOU of the MPTF, agencies are supposed to use their procedures for monitoring and evaluation. The Secretariat should ensure that those evaluations are shared and lessons are learned and incorporated. In addition, the Secretariat should share the best practices and lessons learned via both internal UN discussions and larger forums that include participants from outside the UN, including donors.

A lot of progress has been made in terms of political awareness and the establishment of a robust normative/policy framework reflected in SCRs on conflict-related sexual violence and joint communiqués. However, interviewees reflected that a lot more needs to be done to translate these commitments to actual implementation. However, reflected in the small size of the overall TF, its TORs and small amount of funds allotted to each project, this cannot be the responsibility of the TF alone. This is the responsibility of many parties. Overall implementation of resolutions and joint communiqués needs to be supported by signatories, the UN system and civil society as a whole, with the TF supporting to kick-start initiatives through catalytic funding.

The international community, UNHQ, and the Security Council tend to be reactive and focused on current events, especially those that are in their immediate interest. As a result, not many donors like to invest in

prevention, which is a topic that should receive greater attention and funding. Prevention is an area where UN Action, representing a “One UN” approach, could add specific value. The MPTF could be harnessed even more to encourage this “One UN” approach to prevention.

Interviewees also stated that there is a lack of awareness of the MPTF in NYHQ and in the field. As a result, opportunities may have been missed where the trust fund could have added value. This could be attributed to staff transitions and limited engagement of members of the Steering Committee. The MPTF office hosts a website with a lot of information related to the trust fund. However, several interviewees were unaware of the website and the information that it provides including the trust fund’s terms of reference.

Recommendation: Focal Points should be properly orientated regarding all aspects the MPTF by the MPTF Office and the UN Action Secretariat. Focal points also have a responsibility to review the TORs of the MPTF and of the RMC, which are publicly available documents. Focal points should be responsible for communicating on the existence and availability of the MPTF with their colleagues in the field on a regular basis.

While the MPTF office website provides detailed information about each project including (in some instances) the project proposals and final reports, many interviewees were not aware that this information exists and how to access it. The UN Action Secretariat can communicate decisions from the RMC to the Focal Points, which is currently done per copying them in emails from the SRSG to the Steering Committee. In addition, the Secretariat can share the notes from the RMC meetings with all focal points.

Recommendation: The Secretariat should brief the Focal Points and the RMC members prior to and after the proposal submission process the outcome of RMC meetings. The meeting notes from the RMC review process should be provided to the focal points.

MPTF projects may be more effective and sustainable if they were better integrated into the ongoing country-level responses. For example, an interviewee stated that, “the context in which these CRSV projects are implemented are usually in places where there is an ongoing humanitarian response. For some, but not all of the projects, there are linkages to humanitarian partners and humanitarian coordination mechanisms that already exist on the ground. Cooperation and coordination are also important with other forums and communities of practice. This could be strengthened in the proposal requirements.” In the future, when project proposals are designed the UN Agencies should consider how the CRSV-specific projects fit into these existing mechanisms and interventions – for example ongoing cluster-led responses.

Recommendation: It should be a project proposal requirement that a project fits within the ongoing UN country-level response in addition to a country-focused CRSV-specific and/or interagency GBV strategy.

4. Did the MPTF facilitate closer collaboration and joined up work of UN Agencies?

CRSV is a complex and politically sensitive issue that requires a multi-sector, holistic response. When applied effectively, the MPTF encouraged better coordination and collaboration between UN entities by

leveraging the particular areas of expertise of each agency.³¹ Stated by an interviewee, “the MPTF requires that applications be presented by more than one UN agency. So, from the beginning of the proposal process it requires agencies to work together in design, implementation, and reporting. It also facilitates a better understanding of the different agency’s angles. [In addition], when agencies have overlapping mandates, the proposal process encourages the agencies to see and highlight each other’s strengths and comparative advantage.”.

Examples of collaboration between UN entities include:

- 4.1 BiH –Project #UNA037 – *Seeking Care, Support and Justice for Survivors of Conflict Related Sexual Violence*, was jointly implemented by UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women, and IOM from Sept 2015 to Aug 2017. It was highlighted as one of the best examples of a true multi-agency project that produced tangible results. A factor that contributed to this project’s success was that all of the agencies had clear roles based on their organizational strength and mandate.
- 4.2 OHCHR and UN Women worked together on Project # UNA033 to translate and launch a Guidance Note on Reparations for CRSV at the request of the SG’s Policy Committee. The guidance was translated into French, Spanish and Arabic and events were held to launch the note in New York, London, Tunis, and Sarajevo. As a result, UN entities, member states and civil society partners were more aware of the Guidance Note and its key principles, and they developed concrete recommendations for how it could be implemented in a local context
- 4.3 Several recent proposals were accepted that portray how the MPTF encourages collaboration between UN entities. For example, in Iraq, UNFPA was looking to expand and augment its service provision for survivors including clinical services. Apparently, staff on the ground and members of TOE have identified gaps in existing mental health and psycho-social support. So, UNFPA augmented its service provision, to provide more comprehensive services to the target populations. In addition, UNFPA also worked in close coordination with IOM, which had ongoing MHPSS programming since 2014 in nine governorates as well as expertise and working relationships with the Ministry of Health on MHPSS. Through the process of project design, it became clear that UNFPA and IOM had complementary programming areas that, when coordinated through MPTF funding, different skill sets that could be applied to address the issue more holistically.
- 4.4. Project # UNA059 Enhancing capacity and accountability to prevent and respond to CRSV in Myanmar - is another potentially good example of how the MPTF encouraged positive collaboration between UNICEF, IOM, UNFPA, as well as the OSRSG-SVC and the OSRSG-CAAC. The objectives of the project are to 1) Improve access to support services for survivors of CRSV focusing on mental and physical health services; 2) Reinforce positive social norms to support survivors service seeking behavior as well as community support to survivors; and, 3) Improved awareness of CRSV among duty bearers to prevent future violations. During the proposal design process, each entity was able to identify their existing mandates, expertise, and existing initiatives in Myanmar so that the proposed activities built on each agencies strength to fill gaps. For example, UNICEF works at the national level on child survivors that are victims of trafficking; IOM focuses on building the capacity at state and local level for psycho-social support for survivors; and, since UNFPA is the lead protection agency focused on GBV in Myanmar, it focuses on working with the department of social

³¹ Approximately 61% of the projects included three or more UN agencies; 13% included two UN agencies; and 26% of the projects included one UN agency.

welfare to set up guidelines for case management and SOPs on identifications and management of survivors of GBV. Stated by an interviewee, “Having these three different strengths and a wider scope will enable us to maximize each agency’s strengths to support the government towards the action points in the Joint Communiqué.”

In general, UNA projects funded by the MPTF focused on countries that aligned with the TOE and OSRSG-SVC’s priority countries, although in some cases the trust fund supported projects in additional countries in response to developments on the ground or requests for assistance.³² In some contexts, UNA projects and the TOE were complementary and mutually reinforcing which has been associated with stronger results. For example, in countries where the MPTF supported a WPA, there appears to have been positive coordination and collaboration with the TOE.³³ For example, in Côte d’Ivoire, the WPA and the TOE appear to have provided coherent technical support to the government and the security forces over time, leading to stronger commitment to ensure accountability. Similarly, in BiH, the TOE and other MPTF-funded projects have been complementary – together they reinforced the design and implementation of a strong joint program. However, while strong and sustained coordination and cooperation was clear in several priority countries, this wasn’t consistent across all contexts. In general, the MPTF might have had a greater impact with more consistent efforts to align projects between UN Action and the TOE, by supporting initiatives coming out of or complementing TOE technical assistance but beyond the TOE’s narrower scope as well as maintaining focus on the same priority countries. For example, IOM has strong expertise implementing large-scale reparations programs. This experience, expertise, and permanent representation on the ground could be harnessed better to inform the work of the TOE and vice versa. It appears that this may already be happening informally.

Recommendation: A joint planning framework and regular communication between UNA (Secretariat and RMC), OSRSG-SVC, and TOE on country priorities is essential. It is important to note that UN Action focal points will support the development of the joint planning framework and will be involved in country-specific discussions.

Some interviewees recommended that UNA have some flexibility on the strict criterion that all proposals must include more than one UN agency. There may be cases when time-sensitive issues only necessitate the work of one UN agency, or in which a topic might be too sensitive for a second entity to agree to work on. Addressing sexual violence against men and boys has been an example in the past. In such situations, the UN Action Secretariat has served as a partner for the project to ensure that such work can still take place. This flexibility should continue to be considered in the future.

It needs to be noted that a MPTF alone cannot improve the way UN system entities collaborate. While the MPTF has encouraged better coordination at the project level, this has not always translated into a holistic UN approach to CRSV at the country level. Conducting multi-sector country and regional analyses and designing joint strategies may help to encourage more holistic interventions. This though is beyond the scope of what a MPTF can achieve and for consideration by the UN Action network and the Gender-Based Violence Sub-clusters as a whole.

Recommendation: Proposals to the MPTF should include an analysis of what is already happening in a particular context. Then, based on this analysis, the proposed projects should be appropriate,

³² UNA Against Sexual Violence in Conflict Fund (2018). 9th Consolidated Annual Progress Report for the period of (1 January – 31 December 2017)

³³ Mid-term Review of the 2015-2019 Joint Programme of the United Nations Team of Experts on the Rule of Law / Sexual Violence in Conflict.

complementary, and fit into the bigger-picture of planning and interventions that are already in place.

5. Were the MPTF projects catalytic?

Due to the limited amount of monitoring, evaluation, and reporting and staff turn-over in the Secretariat and within representatives of the UN Action entities, it is difficult to determine if and how projects were catalytic beyond the immediate output of the project. It also depends on how the term catalytic is defined.

First, catalytic could be defined as filling gaps long enough to encourage the inclusion of posts into regular budgets. For example, the MPTF was used to pay the salary of three WPAs in UN peace operations until core funding for these positions was prioritized. In this sense the MPTF was catalytic in showing the value added of the WPAs and encouraging the UN peace operations to include them in their core budgets. For example, the work of the WPA was also catalytic in establishing the Monitoring, Analysis and Reporting Arrangements in Cote d'Ivoire, the DRC, Iraq.³⁴

Second, catalytic could be defined as piloting new ideas and providing proof of concept leading to greater donor support, longer-term funding, and adapting and transferring the idea to other contexts. For example, UNODC implemented two projects that it would not have worked on without the MPTF. The project implemented in Somaliland resulted in the formation of Sexual Offences Bill, which was drafted with the aim of providing a comprehensive law to make investigation and prosecution of SGBV cases more effective and support access to justice for survivors of sexual violence. The project contributed, through the continuous advocacy, to push the parliament to pass the Sexual Offences Bill.³⁵

Third, catalytic could be defined as addressing one issue or a set of issues related to CRSV that, in turn, has a ripple effect by enabling other interventions or the inclusion of CRSV into broader political and programmatic activities. For example, the MPTF supported DPA to publish the *Guidance for Mediators: Addressing Conflict-Related Sexual Violence in Ceasefire and Peace Agreements*, which had a ripple effect evidenced by the inclusion of CRSV in several ceasefire and peace agreements.

Another potential example of a catalytic initiative is project # UNA057 - *Creating conditions for development and implementation of reparations for survivors of CRSV*, which is being implemented by IOM, UNAMI, and the OSRSG-SVC in Iraq. If successful, the MPTF support will enable IOM and the OSRSG-SVC to work with the central Government of Iraq and the Kurdistan Regional Government in Erbil, UN agencies, and NGOs and CSOs to raise awareness of the rights of victims to reparations. If the project is successful in creating a roadmap to a comprehensive legal framework, survivor-centered procedures and a sustainable mechanism for reparations and long-term care, this project could build donor's confidence in the government's commitment and political will, which would help to encourage them to invest larger and longer-term funding to support the implementation of the framework. According to interviewees, it is often very difficult to get funds for transitional and restorative justice including reparations for victims of CRSV particularly in countries where the bi-lateral donors lack historical ties or national interests. The MPTF is unique in that it provides access to funds that are not available for particular types of programming focused on reparations and immediate service provision for survivors.

³⁴ Due to the difficult nature of measuring prevention, it is unclear if the work of the WPAs was catalytic in preventing CRSV.

Recommendations for strengthening the catalytic potential of MPTF projects: Project proposals should clearly articulate if and how the projects are anticipated to be catalytic. Then, M&E and other reporting tools including final reports, impact evaluations, etc. should explain the catalytic effects of the project. In addition, in some instances, greater financial resources and longer timeframes should be allocated per project if the MPTF projects are expected to have a significant catalytic effect.

6. Were the project results sustainable?

The relatively small amount of resources and time allocated per project pose a challenge to sustainability. In addition, the nature of the projects supported by the MPTF are not necessarily meant to be sustainable as they are often focused on filling gaps and catalyzing new or existing interventions. Interviewees stated that for many of the UN Agencies, the MPTF projects are used to fill a gap and feed into a broader program so even if there are specific deliverables included in the MPTF project, there is often a larger portfolio that the project fits into, which helps to guarantee sustainability. Therefore, expectations of being able to achieve and show sustainable outcomes and impact should not be limited for a single project in isolation. In addition, sustainability should be measured at different levels. For example, many of the MPTF projects were sustained at the output level particularly in terms of curriculum development, training, and awareness raising activities. For instance, project # UNA047 implemented by UNDP and UNFPA in Lebanon from 21 September 2016 to 31 December 2018, resulted in the development of a curriculum for the municipal police on CRSV that is now included in the Government of Lebanon's Ministry of Interior's internal security forces regular training program. As an output level indicator, this is positive. Another output indicator could be the number of police that have received training in CRSV. However, even if the output indicators are met and sustained, they do not capture the outcomes or impact of the project and whether or not they were sustained. For example, it is unclear if the inclusion of training for the police led to increased protection of both refugee and host community women and girls, men and boys affected by the Syrian crisis.

Another positive example of sustained outcomes includes the work of the WPA and UNFPA in Côte d'Ivoire. These investments made significant progress some of which were sustained after the WPA's assignment ended and upon completion of the projects. For example, with support from the MPTF - The Government of Côte d'Ivoire "adopted concrete measures such as: The creation of a National Committee on CRSV, the signing of commitments by FACI Commanders to combat CRSV, a Code of Conduct of the Ivoirian soldier to fight against sexual violence, the follow-up of cases, including judicial, through a joint mechanism FACI - CNDHCI that led to the reduction of number of cases of sexual violence imputable to the FACI, and the commitment of the Government to create a National Programme on SGBV to implement the National Strategy on Gender-Based Violence (NSGBV). As a consequence, at the end of her assignment in 2016, the WPA suggested the delisting of the FACI from the Annex of the Secretary General's report on CRSV." This helped to inform the SRSG's recommendation to the Secretary-General in that regard.

According to the WPA, much of the work that was completed during her assignment has been sustained including the national committee and a pool of experts on CRSV including military and security force personnel that meet once a month and report to the ministers, relevant government bodies, and the President. A generic adaptation of the MARA database was also developed and has been sustained. Apparently, since the UN Mission ended, the two national institutions are still using this database to monitor and report on cases of CRSV. It is also important to note that upon the withdrawal of the

Mission, to encourage national ownership and responsibility, the TOE deployed two national experts to support national authorities to help prevent and respond to CRSV.

However, Côte d'Ivoire also provides an important lesson learned regarding support needed by the MPTF to maintain CRSV capacity in the country once a mission draws down. For example, the removal of the WPA immediately following the end of a Mission could have an impact particularly from a coordination perspective. Stated by the WPA, “while each of the UN agencies have individual gender experts, they need a coordinator within the Resident Coordinator’s office.” The extension of the WPA could have been supported by the MPTF to continue coordinating the work of the UNCT at the country level to ensure greater sustainability.

Interviewees questioned the use of the MPTF for consultants and UN staff salaries especially if the position is a permanent position within the existing UN architecture. There are obvious pros and cons to this approach. In some cases, such as the WPA posts, the funds filled a gap that led the use of core Mission funding. However, there are other staff postings that end when MPTF project ends. The sustainability of a posting should be considered if the MPTF is used to support the position temporarily.

As mentioned above, it would also be beneficial to have clear communication on an overarching strategy, M&E, reporting, between UNA RMC, the TOE, and the OSRSG-SVC in order to complement each other’s investments and to scale up projects after the initial funds are complete.

As a recommendation for project proposing entities, they need to be more realistic in what they can achieve during the timeframe. It would also be beneficial to include a focus on sustainability in the project proposal review process.

Furthermore, to encourage sustainability, it is important to adapt interventions to the context. What works in one country may not work in another. Gaining buy-in from national counterparts is also paramount to the sustainability of any intervention. For example, the success of the WPA in Côte d'Ivoire, was partly based on her willingness and ability to work with national stakeholders to adapt existing tools to their unique context and political interests and constraints.

Better and more transparent and candid conversations with donors at the global and country level may also contribute to greater sustainability. For example, if a project is showing preliminary results, but the funding is going to end in a relatively short period of time, more regular conversations with donors about the project may encourage them to either invest more in the MPTF to continue the project or to provide bi-lateral funding to the UN entities or other stakeholders that are involved in the project to ensure continuity. If donors are unaware of the projects, they cannot be expected to provide this type of financial support. The responsibility in this lies primarily in UN Action member entities in countries of concern. The UN Action Secretariat and SRSG SVC can also support these requests through advocacy.

Recommendation: The UN Action Secretariat and UN Action Focal Points of the related agencies should monitor the sustainability of the project throughout the project implementation. If concerns arise, the RMC and focal points of the respective agencies should be informed. If no solution can be found internally in due time, donors should be informed. In that regard, it is recommended that the UN Action Secretariat and the RMC also have regular conversations with donors.

7. Did some UNA members resort to the MPTF more than others?

Based on the data from the MPTFO website³⁶, certain UN agencies did receive more funding and projects than others. However, as the website lists only approved projects, it is possible that some agencies may have resorted to the MPTF more than others, but their proposals may have been rejected. It is also important to note that some UN agencies like OHCHR have presented and implemented joint-projects with other agencies such as UN Women and DPKO, without receiving direct funding.

| Total approved budget by agency (non-TOE) | | # of projects (direct funding) |
|---|--------------|--------------------------------|
| UNHCR | \$578,367 | 4 |
| UNFPA | \$3,216,938 | 10 |
| UN Women | \$3,473,716 | 8 |
| DPKO | \$2,703,616 | 7 |
| UNDPA | \$741,859 | 3 |
| WHO | \$722,250 | 3 |
| OCHA | \$428,271 | 4 |
| UNAIDS | \$171,414 | 3 |
| UNICEF | \$2,310,685 | 10 |
| UNDP | \$1,719,006 | 8 |
| ORSG-SVC | \$4,655,225 | 1 |
| UNODC | \$150,712 | 1 |
| IOM | \$757,239 | 2 ³⁷ |
| TOTAL | \$21,629,299 | |

It is difficult to determine specific reasons why some UNA members resorted to the MPTF for funding more than others. Potential reasons stated during interviews include:

- Different levels of interest and engagement from the UNA focal points.
- Different levels of engagement on CRSV by different UN Action member entities.
- Limited levels of funding. For some UNA members, the level of funding is small compared to their existing budgets. The MPTF may provide a stop-gap, however it is not their main source of funding. So, it may not be worth them taking the time to draft a proposal. They may also prefer going directly to donors for bi-lateral funding rather than utilizing the MPTF.
- Limited awareness of the MPTF - Several interviewees reported that there is a general lack of awareness of the MPTF particularly at the country level. The Secretariat, Focal Points, and Steering Committee could be more proactive in raising awareness of the MPTF and ensuring that the various UN agencies involved understand how and when to submit proposals.

Recommendation: Focal Points meetings should include regular updates on the funds available in the trust fund and encouraged to share the information on the fund with their counterparts in the field. Focal points also need to proactively and in a coordinated manner identify gaps in CRSV response in countries of concern and encourage their country offices to address these concerns, if needed via submitting a project proposal to the MPTF.

³⁶ as of 28 March 2019

³⁷ IOM is relatively new to the TF so this number may be misleading in terms of its engagement with the TF.

8. How effective were the governance and management arrangements of the Fund?

8.1 Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTFO) of UNDP serves as the Administrative Agent of the MPTF. Interviewees only had positive feedback for the administrative services provided by the MPTFO. The office is very responsive and able to release funds quickly with a very low overhead. The MPTFO also hosts a website (<http://mptf.undp.org>) that provides the financial details of the allocation of funds per donor, project, and UN agency. Project proposals and reports that are submitted are also provided on the website. In the future, the Secretariat could be more pro-active in ensuring that individuals are aware of the website. To enable more detailed information, such as on earmarked funding, the MPTFO is currently updating its website.

8.2 UNA Steering Committee (SC) is tasked with providing overall leadership and setting the strategic direction for the UNA Network. Chaired by the SRSB-SVC, the SC comprises principals from each UN Action member as well as the SRSB for Children and Armed Conflict (SRSB-CAAC). The principals currently mainly serve as consultation forum and to ensure buy in from agencies into decisions taken by the RMC, yet there is currently low engagement in terms of proactively providing leadership and strategic direction for the MPTF. Interviewees noted that the “UNA principals” are not selected at the highest (principal) level, which creates a potential for confusion as some principals might not be aware of decisions taken by “UNA principals”. Several SC meeting reports were reviewed including (11 May 2015; 5 April 2016; and 9 March 2018). Each of the meetings was attended by at least 11 UNA principals and all three meetings were chaired by the SRSB-SVC. Each of these reports included a constructive discourse between the SRSB-SVC and the principals on major policy considerations and priority situations of concern to the SRSB-SVC that were outlined in the Annual Reports of the SG or from field visits of the SRSB-SVC. However, it does not appear that there was any discussion of existing projects and the effectiveness of projects during the SC meeting as there was no mention of the MPTF in any of the meeting minutes. Furthermore, while the discussions raised a number of topics related to CRSV, none of the notes referred to the development of a strategy to address the range of topics discussed, with exception of the SRSB’s MENA Strategy. Last, the principals spoke in relation to their individual entities, not UNA as a whole and what role it could have in addressing the myriad of issues raised during the meetings. The meeting notes also did not identify ways for the UNA members to work in a coordination manner across sectors to address the issues raised during the meeting. Moving forward, the SC’s TOR should be revised to define its core function vis-à-vis UNA, the TOE, and the OSRSB-SVC.

Recommendation: In revising the MPTF, revise the TORs for the trust fund and the governance entities, including the Steering Committee, the RMC, the UN Action Secretariat, and the TORs for UN Action Focal Points.

8.3 UNA Secretariat is tasked with coordinating the work of the UNA network. Currently the Secretariat consists of a coordinator, an advocacy and women’s rights specialist, a programme analyst who only serves their function part-time³⁸, and a program assistant. According to the TOR of the MPTF, the Secretariat, in addition to its broader function as secretariat of the network, is responsible for supporting the work of the Resource Management Committee (RMC), participating UN organizations, the administrative agent (MPTFO), and the Steering Committee for the purpose of facilitating the MPTF through the following activities:

³⁸ This was a necessary temporary arrangement taken in 2017 due to contract limitations, but it is planned to revert this position to a full-time UN Action position.

- (i) Review proposals submitted by participating UN organizations for completeness and consistency with the strategic framework and transmit to the RMC for its consideration;
- (ii) Transmit proposals approved by the RMC to the administrative agent for fund disbursement;
- (iii) Synthesize the narrative reports submitted by participating UN organizations each calendar year upon completion of each UNA MPTF project or programmes; and
- (iv) Compile the narrative reports and consolidated financial reports into an annual progress report to be submitted to the UNA Steering Committee for approval. The administrative agent shall provide donors with these progress reports.
- (v) In addition to what is stated in its TOR, the 2017 annual progress report lists additional responsibilities of the Secretariat including: “provides technical and administrative support to the network, supports preparation of the Secretary-General’s annual report, frames advocacy messages for the network and SRSG-SVC, supports and engages in joint missions, conducts training, briefings, outreach and the development of strategic partnerships, oversees the MPTF, facilitates the network’s strategic planning, mobilizes resources, monitors implementation of agreed-upon deliverables, and evaluates and reports on the impact of the network’s activities.”

Given the Secretariat’s limited human resources, and the fact that the Secretariat also coordinates the network as a whole, this seems like an unrealistic number of responsibilities. Steps should be taken to ensure that the Secretariat has the appropriate human and financial resources in relation to its expected roles, functions, and responsibilities.

Several core positions might include: Lead Coordinator (P-5); Coordination and Programme Officer (P-4); Grants Manager and M&E Specialist (P-3); a Research and Knowledge Manager (P-3) and an administrative assistant. This would help address concerns of timeliness of feedback on project proposals, regular exchange and feedback to project entities and focal points, the development of strategies for the new MPTF, as well as country-strategies. The TOR for the Secretariat and each of these positions should be revised including its roles, functions, and responsibilities vis-à-vis the OSRSG SVC.

Recommendation: One of the key steps to address many of the concerns raised would be to ensure adequate staffing of the UN Action Secretariat relevant to its function. This needs to include a: Lead Coordinator (P-5); Coordination and Programme Officer (P-4); Grants Manager and M&E Specialist (P-3); Research and Knowledge Manager (P-3) and an administrative assistant. Experts could also be seconded from UN Action Member Entities on a rotating basis. The TOR for the Secretariat and each of these positions should be revised including its roles, functions, and responsibilities.

8.4 Focal Points and the RMC – consists of representatives of each of the UNA member entities. They are tasked with developing the biannual Strategic Framework for the endorsement of the SC. The focal points meet more or less on a monthly basis. The RMC consists of five UNA Focal Points, one of which serves as the Chairperson. According to the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure (TOR) the Chairperson is chosen by the RMC members and RMC membership shall be determined annually on a rotating basis. The Chairperson is responsible for ensuring that the RMC operates in compliance with the TOR. The TOR also stipulates that the UNA Coordinator and a representative of the Administrative Agent (MPTFO) serve as ex-officio and non-decision-making members of the RMC. Furthermore, in order for the RMC to take action, a quorum of three RMC members, including the Chairperson, must be present and decisions are made by consensus. In the event that a consensus is not reached, the issue shall be referred to the Chairperson for a decision. Also, in the event that a proposal is from the same participating UN Organization as an RMC member, the RMC member

shall excuse him/herself from consideration of the specific proposal. The Secretariat is responsible for recording the RMC meetings and decisions. Additional RMC responsibilities listed in the TOR include:

- (i) Evaluate proposals, taking into consideration available resources and the degree to which a proposal conforms to the UNA Strategic Framework and the Selection Criteria;
- (ii) Ensure that proposals contain an in-built communications strategy that includes visibility for UNA's *Stop Rape Now* campaign, brand and/or website, in line with the UNA Strategic Framework;
- (iii) Ensure that projects or programmes are informed by decisions of the UNA Steering Committee and Focal Points;
- (iv) Ensure appropriate consultative processes take place with key stakeholders to avoid duplication between the projects or programmes of UNA entities and other UN funding mechanisms;
- (v) Periodically review the RMC's Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure and submit any necessary revisions to the Secretariat. Any revisions must then be approved by the Focal Points and endorsed by the Steering Committee;
- (vi) Periodically evaluate the cost effectiveness of the UNA MPTF.

8.5 Project Proposal and Review Process

The TOR states that “only participating UN Organization(s), i.e. those UN entities which have signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Administrative Agent (MPTFO), are eligible to submit proposals through the UNA Secretariat.” Furthermore, the TOR states that proposals from UN agencies must be “identified as deliverables under the Three Pillars of the UNA Strategic Framework [i.e. country level action, advocacy, and knowledge building].” The selection criteria for proposal include:

- (i) The extent to which the goals and objectives of the proposal conform to the UNA Strategic Framework and the Selection Criteria;
- (ii) The overall quality of the proposal;
- (iii) Institutional capacity of the organization(s) to implement the project/programmes;
- (iv) The extent to which the proposal fosters joint planning, or programming by a number of UN entities;
- (v) Potential for sustainability;
- (vi) Commitment and plan for monitoring the activity;
- (vii) Clear description of budget requirements and link to achieving results;
- (viii) Minimum budget of \$50,000, and
- (ix) Implementation period of no more than two years.

Proposals can generally be submitted on a rolling basis. The templates are available on the website of the trust fund. It was recognized that those templates need to be updated because, for instance, they do not include the requirement for a log frame. The Focal Points should also ensure that their staff in HQ and the field are aware of the proposal process and the templates.

In general, the TOR for the RMC and the guidelines and procedures for reviewing proposals is clearly articulated and fairly robust. Representatives of the RMC stated that the proposal review process was an insightful process to be a part of. They also commended the thought and energy that the members of the RMC put into reviewing the value of the projects that are submitted. Stated by an RMC representative, “There is a lot care that is put into the process. A lot of interesting things come up when we share our feedback with each other.”

RMC members also stated that the process of receiving proposals prior to sitting together was “as well managed as it could be”. However, more time was requested for RMC members to review proposals in a

thorough and meaningful way. Stated by an RMC member, “sometimes I found myself overwhelmed. There are too many projects at once to give a proper assessment of each project. We don’t have a lot of time to review all of the projects. Sometimes I align myself with the position of other members because I just don’t have time to review everything thoroughly. I often just focus on what is in the headlines because don’t have time to do the necessary due diligence.”

A potential suggestion to improve efficiency was to upload the proposals onto a shared platform such as Google Docs or Unite Docs so that the reviewers could see each other’s questions and comments and identify areas of agreement and disagreement prior to meeting in person.

RMC members also stated that, at times, it was difficult to keep their individual agency hats off and to represent and serve UN Action as a whole. Stated by an interviewee, “this has led to disagreements about the approach or coordination that has gone into project proposals including accusations of why such and such organization did not coordinate on the proposal design with another agency. The RMC could improve the way that it encourages cross-agency cooperation instead of fomenting UN politics.” Stated by another interviewee, “The inter-agency competition is always there... Of course, people are impartial to their agency, which is why I would like to see a broader representation and always having independent experts looking at the proposed projects.”

RMC members also recommended a standardized and **detailed budget template and budget guidance** for proposals. Stated by an interviewee, “we need more guidance on what types of costs and what proportion of costs [the trust fund should cover]. At the moment, there is no standard.” Then, the RMC should conduct an analysis of the budget to determine the value of the proposed project in relation to the proposed budget.

In addition, RMC members recommended that UNA members **submit concept notes** rather than full proposals to determine if the idea is appropriate and fits within the guidelines of the MPTF. Stated by an interviewee, “this would reduce the burden on agency staff and the RMC rather than going back and forth on full proposals... We spend so much time in the RMC reviewing proposals in detail, but often asking basic “proof of concept” questions about the proposed approach that could be addressed at a much earlier stage, before country-level colleagues in particular spend so much time developing a proposal that may ultimately be rejected...The concept note should indicate the relevance of the project to the fund [and. It would] get colleagues to drill down into how the project will speak to the funding criteria and the value added of the fund itself.”

Another recommendation was **greater scrutiny of expenditure tracking, project reporting, completion of deliverables, project closure, and other feedback mechanisms** to measure agency performance. Stated by an RMC member, “accountability mechanisms are not taken as seriously for the MPTF. Setting higher expectations for recipients of the fund may help to increase donor confidence in the fund.”

When asked how the RMC prioritizes decisions in terms of the types of proposals it funds, RMC members stated that it could be more proactive in rejecting proposals that do not fit into the stated guidelines and priorities of UN Action instead of going “back and forth wordsmithing a proposal to fit into the guidelines rather than just saying no. We could also be bold and empowered enough to say that this proposal is not strategic, or value added. [However], if you coordinate with this agency or this cluster then we would consider it.” An RMC member further stated, “We also need clear decisions on what we won’t fund when we are not convinced by a project proposal. Several times we have asked country colleagues to go back again and again to refine a proposal to transform it into something UNA will fund; and, other times we have simply said no right away and it’s not clear where that balance lies.

Interviewees also stressed the need for UN Action members to discuss and agree on “what exactly we are funding”. For example, an interviewee stated, “sometimes we are funding projects focused on GBV in Emergencies. This means that the funds for CRSV is reduced and GBV has other potential sources of funds. CRSV is very complicated and political to get funds. So, we need to really discuss if/how GBV in Emergencies and CRSV are linked and what should be funded and not funded by the UN Action Trust Fund.”

Interviewees also expressed concern regarding what happens after the RMC reviews the proposals. Stated by an interviewee, “we don’t know what happens behind closed doors after the RMC decides to fund a project. What happens after the RMC review should be more transparent.” Members of the RMC and other UN Action members requested more information sharing after the review process.

Interviewees also expressed concern regarding the role of the OSRSG in the proposal review process. Stated by an interviewee, “There is not enough substantive debate of the proposals. You cannot have a frank conversation because someone from the OSRSG sits on the RMC – if they disagreed with the SRSR then they could be seen as blocking the SRSR.”

Stated by another interviewee, “The RMC attempts to be rigorous and there is a process in place. But, comes down to who decides what the priorities are... Without the larger structure and focus, it is hard for the RMC to prioritize what to fund and what not to fund.

Recommendations to improve the RMC and the project proposal and review process:

***Recommendation for Proposal Writing:* As a first stage, a project concept note, or lighter document should be first submitted for consideration by the RMC to see whether it fits UN Action’s priorities and country strategies. The RMC should develop guidance for that. If the RMC finds that project fits within the priorities of UN Action and the MPTF, the submitting entities should be informed by the UN Action Secretariat and invited to submit a long-form proposal.**

The templates for the long-form proposals need to be updated to require log frames for tracking the project’s impact; a context analysis to help situate the proposed projects into the larger context of CRSV; a description how activities are coordinated with other humanitarian plans or initiatives; a sustainability plan and a Do No Harm and risk analysis.

The RMC also needs to produce standardized budget guidance including value-for-money indicators, percentage of project costs can be staff costs and ensure that project timelines and budgets are realistic in relation to the proposed project.

***Recommendations for Proposal Review:* The UN Action Secretariat needs to allow more time for reviewing proposals and possibly share the proposal on Unite docs or Google docs so that RMC members can see each other’s comments; RMC members need to be aware of and manage their institutional and sector bias in order to serve the entire UNA network, rather than their individual entity or sector particularly when providing constructive feedback and deciding which proposals should be accepted – the exclusion of the focal point from the decision making process has been a way to manage that. The RMC should also consider the inclusion of external technical experts and donors on the RMC as members. This would increase the substantive and political debate; enhance donor interest and engagement with UNA and the MPTF; and, perhaps encourage increased funding from the donors either through the MPTF or through direct bi-lateral funding.**

After the RMC takes the decision, according to the TOR, “Decisions by the RMC will be shared with all stakeholders in order to ensure transparency of MPTF financed projects. In line with the UN’s commitment towards public disclosure of its operational activities, the Administrative Agent in consultation with the RMC, will ensure that reports and documents of the UNA MPTF, such as RMC approved projects/programmes, awaiting approval, fund level annual financial and progress reports, and external evaluations, as appropriate, are posted for public information on the UNA MPTF page of the MPTF Office website.” While all of the project proposals and funded projects are cited on the website, the minutes of the RMC meeting are not public record yet. It would be more transparent to post those minutes.

Recommendations to improve the project support and lessons learning:

Regarding support to ongoing projects, UN Action Focal points have a role to play. Together with the UN Action Secretariat, they should monitor projects, provide technical support. Joint monitoring visits between the Secretariat and UN Action Focal points should be organized. This will also help to socialize learnings, and engage the wider network.

In addition, the UN Action Secretariat should provide feedback on the effectiveness of implementation, challenges, progress towards outcomes and impact, and learning. In order to do so, the UN Action Secretariat needs to invest a significant amount of time into following up with each project, regular check-ins, monitoring visits and frequent results-based project-reporting (at least every six months). This will help the Secretariat, the RMC members and focal points to learn from what worked and what did not in order to apply learning to help strengthen future proposals and projects both conceptually and operationally.³⁹ As mentioned above, it is likely that this would mean that the UN Action Secretariat needs to recruit a full-time M&E expert for this work.

8.6 Donor Engagement and Resource Mobilization

In the first eight years of the fund, the UNA coordinator engaged directly with donors to raise funds. Due to the transition in the position and the Secretariat’s limited staff capacity, UNA in the past two years has lacked visibility and lost donor confidence. As a result, donors are funding the OSRSG-SVC and the TOE, but not necessarily UNA. Stated by an interviewee, “Donors have asked if there is any point in having the UNA network, because they are not seeing the network function effectively and they are not seeing enough results. The network was created before the OSRSG. Now that you have the OSRSG, the donors may see a redundancy in the coordination role [of the Secretariat].”

However, OSRSG-SVC is not operational at the country level, and the SRSG-SVC largely relies on the UN Action network to implement the CRSV mandate in the field. The UN Action Secretariat has not been replaced by OSRSG SVC, but it is the arm of the Office that supports the SRSG in her role as Chair of UN Action with the coordination of and providing Secretariat support to the network. The UNA Secretariat and OSRSG-SVC leadership should begin engaging with the donors more regularly to explain how the UN Action Secretariat remains essential for addressing CRSV.

³⁹ In that regard, it also needs to be kept in mind that RMC members serve on an add-on basis to their normal responsibilities and can dedicate limited amount of time every month to the network. So expectations in terms of how much oversight and learning can be provided by the RMC need to remain realistic. It could be explored though for UN entities to appoint full-time CRSV Focal Points, as was done in DPO, who could dedicate their work towards addressing CRSV and focus on supporting UN Action and the TF.

Donors mentioned that they continue to support the cause of CRSV and that they would consider supporting UN Action, yet that there was a lack of opportunity for engagement. Initially, donors were very engaged through donor conferences, discussions, and via their participation at strategic planning meetings and evaluations. However, beyond the 2013 evaluation of UNA, the donors have not received any evaluations or reports beyond the annual report. As a result, donors are also not given opportunities to provide input or feedback on the direction or performance of the MPTF. Furthermore, more and better follow up needs to occur when donors make requests to the Secretariat or to the OSRSG-SVC. For example, donors requested and provided financial support to the UNA Secretariat to develop a better Theory of Change (TOC) and Results-Based Framework. But the TOC and framework that was developed were not consistently reported against. Donors need to see more tangible results and they need to understand how individual MPTF projects are strategic in terms of their linkages with larger initiatives. Apparently, there has only been one joint-donor meeting in Geneva. Donors were also invited to participate in a strategic planning meeting for UN Action in 2016. The 2013 Review of UNA also recommended “the revival of the very successful annual donor meetings”. This recommendation should be implemented.

Recommendation: UNA and OSRSG-SVC leadership should consistently engage with the donors to explain how the UN Action network works in complementarity to OSRSG SVC and remains essential for addressing CRSV. An integrated resource mobilization and partnerships strategy across UNA, OSRSG and the Team of Experts would be useful in that regard. Furthermore, UN Action should transparently engage donors to discuss not only project results but also challenges and setbacks. The revival of the annual donor meetings should be considered.

Furthermore, the strategic role and mandate of UNA needs to be clarified to donors so that they can differentiate between and see the value added of supporting UNA in relation to providing bi-lateral funding to individual UN agencies and funds. Donors want to see how UNA and the MPTF are aligned with the existing UN Architecture both in terms of institutional mandates and existing funding mechanisms. By clearly identifying how and where UNA fits into this architecture and identifying the specific gaps that it fills, it will help donors to justify their investment. Stated by an interviewee, “There needs to be greater clarity on the types of initiatives that should and should not be funded by UNA via the MPTF.” Donors also suggested the possibility of conducting country level analyses and developing country level priorities and strategies. Then, based on these strategies identify specific gaps that the MPTF can fill. This would assist in showing the relevance of UNA and the MPTF in relation to existing initiatives and funds at the country level. It would also make it easier to measure the results of the MPTF projects and how they were catalytic.

Interviewees stated that UN Action Secretariat is attempting to be both normative (advocacy) and operational (grants). To build donor confidence in UNA’s ability to serve both functions, the governance arrangements need to be fit for purpose. For example, it needs to be ensured that the Secretariat is adequately staffed in relation to its expected functions and responsibilities.

9. What was the role of the MPTF in the context of other funding mechanisms?

The majority of interviewees agreed that it was necessary to have a separate fund for CRSV to ensure that the issue does not get lost in the other larger funding mechanisms. However, a clearer distinction needs to be made between the UNA MPTF and other funds for it to be necessary as a stand-alone fund.

The UNA MPTF is one of the only funds supported by multiple donors that specifically targets CRSV, however there are several other funds that focus more broadly on GBV, yet all with distinct focus areas. For example, the EU supported Spotlight Initiative Fund, which is focused on “eliminating violence against women and girls and harmful practices in almost exclusively development (non-humanitarian) contexts; UNFPA has a fund for GBV; UN Women has a dedicated fund focused on violence against women through funding NGOs; Aspects of the Peacebuilding Fund and other peacebuilding, stabilization, rule of law and justice related funds also overlap with aspects of CRSV. Several global and country level funds also focused on socio-economic development, which could be used to address aspects of CRSV such as gender inequality; The United States has a fund titled Safe from the Start, which drives a very strong focus on addressing GBV in conflicts and natural disasters with a longer term goal of realizing behavioral change addressing the root causes of GBV; DFID also has a fund for research on violence against women and girls; the Dr. Denis Mukwege Foundation is also considering starting a Global Fund for Victims of Sexual Violence, which could be complimentary because this reparations fund can support non-UN entities. There is currently a mapping of the funding architecture ongoing on an initiative by the Secretary General.

Recommendation: The UN Action RMC should contextualize how the MPTF fits into the larger financial landscape. This investment would be beneficial for determining global funding gaps, prioritizing projects, and increasing the sustainability of the projects supported by the UNA MPTF. It may also have a positive impact on the overall effort to address CRSV at the global and country level.

UN Action should use the global attention in 2019 and in particular around the 10-year anniversary of SCR 1888 to present its unique added value and engage with donors for funding.

V. Recommendations for consideration when designing the next phase of the MPTF

General Recommendations:

UNA needs leadership and revitalization in order to maximize the use of the MPTF. It needs clear goals, strategies to reach those goals, and better ways to measure progress and show results. The following steps may assist in this process.

- 1) With the recently updated Theory of Change of UN Action, determine how the MPTF can support UNA to serve its function and achieve its objectives.
- 2) Develop a multi-year strategy for UN Action and the MPTF and finalize the results framework with Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-Oriented (SMART) objectives.
- 3) Revise the TORs for each component of the UNA MPTF including the UNA Secretariat, Steering Committee, Focal Points, RMC.
- 4) Ensure that the Secretariat is fit for purpose and has the necessary human resources to serve its core function, roles and responsibilities.
- 5) Integrate UNA's strategic planning process "to promote joined-up and well-sequenced actions by the SRSR-SVC, TOE, and the UNA pillars of work. This includes concentration on an updated set of priority countries and emerging situations of concern. UN missions and UNCTs of listed countries need to be on board in shaping the support required" including the determination of gaps that the MPTF can help to fill.
- 6) Determine how the MPTF can be harnessed to reinforce global and country level efforts to address CRSV. This should result in a revised strategy, TOR, and results framework for the MPTF. It should also include an accountability and compliance mechanism that ensures that all entities benefitting from the MPTF share programmatic efforts and financial expenditure in a timely and transparent manner.
- 7) Once all of the above is complete, the OSRSR-SVC, the UNA Secretariat, and the TOE should develop an integrated advocacy, external relations, and resource mobilization and partnerships strategy.
- 8) Enhance communication and build relations between UNHQ and the field to maximize the effectiveness of entities at each level. This should include clearly defining the role and expectations of the OSRSR-SVC in relation to the UNA entities at the country level particularly in relation to country-level analysis, strategy, prioritization, and proposal design and approval. This should be a transparent and collaborative process.

Recommendations on increasing the impact of funding

- 9) Priority countries should be decided by the UN Action Steering Committee in close consultation with the UN Action Focal Points. The RMC should ensure that projects focus on these priority countries and that project fits into a larger country-level strategy on CRSV.

- 10) Funded projects should fit into the ongoing UN country-level response. Therefore, project proposal templates need to be updated to ensure that project plans articulate the links to such larger strategies and that sustainability plans are included.

Recommendations on strengthening collaboration and coordination and learning

- 11) A joint planning framework and regular communication between UNA (Secretariat and RMC), OSRSG-SVC, and TOE on country priorities is essential. It is important to note that UN Action focal points will support the development of the joint planning framework and will be involved in country-specific discussions.
- 12) Focal Points should be properly orientated regarding all aspects the MPTF by the MPTF Office and the UN Action Secretariat. Focal Points should be responsible for communicating information regarding the MPTF within their agency to colleagues in HQ and the field on a regular basis.
- 13) The Secretariat should brief the Focal Points and the RMC members prior to and after the proposal submission process the outcome of RMC meetings. The meeting notes from the RMC review process should be provided to the focal points.
- 14) Knowledge products developed by projects should consistently be made available and reviewed by the network to enhance shared learning. A repository of such documents should be maintained and accessible to all UN Action Members.

Recommendations for strengthening the catalytic potential and sustainability of MPTF projects

- 15) Project proposals should clearly articulate if and how the projects are anticipated to be catalytic. Then, M&E and other reporting tools including final reports, impact evaluations, etc. should explain the catalytic effects of the project. In addition, in some instances, greater financial resources and longer timeframes should be allocated per project if the MPTF projects are expected to have a significant catalytic effect.
- 16) The UN Action Secretariat and UN Action Focal Points of the related agencies should monitor the sustainability of the project throughout the project implementation. If concerns arise, the RMC and focal points of the respective agencies should be informed. If no solution can be found internally in due time, donors should be informed. In that regard, it is recommended that the UN Action Secretariat and the RMC also has regular conversations with donors.
- 17) Focal Points meetings should include regular updates on the funds available in the trust fund and encouraged to share the information on the fund with their counterparts in the field. Focal points also need to proactively and in a coordinated manner identify gaps in CRSV response in countries of concern and encourage their country offices to address these concerns, if needed via submitting a project proposal to the MPTF.

Recommendation for Governance Arrangements:

- 18) One of the key steps to address many of the concerns raised would be to ensure adequate staffing of the UN Action Secretariat relevant to its function. This needs to include a: Lead Coordinator (P-5);

Coordination and Programme Officer (P-4); Grants Manager and M&E Specialist (P-3); a Research and Knowledge Manager (P-3) and an administrative assistant. Additional CRSV programme experts could be seconded from UN Action member entities on a rotating basis to drive specific initiatives of the network. The TOR for the Secretariat and each of these positions should be revised including its roles, functions, and responsibilities.

Recommendation for the proposal review process

- 19) The review process should start with the submission of a project concept note, or lighter document for consideration by the RMC to demonstrate proof of concept and whether it fits UN Action's priorities and country strategies. Following a positive outcome of this initial review, the submitting entities would be invited to submit a long-form proposal.
- 20) The templates for the long-form proposals need to be updated to require log frames for tracking the project's impact; a context analysis to help situate the proposed projects into the larger context of CRSV; a description how activities are coordinated with other humanitarian plans or initiatives; and a Do No Harm and risk analysis.
- 21) The RMC also needs to produce standardized budget guidance including value-for-money indicators, percentage of project costs can be staff costs and ensure that project timelines and budgets are realistic in relation to the proposed project.
- 22) The UN Action Secretariat should allow adequate time for the RMC to review proposals;
- 23) RMC members need to be aware of and manage their institutional and sector bias in order to serve the entire UNA network, rather than their individual entity or sector particularly when providing constructive feedback and deciding which proposals should be accepted – the exclusion of the focal point from the decision-making process has been a way to manage that.
- 24) The RMC should consider to keep the link with external technical experts and donors as needed and to reinstate the annual donors' conference where projects impact and lessons learned could be discussed. This would increase the substantive and political debate, enhance donor interest and engagement with UNA and the MPTF.

Recommendation for Project Evaluation and Lessons Learning:

- 25) The UN Action Secretariat should provide feedback on the effectiveness of implementation, challenges, progress towards outcomes and impact, and learning. In order to do so, the UN Action Secretariat needs to invest a significant amount of time into following up with each project, regular check-ins, monitoring visits and frequent results-based project-reporting (at least every six months). This will help the Secretariat, the RMC members and focal points to learn from what worked and what did not in order to apply learning to help strengthen future proposals and projects both conceptually and operationally. This would mean that the UN Action Secretariat needs to recruit a full-time M&E expert for this work.
- 26) In addition, the UN Action Focal Points for the agencies implementing a project should participate in the monitoring and provide technical advice to their field counterparts where needed. This would allow to increase learning from different projects, enhance coordination between agencies at the HQ

level and improve the technical advice provided to project entities in order to maximize the complementarities of the various UN agencies.

- 27) According to the MOU of the MPTF, agencies who receive funds are supposed to use their procedures for monitoring and evaluation. The Secretariat should ensure that those evaluations are shared and lessons are learned and incorporated. In addition, the Secretariat should share the best practices and lessons learned via both internal UN discussions and larger forums that include participants from outside the UN, including donors.

Recommendation on engagement with donors:

- 28) UNA and OSRSG-SVC leadership should consistently engage with the donors to explain how the UN Action network works in complementarity to OSRSG SVC and remains essential for addressing CRSV. An integrated resource mobilization and partnerships strategy across UNA, OSRSG and the Team of Experts would be useful in that regard. Furthermore, UN Action should transparently engage donors to discuss not only project results but also challenges and setbacks. The revival of the annual donor meetings should be considered.
- 29) The UN Action RMC should contextualize how the MPTF fits into the larger financial landscape. This investment would be beneficial for determining global funding gaps, prioritizing projects, and increasing the sustainability of the projects supported by the UNA MPTF. It may also have a positive impact on the overall effort to address CRSV at the global and country level.
- 30) UN Action should use the global attention in 2019 and in particular around the 10-year anniversary of SCR 1888 to present its unique added value and engage with donors for funding.

Annexes

A. List of Documents Reviewed

Amnesty International (2004) *Lives Blown Apart. Crimes against Women in Times of Conflict*. London: Amnesty International Publication.

Brouneus, Karen (2008) Truth-telling as talking cure? Insecurity and retraumatization in the Rwandan Gacaca courts. *Security Dialogue* 39(1): 55-76.

Cohen, Dara Kay. *Rape during Civil War*. Cornell University Press, 2016. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt20d8b3j.

Davies, Sara E & Jacqui True (2015) Reframing conflict-related sexual and gender-based violence: Bringing gender analysis back in. *Security Dialogue* 46(6): 495-512.

Dolan, Chris. 2016. Inclusive gender: Why tackling gender hierarchies cannot be at the expense of human rights and the humanitarian imperative. *International Review of the Red Cross* 98 (2): 625-34.

Dolan, Chris. 2018. Only a fool... 'why men don't disclose conflict-related sexual violence in an age of global media. *Sexual Violence Against Men in Global Politics*, 167.

Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women. A/RES/48/104. 20 December 1993.

Forsberg, Erika & Olsson, Louise (2016) Gender Inequality and Internal Conflict. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. August 2016. <http://oxfordre.com/politics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-34>

Gorris, E. A. P. (2015). Invisible victims? Where are male victims of conflict-related sexual violence in international law and policy? *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 22(4), 412–427. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506815605345>

International Solutions Group, Evaluation of the Gender Based Violence Information Management System (GBVIMS), 2014.

Joint Communiqué of the Republic of Iraq and the United Nations on Prevention and Response to Conflict-Related Sexual Violence. September 23, 2016.

Karim, Sabrina & Beardsley, Kyle (2013) Female peacekeepers and gender balancing: Token gestures or informed policymaking? *International Interactions* 39(4): 461-488.

Krause, Jana, Krause, Werner & Branfors Pila (2018) Women's Participation in Peace Negotiations and the Durability of Peace. *International Interactions* 44(6): 985-1016.

Mid-term Review of the 2015-2019 Joint Programme of the United Nations Team of Experts on the Rule of Law / Sexual Violence in Conflict.

O'Gorman, Eleanor. Review of UNA Against Sexual Violence in Conflict 2007-2012 – Final Report. Cambridge, UK. January 2013.

Olsson, Louise & Bjorsson, Anna (2017) *Gender Training for Leaders: The Swedish Gender Coach Program*. Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace, and Security. Washington D.C.

Report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women. *Towards an effective implementation of international norms to end violence against women*, UN Doc. E/CN.4/2004/66, 26 December 2003.

Report of the Secretary-General on conflict-related sexual violence (S/2017/249).

Report of the Secretary-General on conflict-related sexual violence (S/2018/250).

Sarah K Chynoweth, Julie Freccero & Heleen Touquet (2017) Sexual violence against men and boys in conflict and forced displacement: implications for the health sector, *Reproductive Health Matters*, 25:51, 90-94, DOI: [10.1080/09688080.2017.1401895](https://doi.org/10.1080/09688080.2017.1401895)

UNA Against Sexual Violence in Conflict Fund (2017). 8th Consolidated Annual Progress Report for the period of (1 January – 31 December 2016).

UNA Against Sexual Violence in Conflict Fund (2018). 9th Consolidated Annual Progress Report for the period of (1 January – 31 December 2017).

UNA MPTF. Terms of Reference. Updated 31 December 2012.

UNA MPTF. Operational Guidance Note for the RMC. August 2015.

Resource Management Committee. Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure.

Team of Experts: Annual Report 2017.

MPTF Annual and End of Project Reports for all projects for which these are available. MPTF Programme Documents for ongoing MPTF-funded projects for which final project reports are not yet available.

Sample set of UNA Steering Committee, RMC, and Focal Point Meeting Minutes

B. List of individuals interviewed for the review

| | |
|------------|------------------------------|
| SRSG-SVC | 1. Pramila Patten |
| UNODC | 2. Nina Brantley |
| UNAIDS | 3. Mamadi Diakite |
| OHCHR | 4. Georgina Mendoza Solorio |
| WHO | 5. Claudia Garcia Moreno |
| | 6. Elisabeth Roesch |
| IOM | 7. Anna Reichenberg |
| | 8. Sandra Orlovic |
| | 9. Kristin Parco |
| | 10. Monica Noriega |
| | 11. Igor Cvetkovski |
| UNHCR | 12. Joanina Karugaba |
| UNICEF | 13. Christine Heckman |
| | 14. Tasha Gill |
| | 15. Noriko Izumi |
| UNFPA | 16. Argentina Matavel Piccin |
| OSRSG-SVC | 17. Tonderai Chikuhwa |
| | 18. Emmanuelle Compingt |
| | 19. Sana Hajra |
| OSRSG-CAAC | 20. Nicolas Gerard |
| DPO | 21. David Heari |
| | 22. Silvester Kuhudzai |
| | 23. Maria Trovato |
| | 24. Robert Pulver |
| | 25. Renaud Galand |
| | 26. Georgia Tortora |
| | 27. Annika Kolvar |
| | 28. Amin Mohsen |
| DPA | 29. Lone Jessen |
| | 30. Tanisha Hewanpola |
| UN Women | 31. Alejandro Sanchez |
| UNDP | 32. Evelyn Edroma |
| | 33. Katy Thompson |

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| | 34. Gaelle Kibranian |
| UNAMI - WPA | 35. Idah Muema Agba |
| Sweden | 36. Anette Widholm Bolme |
| | 37. Petra Smitmanis |
| Japan | 38. Chikako Ono |
| Norway | 39. Birgitte Wilhemsen |
| | 40. Hanne Melfald |
| MPTF Office | 41. Mari Matsumoto |
| TOE-ROL | 42. Kaoru Okuizumi |
| | 43. Toby Bonini |
| | 44. Gloria Carrera Massana |
| | 45. Sofia Candeias |
| UNA Secretariat | 46. Fareen Walji |
| | 47. Raquel Villodres Toledo |
| Former UNA Coordinators | 48. Nadine Puechguirbal |
| | 49. Gillian Holmes |
| Former UNA Secretariat | 50. Laura Martin |
| Human Rights Watch, Women's Rights Division | 51. Skye Wheeler |
| GBV - CRSV expert | 52. Danaé van der Straten |
| GBV - CRSV expert | 53. Amra Lee |
| Former WPA in Cote d'Ivoire | 54. Caroline Allibert-Delestras |
| Center for the Prevention of Genocide, Holocaust Museum | 55. Naomi Kikoler |

C. Templates for interviews

General Questions for Grantees

1. What is the value added of the fund?
2. How can the fund have a greater value added?
3. What are some of the weaknesses of the fund?
4. What can be done to overcome these weaknesses?
5. Is the proposal process for accessing the fund clear / user-friendly? How can it be improved?
6. Is the reporting process for the fund clear? How can it be improved?
7. Did the fund encourage / facilitate closer collaboration and joined up work of UN Agencies at the national and international level? If so how? If not, why not? How can this be improved?
8. Were any of your projects catalytic? If so, how? If not, why not? How can this be improved?
9. Did projects supported by the trust fund support / enhance existing initiatives? If so, how?
10. Were the project results sustainable? If so, how? If not, why not? How can this be improved?
11. What are some of the areas that have seen the most progress over the past 10 years as a result of the fund? Examples...
12. What areas need more attention?
13. What are the opportunities for the next phase of the trust fund?
14. Are there specific issues that the fund should address in the future?

General Questions for Donors

1. What is your general interest in supporting the UN Action Multi Partner Trust Fund?
2. Are these interests being met?
3. What is the value added of the fund?
4. How can the fund have a greater value added?
5. What are some of the weaknesses of the fund?
6. What can be done to overcome these weaknesses?
7. What are some of the areas that have seen the most progress over the past 10 years as a result of the fund? Examples...
8. What areas need more attention?
9. Are you satisfied with the level of reporting? If not, how can this be improved?
10. Do you have opportunities to provide feedback? How can this be improved?
11. What are the opportunities for the next phase of an MPTF?
12. Are there specific issues that the fund should address in the future?

D. Results Framework

| UN ACTION AGAINST SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN CONFLICT | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| RESULTS FRAMEWORK | | | | | |
| Goal: CRSV IS PREVENTED, SURVIVORS' NEEDS ARE MET AND ACCOUNTABILITY IS ENHANCED | | | | | |
| Code | Indicator | Type | Verification Method | Data Collection & Reporting Frequency | Implicated Actors |
| Output 1 – The network fulfills its role as a consultative forum on CRSV and as a platform for coordinating advocacy and implementation of gap-filling joint CRSV-focused interventions | | | | | |
| UNAOup.1.1 | <i># of country-focused coordination meetings held; CRSV-affected countries/regions covered by enhanced coordination and joint action planning</i> | Quant | Meeting minutes, Regular updates and information exchanges on CRSV via email or other communication channels | Yearly | UNA Secretariat |
| UNAOup.1.2 | <i># of gap-filling MPTF projects approved and implemented, per focus country</i> | Quant | RMC fund signature document, monthly project monitoring reports | Yearly | UNA Secretariat + RMC |
| Output 2 – Context-appropriate, catalytic tools and resources are developed to fill cross-sector gaps in knowledge, practices, advocacy and technical expertise for improved survivor-centered response | | | | | |
| UNAOup.2.1 | <i>Types of CRSV-related knowledge products and/or advocacy tools and/or resources developed to support improved CRSV prevention and response, per focus country</i> | Qual | Tools and resources, UNA KM repository | Yearly | Country teams |
| Output 3 – Capacity and technical expertise of institutional, operational, national and other key actors is strengthened to prevent and address CRSV | | | | | |
| UNAOup.3.1 | <i>Stakeholder groups trained and/or employing knowledge products, advocacy tools and/or resources developed through UNA support, per focus country</i> | Qual | MPTF project monitoring reports, training attendance lists | Yearly | Country teams + UNA Secretariat |
| UNAOup.3.2 | <i>UNA-funded HQ and field level human resources supporting improved CRSV prevention and response</i> | Qual | MPTF projects budgets, MOUs, UNA Secretariat budget | Yearly | UNA Secretariat + PKO and political missions |

| Output 4 – Institutional and technological links are established between various CRSV information management platforms to enable ethical data collection and sharing in support of MARA and locally relevant prevention and response strategies | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| UNAOut.4.1 | <i>CRSV-affected countries piloting the GBVIMS/MARA intersections guidance note</i> | Qual | Monthly activity update report | Yearly | UNA Secretariat + DPKO + OHCHR + GBVIMS entities |
| UNAOut.4.2 | <i>MARA-targeted countries where addendum to information sharing protocols for action have been jointly developed, signed and implemented</i> | Qual | Addenda to information sharing protocols | Yearly | UNA Secretariat + OHCHR + DPKO + GBVIMS entities |
| Outcome 1 – CRSV risks are prevented; survivors and at-risk groups are supported and protected | | | | | |
| UNAOuc.1.1 | <i>Increased knowledge, technical expertise and/or advocacy capacity of targeted stakeholders to respond to CRSV and protect survivors and at-risk groups</i> | Qual or Quant | As this is a country and project-specific indicator, each MPTF project will employ its own methodology and verification method to measure and report against this indicator | Yearly ideally, timeframe may vary depending on project completion dates | Country teams + PKO and political missions |
| UNAOuc.1.2 | <i>Improved CRSV policy, practice and access to specific support services</i> | Qual or Quant | As this is a country and project-specific indicator, each MPTF project will employ its own methodology and verification method to measure and report against this indicator | Yearly ideally, timeframe may vary depending on project completion dates | Country teams + PKO and political missions |
| Outcome 2 – Reliable, timely and objective information on CRSV trends, risks and patterns supports evidence-based and impactful high-level political advocacy by the Office of the SRSG and the work of its TOE-RoL | | | | | |
| UNAOuc.2.1 | <i>Briefings shared by the UNA network with the Office of the SRSG on focus countries that are used to inform high-level political advocacy and follow-up actions by the SRSG</i> | Qual | Country briefings documentation, records of actions taken by the SRSG (trips, declarations / statements, etc.) | Yearly | UNA Network |
| Outcome 3 – Comprehensive National Strategies and/or Action Plans that address CRSV are developed and implemented | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|------|---|--------|--|
| UNAOuc.3.1 | <i>CRSV-affected countries supported with National Strategies and/or Action plans</i> | Qual | National Strategy / Action Plans documents | Yearly | Country teams + PKO and political missions + UNA Secretariat |
| UNAOuc.3.2 | <i>UNA-supported Comprehensive National Strategies and Action Plans launched that are able to secure donor funding for implementation of strategy-related follow-up activities</i> | Qual | Donor pledges, MOUs, project documents | Yearly | Country teams + PKO and political missions + UNA Secretariat |
| <i>Outcome 4 – Neglected aspects of the WPS/CRSV response are addressed at policy and field level</i> | | | | | |
| UNAOuc.4.1 | <i>Projects and activities that address neglected aspects of CRSV receive donor funding and/or political leverage</i> | Qual | Guidance notes/briefing papers, activity records, donor pledges, MPTF project documents | Yearly | Member States + UN Action network |