



## GBV Coordination Survey – September 2018:

### Analysis of the results for GBV Coordination Survey: (24 of 24 responded)

- A majority of (66.67%) which indicates that 16/24 respondent are working with **International NGOs**, (20.83%) indicates that 5/24 respondent are from **Local NGOs**, and the minority (16.67%) indicates that 4/24 respondent are working with **UN Agencies**.
- A majority of (58.33%) indicates that 14/24 respondent think that GBV Coordination Meetings are **always useful**, (37.50%) indicates that 9/24 respondent think it's **usually useful** and a minority of (4.17%) indicates that 1/24 respondent think that **sometimes** it's a useful forum.
- A majority of (95.83%) which indicates that 23/24 respondent think that information they get from GBV Coordination Mechanism **helps** implementing their programme, and (4.17%) indicates that 1/24 respondent **don't think it helps** in implementing with their programme.
- A majority of (75%) which indicates that 18/24 respondent think that GBV coordination has been able to increase funding for the GBV response, and (16.67%) indicates that 4/24 respondent **disagreed**. Also, (8.33%) indicates that 2/24 respondent are **not sure** if it helped in increasing funding for the GBV response.
- A majority of (83.33%) which indicates that 20/24 respondent **agreed** that GBV coordination has been responsive to their advocacy needs, although (8.33%) indicates that 2/24 respondent **disagreed** and a percentage of (8.33%) indicates that 2/24 respondent explained that we should focus more on PWD and that responses for points that are raised in a meeting would be found in the next meeting.
- A majority of (95.83%) which indicates that 23/24 respondent think that their participation with GBV coordination mechanism **increased** their knowledge on implementing GBV minimum standards, and (4.17%) which indicates that 1/24 respondent **disagreed**.
- A majority of (50%) which indicates that 12/24 respondent rated GBV WG performance in supporting service delivery as **strong**, (33.33%) indicates that 8/24 respondent **do not know**, (8.33%) indicates that 2/24 respondent rated the performance as **unsatisfactory (needs minor improvement)**, (4.17%) indicates that 1/24 respondent rated as weak and (4.17%) indicates that 1/24 respondent explained that there's a need for better contributions and information sharing from the members.
- A majority of (58.3%) indicates that 14/24 respondent evaluated performance of the cluster in ensuring localization, participation and accountability to affected populations as **strong**, (20.83%) indicates that 5/24 respondent **do not know**, (16.67%) indicates that 4/24 respondent rated as **unsatisfactory (needs minor improvement)** and (4.17%) indicates that 1/24 respondent evaluated as **unsatisfactory (needs major improvements)**.
- **The Top 3 most important recommendations to improve coordination:**
  1. Enhance technical support (capacity building, peer sessions, on the job support)
  2. Provision of more strategic direction
  3. Increase joint interagency initiatives