



SGBV Coordination Survey – September 2019:

Analysis of the results for SGBV Coordination Survey: (25 of 25 responded)

- A majority of (52%) which indicates that 13/24 respondents are working with **International NGOs**, (24%) indicates that 6/24 respondents are from **UN Agencies**, (20%) indicates that 5/24 respondents are from **Local NGOs** and a minority of (4%) indicates that 1/24 respondent is working with **Donor**.
- A majority of (68%) indicates that 17/24 respondents acknowledged their agency's participation in the SGBV SWG as **High Active participation and monthly attendance**, (20%) indicates that 5/24 respondents acknowledged their participation **as active participation and regularly attendance**, (8%) indicates that 2/24 respondents rated as **moderate participation** and (4%) indicates that 1/24 respondent rated as **low participation**.
- A majority of (56%) which indicates that 14/24 respondents think that GBV Coordination Meetings are **always useful**, (36%) indicates that 9/24 respondents think it is **usually useful** and a minority of (8%) indicates that 2/24 respondent think that **sometimes** it's a useful forum.
- A majority of (60%) which indicates that 15/24 respondent think that the provided information by the GBV coordination **improves** the quality of their programme services and deliverables, (32%) which indicates that 8/24 respondent acknowledge that the information **affect positively in the different implementation aspects of their programme** and (8%) which indicates that 2/24 respondent think that the information didn't make any impact on their programmes.
- A majority of (56%) which indicates that 14/24 respondent **do not know** if the GBV coordination has been affecting the funding status for GBV response, (28%) which indicates that 7/24 respondent think that **funding status has increased**, (12%) which indicates that 3/24 respondent think that the **funding status stayed the same** and (4%) which indicates that 1/24 responded that it does try to have a stronger affect.
- A majority of (88%) which indicates that 22/24 respondent **agreed** that GBV coordination has been responsive to their advocacy needs, although (8%) indicates that 2/24 respondent **disagreed** and a percentage of (4%) indicates that 1/24 respondent explained that they are not aware of the concrete advocacy that has been made as a result of the GBV Coordination.
- A majority of (92%) which indicates that 23/24 respondent think that their participation with GBV coordination mechanism **increased** their knowledge on implementing GBV minimum standards, and (8%) which indicates that 2/24 respondent **disagreed**.
- A majority of (56%) which indicates that 14/24 respondents rated GBV WG performance in supporting service delivery as **satisfactory**, (36%) indicates that 9/24 respondents rated the performance as **strong**, (8%) indicates that 2/24 respondents **do not know**.
- A majority of (44%) indicates that 11/24 respondents evaluated the performance of SGBV SWG in ensuring participation of local organization and participation of different actors and affected population as **strong**, (40%) indicates that 10/24 respondents evaluated it as **satisfactory**, (8%) which indicates that 2/24 respondents rated as **weak**, (4%) indicates that 1/24 respondent evaluated as **unsatisfactory (needs major improvements)** and a same percentage evaluated as **do not know**.



- **The Top 3 most important recommendations to improve coordination:**
 1. Develop GBV strategies
 2. Prepare needs assessments and analysis of gaps to inform the setting of priorities.
 3. Identify concerns and undertake advocacy with different stakeholders

While comparing between both GBV Coordination surveys for 2018 and 2019, those are the main listed differences:

1. Increasing the number of participants of UN Agencies to the survey with a difference of **7.33%**, and decreasing the number of participation of INGOs with a difference of **14.67%**, and no change for the participation of local NGOs.
Also, a donor participated to the survey in 2019.
2. Decreasing with a percentage of **43%** in the agreement that GBV coordination has been affecting the funding status for GBV response, and increasing the percentage of participants who do not know the orientation of its affecting, with a percentage of **43%**.
3. This year, the majority with a percentage of **56%** rated the performance of the GBV WG in supporting service delivery as satisfactory, while last year the majority rated as strong, in comparison with its rate for this year with a difference of **14%**.
Also, the analysis shows that the performance of the GBV WG in supporting service delivery has been much clarified this year.
4. Increasing the rating on that the performance of the SGBV SWG in ensuring participation of local organization and participation of different actors and affected population, as strong and satisfying.
5. The developing and improving of GBV strategies has been duplicated again for this year as a recommendation for the improvements of GBV coordination.