

Inter-agency Global Evaluation of RH Services for Refugees and IDPs

Component 6: Review of
Resource Availability at the
Global Level in Support of RH
Services for Refugees and IDPs

UNFPA

Purpose

- Identify changes over time in resource availability, at the global level, for RH services for refugees and IDPs

Methodology

- Structured questionnaire covering
 - trends in funding
 - advocacy activities and/or strategies
 - Changes in policies and practices
 - Resources provided through IAWG
- Interviews by phone (7) and face-to-face (2)
- 9 key informants :
 - Senior members of staff
 - Knowledgeable about resource availability in support of RH services for refugees and IDPs
- Additional information from review of selected literature

Major Sources of Funds

- Funds provided by:
 - USA, Netherlands, Belgium, UK, Sweden, Norway, Italy
- Funds often channeled through:
 - USAID, DFID, SIDA, ECHO
- Other sources:
 - private foundations (Mellon, Ted Turner)
 - UN agencies (UNHCR, UNFPA, UNAIDS)

Trends in Funding

- No major changes in sources of funds
- Steady upward trend following ICPD in 1994
- Plateau in 1999-2000 followed by continuing downward trend thought to be influenced by:
 - media and political influence
 - global economic recession
 - increased competition in area of humanitarian aid

Key Factors Supporting Funding Availability

- ICPD, other UN conferences
- High coverage and awareness of humanitarian emergencies (Yugoslavia and Rwanda)
- Work of IAWG
- Backing for initiatives under leadership of UNHCR and UNFPA

Effective Advocacy Activities

- ICPD (1994)
- Women's Commission report (1994)
- RH symposium sponsored by UNHCR, UNFPA, WHO (1995)
- Research-based evidence re RH in refugee situations
- Involvement of senior staff

Key Factors in Changing Policies and Practices

- Move from demographically driven agenda to human rights-based approach
- Creation of IAWG
- Formation of RHRC Consortium

Contributions of IAWG

- Developing guidelines/standards (*Inter-agency Field Manual*)
- Establishing MISP/RH Kits
- Promoting RH training courses
- Exchanging information and experiences
- Joint planning and policy formulation

Limitations

- Subjective recall and selection bias on the part of interviewees
- Subjective bias on the part of researcher with respect to interpretation of findings

Conclusions and Recommendations

- Major sources of funds unchanged
- Decrease in funds since 2000
- To prevent further decrease, IAWG should accelerate its work and:
 - improve coordination, information flow and planning
 - package, target and disseminate advocacy messages more effectively
 - encourage more involvement of local NGOs from the field