

## Report

# **IASC GENDER ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK REPORT 2024 - 2028**

UN Women on behalf of the IASC Reference  
Group on Gender and Humanitarian Action

---

December 2024

Endorsed by IASC OPAG

## ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK FOR THE INTER-AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE POLICY ON GENDER EQUALITY AND THE EMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN AND GIRLS IN HUMANITARIAN ACTION (2024 – 2028)

In January 2024, the IASC endorsed the updated [2024-28 Inter-Agency Standing Committee \(IASC\) Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls \(GEEWG\) in Humanitarian Action](#). The policy is the key guiding document for collective action and shared accountability towards gender equality in humanitarian action. The policy promotes a people-centered, feminist and intersectional vision of equality and inclusion; one that is transformative, inclusive and uncompromising towards achieving the goals of GEEWG in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of coordinated humanitarian response. It is also a practical tool to help actors achieve their commitments. The aim is to set out the IASC's commitment and obligation to gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls (GEEWG) in humanitarian action, through collective action and shared accountability.

The core principles outlined in the policy are foundational to the priority areas and the roles and responsibilities of the IASC and its structures comprise the “how” to advance on the Priority Areas. The “Roles and Responsibilities” section of the policy captures in a non-exhaustive list the actions for different stakeholders based on existing policies, guidelines, and best practice, and pulls these actions into one place.

The updated gender accountability framework (GAF) is based on a set of indicators designed to measure the compliance by the IASC at all levels with the standards, commitments and designated roles and responsibilities. The framework will be utilized to create a published monitoring report for use at the global and national levels to ascertain compliance and to facilitate the creation of recommendations to improve results in subsequent monitoring cycles.

This Accountability Framework seeks to minimize the burden of data collection on IASC Bodies and Members and Standing Invitees. It also does not duplicate data collection from other reporting systems but draws on existing data where applicable. The existing monitoring and reporting desk (‘Gender Desk’) will work with IASC Bodies in collecting the necessary data at the global level and at the country-level, with Gender in Humanitarian Action Working Groups and clusters.

Progress against the priority areas will be made publicly available through a global dashboard that tracks the global and country-level implementation against this accountability framework. Moving towards a localized approach, there will be country-specific focus pages presenting key areas of progress and challenges enabling better use of the recommendations and findings to strengthen efforts in context-specific ways.

The IASC Principals have the overall responsibility to lead and be accountable for the implementation of the IASC Gender Policy in all aspects of the IASC's work.

After five years a review of the policy will take place in order to assess its continued relevance in the light of ongoing accountability framework monitoring, any IASC restructuring, and/or any other developments in the humanitarian system.

Priority Area	Role/Resp	Number	Indicator	Question	MOV/Data Source	Criteria
Priority area 1: Collect sex, age and disability disaggregated data to inform context-specific intersectional analyses and guide humanitarian planning, implementation, and monitoring Processes. Conduct systematic gender analysis at the beginning of a new crisis and as often as necessary (significant change in context, etc.).	HCT, IASC members, ICCG, INGO	1.1	Percentage of humanitarian settings where a Gender Analysis was conducted in the reporting period and was presented to the HCT or ICCG.	Was a Gender Analysis —that covers the crisis impact on women, girls, men, and boys, in all their diversities – conducted in the reporting period and shared/presented with the HCT or the ICCG? - If yes, who was this developed by? - Were there cluster-specific findings? If yes, please list relevant clusters. - Add link	GiHA WG+ consult	1. No Gender Analysis was conducted. 2. Gender Analysis was conducted and published. 3. Gender Analysis was published AND presented in the ICCG or HCT. 4. Gender analysis tools are being utilized to inform current data collection and analysis efforts, including the MSRNA.  Criteria met: 3 or 4
	Clusters	1.2	Percentage of humanitarian settings where at least 75% of clusters collected and used SADD in formulation of cluster- specific response plan.	Did the cluster/sector collect SADD to formulate a gender-responsive and inclusive cluster response plan?	Cluster Survey	1. Did not collect SADD. 2. Collected SADD but was not utilized to inform response planning. 3. Did not collect SADD but developed response activities targeting the specific needs of women and girls. 4. Utilized the SADD collected to develop response activities targeting the specific needs of women and girls.  Criteria met: 4
Priority Area 2: Ensure the prioritized response plan includes both gender targeted, and gender mainstreamed actions that meet the specific humanitarian needs of all women, girls, men and boys, as identified through the gender analysis and through consultation with the affected crisis affected population, including women and girls.	HCT, Cluster Coordinators, ICCG, GCCG	2.1	Percentage of HNRPs (or HNOs) that use sex and age disaggregated data (SADD) in at least 75% of the sector/clusters.	Did the HNRP (or HNO) use/report SADD in at least 75% of the sector/clusters? FOLLOW UP: Please list the sectors that did not report/use SADD.	GiHA WG+ consult	Criteria met: Score YES if over 75% of clusters/sectors used/reported SADD.  I.e. if there are 10 activated clusters, then 8 out of 10 using/reporting SADD would be 75% of activated clusters.
	HCT, Cluster Coordinators, ICCG, GCCG	2.2	Percentage of HNRPs (or similar document) that demonstrate gender analysis	Did the HNRP (or similar document) demonstrate gender analysis?	GiHA WG+ consult	Criteria for gender analysis (all must be satisfied for a YES score): 1- the differential impact of the emergency on affected women, girls, men and boys in the crisis narrative 2- Barriers and risks faced by women and girls to humanitarian assistance 3-Specific needs of women and girls are identified with corresponding provisions to address them

Priority Area	Role/Resp	Number	Indicator	Question	MOV/Data Source	Criteria
	ICCG, cluster coordinators	2.3	Percentage of ISCG/ICCGs that integrated gender into planning of humanitarian response	Did the ISCG/ICCG integrate gender into planning of humanitarian response?	GiHA WG+ consult	1. Not at all/rarely (0 criteria fulfilled) 2. Partially (1) 3. Consistently (2 criteria fulfilled)  <u>Criteria:</u> -The ICCG instructs clusters to incorporate gender into the HPC processes and tools. -The ICCG shares information on gender equality with HCT for strategic humanitarian decision-making.  Criteria met: 3
	ICCG, cluster coordinators	2.4	Percentage of humanitarian settings where 75% of clusters or sub-clusters have a gender focal point to provide cluster specific gender expertise at coordination level	What percentage of humanitarian clusters / sub-clusters have a gender focal point to provide cluster specific gender expertise at coordination level?	GiHA WG+ consult	4 pt scale (0-25%; 25-50%; 50-75%; 75% or more)  Criteria met: 4 (75% or more)
	GCCG, cluster lead agencies	2.5	Percentage of global clusters that have dedicated gender capacity/personnel at the global level (at least 50% of staff time)	Did the cluster have dedicated gender capacity/personnel at the global level (at least 50% of staff time)? Y/N	GCCG survey	Yes No
	GCCG, cluster lead agencies	2.6	Percentage of cluster strategies that contain gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action as a current strategic priority	Was a new cluster strategy published in the reporting year? If yes, is gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action one of the current strategic priorities in the cluster strategy?	GCCG survey	Yes No

Priority Area	Role/Resp	Number	Indicator	Question	MOV/Data Source	Criteria
	ICCG, cluster coordinators	2.7	Percentage of joint / multi cluster needs assessments that were designed and conducted in a gender-responsive manner.	Did the joint/multi cluster needs assessment include methodologies for identifying needs, risks and barriers/opportunities to access for services for women and girls?	GiHA WG+ consult	Yes No  <u>Indicative methodologies:</u> -Questions on gender included in multi-cluster needs assessments e.g. MSNA or MCNA -Mixed gender assessment teams -Data collection tools including FGDs, KIIs, etc, that target ,women and girls, as well as boys, men in all their diversity -Enumerator trainings on PSEA/GBV referrals  Criteria met: 3 out of 4 methodologies
	ICCG	2.8	% of humanitarian settings where the JIAF multi-partner working sessions included GiHA Working Groups (where active).	Did the GiHA Working Group in your context participate in the JIAF multi-partner working sessions?	GiHA WG+ consult	Yes No N/A - no active GiHA/JIAF working sessions not Conducted
	IASC members, HCT, HC	2.9	Percentage of humanitarian settings where at least 75% of cluster assessments included questions/ methodologies for identifying risks and barriers/opportunities to access for services for women and girls and were informed by consultations with diverse groups of women, girls and other at-risk groups	Did the sector / cluster assessment include questions and methodologies for identifying needs, risks and barriers/opportunities to access services for women and girls?	Cluster survey	1. Sector/cluster assessments do not include questions/methodologies for identifying risks or barriers/opportunities to service access to women and girls. 2. Sector/cluster assessments include questions/ methodologies for identifying the risks and barriers/opportunities for women and girls to access services . 3. Sector/cluster assessments include questions/ methodologies for identifying the risks and barriers/opportunities for women and girls to access services; and were informed by consultations with diverse groups of women, girls and other at-risk groups.  Criteria met: 3
	Clusters	2.10	Percentage of humanitarian settings where at least 75% of clusters used gender balanced teams in conducting assessments.	Did the cluster/sector use gender balanced teams in conducting assessments?	Cluster survey	Yes No  Gender balanced is defined as male-female teams with a range within a 47%-53% distribution.
	Clusters	2.11	Percentage of humanitarian settings where at least 75% of clusters/sectors identified GBV risk mitigation measures and included	Did the cluster/sector, after consultation with women and girls, identify GBV risk mitigation measures and included such measures in programme implementation?	Cluster survey	1. Yes, GBV mitigation measures were incorporated after consultations. 2. Yes, GBV mitigation measures were incorporated but no consultations were held. 3. No, GBV mitigation measures were not incorporated.

Priority Area	Role/Resp	Number	Indicator	Question	MOV/Data Source	Criteria
			such measures in programme implementation.			Criteria met: 1 or 2
Priority area 3: Meaningfully include crisis affected women and girls, persons with diverse SOGIESC, and the organisations representing them in the coordination decision-making processes for assessing, planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluation of humanitarian programming, as well as promote their inclusion in conflict prevention, resilience and peacebuilding efforts	HCT, Cluster Coordinators	3.1	Percentage of humanitarian settings where the HCT <i>engaged</i> with crisis affected women and girls or local women's organizations for coordination, mutual learning, and to enhance integration of gender equality into the humanitarian response.	Did the HCT engage with crisis affected women and girls or local women's organizations/networks for coordination, mutual learning, and to enhance integration of gender equality into the humanitarian response? - Did the HC or HCT members directly engage with said WLOs? - Or, was the ICCG tasked to do so on the HCT's behalf?	GiHA WG+ consult	1. No 2. Once 3. More than once  Criteria met: 3
		3.2	Percentage of HCTs with at least one local WLO (or network of local WLOs) holding a seat	Was there one or more women led organization(s) represented on the HCT? - If yes, did that WLO represent a network of local WLOs?	GiHA WG+ consult	1. NONE 2. One 3. More than one Definition: Reference definition of WLO from policy Criteria met: 2 or 3
	Clusters	3.3	Percentage of humanitarian settings where at least 75% of clusters programmes were monitored to determine levels of access for and inclusion of women and girls, including adolescent girls, persons with disabilities and with diverse SOGIESC.	Were programmes implemented under the cluster/sector monitored to determine levels of access for and inclusion of women and girls, including adolescent girls, persons with disabilities and with diverse SOGIESC?	Cluster survey	1. No - programmes are not monitored to determine levels of access for and inclusion of women and girls 2. Sometimes - gender sensitive indicators and/or safety audits (or other methodology) and participatory approaches are sometimes used but not consistently. 3. Yes - Consistently monitored through gender-sensitive indicators, safety audits (or other methods) and participatory approaches.  Criteria met: 3
	Clusters	3.4	Percentage of humanitarian settings where at least 75% of clusters/sector engaged with Women Led Organizations (WLOs) throughout the process to develop the cluster/sector response plan.	Did the cluster/sector engage with Women Led Organizations (WLOs) throughout the process to develop the cluster/sector response plan?	Cluster survey	Yes No N/A - no cluster response plan

Priority Area	Role/Resp	Number	Indicator	Question	MOV/Data Source	Criteria
	Clusters	3.5	Percentage of humanitarian settings where at least 75% of clusters/sectors had WLOs as members.	Were Women Led Organizations (WLOs) members of the cluster/sector? - Follow-up: if Yes, what percentage of the total membership were WLOs?	Cluster survey	Yes No
	Clusters	3.6	Percentage of humanitarian settings where at least 75% of clusters/sectors engaged with organizations led by adolescent girls throughout the process to develop the cluster response plan.	Did the cluster/sector engage with organizations led by adolescent girls throughout the process to develop the cluster response plan?	Cluster Survey	Yes No
Priority area 4: Facilitate local and national WLO and WRO, as well as organisations representing or led by adolescent girls, youth and persons with diverse SOGIESC, access to quality funding and support, including core, unrestricted and multi-year funding.	HCT	4.1	Percentage of CBPF advisory boards that include at least one local WLO/WRO member (or network of WLOs) (baseline for 2023 13/19 CBPF).	Did the CBPF advisory board include at least one local WLO member? - If yes, did that WLO represent a network of local WLOs?	CBPF annual review; baseline for 2023 13/19 CBPF	Yes No
	HC, HCT, Donors, OCHA	4.2	Percentage of IASC members that have a system to track the amount of funds that go to women-led organizations.	Does your entity have a system to track the amount of funds that go to Women - Led organizations? Follow up: 'if yes, what percentage of your organization's humanitarian funding is going to WLOs?'	IASC member survey or Q to GRG Members	Yes No
	IASC members, HCT	4.3	Percentage of direct CBPF recipients which were local women-led organizations.	What is the percentage of direct CBPF recipients which were local women-led organizations?	CBPF annual review	Number of WLO recipients / Number of total direct CBPF recipients in the reporting year
	IASC members, HCT	4.4	Percentage of CBPF allocations that went to WLOs.	What is the percentage of CBPF allocations that went to WLOs?	CBPF annual review	Dollar amount of CBPF allocations that went to WLOs / Total dollar amount of CBPF allocations in the reporting year

Priority Area	Role/Resp	Number	Indicator	Question	MOV/Data Source	Criteria
<p>Priority area 5: Establish gender in humanitarian action (GiHA) working groups in each crisis context comprising representation from UN entities, INGOs, LNGOs (including local and national WLOs, WROs and organizations representing persons with disabilities and with diverse SOGIESC), clusters/sectors, local government etc. (context appropriate). The policy encourages the GiHA Working Groups to engage local civil society organizations and networks led by adolescent girls whenever feasible.</p>	HC, HCT	5.1	Percentage of humanitarian settings with a functional GiHA WG.	Does your setting have a functional GiHA (or similar gender working group with a humanitarian focus)?	GiHA WG+ consult	<p>5 Criteria for a functional GiHA working Group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The GiHA working group has an agreed upon Terms of Reference or strategy/strategic type document in place (specify when drafted/updated)</li> <li>2. The GiHA working group met at least quarterly during the reporting year</li> <li>3. GiHA working group has a formal link to the HCT and ICCG or engages in consistent liaison with the HCT and ICCG.</li> <li>4. GiHA working group has an agreed upon workplan in place that was updated in the last 12 months.</li> <li>5. GiHA working group membership includes WLOs.</li> </ol> <p>Answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A GiHA working group does not exist.</li> <li>2. 2-3of the criteria of a functional GiHA WG are met</li> <li>3. At least 4 of the 5 criteria for a functional GiHA working group are met.</li> </ol> <p>Criteria met: 3</p>
	UN Women, GiHA, OCHA	5.2	% of GiHAs with WLOs as members.	Were local women led organizations (WLOs) members of the GiHA working groups? If yes, what percentage of the total membership?	GiHA WG+ consult	<p>Yes No</p> <p>#WLOs / Total GiHA WG Membership in a context</p>
	Clusters	5.3	Percentage of humanitarian settings where at least 75% of clusters/sectors had representation in GiHA Working Group.	Did the cluster/sector assign someone to represent the cluster in the GiHA working group?	Cluster survey	<p>Yes No Unaware of GiHA working group</p>

Priority Area	Role/Resp	Number	Indicator	Question	MOV/Data Source	Criteria
Priority area 6: Allocate a percentage/portion of funds from appeals, pooled funds, to identified gender priorities and to WROs and WLOs. Allocations should also be considered for the full list of organisations outlined in Priority Area 4 where feasible, relevant and as soon as possible	HC	6.1	Percentage of overall CBPF funding to national and local actors that was allocated to WLOs.	What percentage of the overall CBPF funding for local and national actors was allocated to WLOs?	OCHA Pooled Fund Annual Report	Data confirmed release in June; (Baseline: funding to WLOs represented approximately a fifth (21%) of the overall CBPF funding allocated to local and national actors in 2022)
Priority Area 7: Ensure that funding for WLOs and WROs, as well as funding for gender targeted programming is consistently and systematically tracked, monitored and reported on.	OCHA	7.1	% of HRP or HNRP countries where GBV requirements were funded at least 50%	What percentage of required GBV funding is met at the end of the year?	FTS GBV Sector	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. less than 25%</li> <li>2. between 25-50%</li> <li>3. between 50-75%</li> <li>4. over 75%</li> </ol> (represented by pie chart)  Criteria met: 3 or 4
Priority area 8: Ensure adequate gender advisory capacity, (such as advisers deployed by the IASC Gender Capacity (GenCap) project, UN Women, UNICEF, and/or UNFPA) is in place to advise Humanitarian Coordinators (HCs), the HCT and inter-cluster coordination, including to facilitate compliance with the IASC's Gender Policy. In contexts where there are multiple GiHA experts in place, facilitate collaboration and coordination.	OCHA, HCT, UN Agencies	8.1	Percentage of humanitarian settings where at least 75% of clusters/sectors benefitted from GiHA capacity training opportunities.	Did the cluster/sector have access to and take advantage of technical capacity building or learning activities on gender?	Cluster survey	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes</li> <li>2. No</li> <li>3. Such activities were not available.</li> <li>4. The sector has adequate internal gender capacity</li> </ol>
	GiHA actors, GiHA working group	8.2	Percentage of humanitarian settings which have gender in humanitarian action technical advisory capacity (for at least 9 months).	Did the HCT have access to sustained senior gender capacity for technical advisory support?  If yes, please describe the source of technical support received accompanied by evidence, where available.	GiHA WG+ consult	Yes No  "SENIOR" at least P3 or equivalent Gender capacity: able to influence the humanitarian leadership. This can be through an individual (over 50% of staff time) or entity meeting the need of gender advisory.  Please indicate source of capacity: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GenCap</li> <li>2. UN (List)</li> <li>3. NGO (List);</li> <li>4. Other (List)</li> </ol>

Priority Area	Role/Resp	Number	Indicator	Question	MOV/Data Source	Criteria
	HCT	8.3	Nature of support requested by HCT (repeat for ICCG/clusters)	Which best describes the areas of general support requested by the HCT related to gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls?	GiHA WG+ consult	Check the three (3) that are most frequently requested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Gender mainstreaming across sectors</li> <li>● Gender analysis</li> <li>● Advocacy</li> <li>● Gender equality strategy</li> <li>● Funding for women and girls/ donor engagement</li> <li>● Strategic communications</li> <li>● Humanitarian Response planning (HNRP)</li> <li>● Data collection (SADD)</li> <li>● Engagement of women led organizations (WLOs)</li> <li>● Capacity strengthening</li> <li>● Joint/multi-sectoral assessments (MSNA, MCNA, etc.)</li> <li>● Context specific tools.</li> <li>● Other (List)</li> <li>● None of the above</li> <li>● No support was requested.</li> </ul>
Priority area 9: Ensure HCTs have defined priorities and a plan on gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in place, either standalone or as part of a comprehensive plan on cross-cutting thematic priorities, including strategies for engagement with local WLOs, WROs and organizations representing persons with disabilities and/or with diverse SOGIESC.	HCT, ICCG	9.1	Percentage of humanitarian settings where the HCT had an endorsed Gender Strategy, which included concrete action to engage with local women's organisations.	Does the HCT have an endorsed plan/strategy on gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls which includes concrete action to engage with local women's organisations?	GiHA WG+ consult	1. No. There is no gender strategy and gender is not included in other "umbrella" strategies. 2. Gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls is addressed as part of other strategies endorsed by the HCT (not stand-alone). 3. There is a stand-alone endorsed gender strategy. 4. There is a stand-alone endorsed gender strategy which includes concrete action to engage with local women's organisations.  Criteria met: 4
	HC, HCT	9.2	Percentage of humanitarian settings where the HCT consulted with the GiHA WG during the HPC process	How often did HCT consult with the GiHA Working Group during the HPC process?	GiHA WG+ consult	1. Never 2. Once 3. Two or more times  Criteria met: 2 or 3
Priority Area 10: Principals, Deputies and Emergency Directors Groups ensure that gender is maintained as a key focus of decision-making on strategic issues and operational needs on the ground in all current crises under the IASC's purview.	IASC bodies	10.1	Percentage of outputs produced and endorsed by the IASC that reflect the standards and commitments contained in the IASC Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls	Do the policies and statements produced and endorsed by IASC reflect the standards and commitments contained in the IASC Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women?	Doc Review of IASC products and statements	Outputs which include reference to GEEWG at a minimum are considered to be consistent with commitments outlined in the policy.

Priority Area	Role/Resp	Number	Indicator	Question	MOV/Data Source	Criteria
Priority area 11: Task forces, subsidiary bodies and associated entities integrate GEEWG and how it relates to the different strategic priority thematic that the IASC has committed to; ensure regular coordination between co-chairs and associated groups to share information and for mutual accountability.	IASC members	11.1	Percentage of IASC members that have an organizational strategy/policy that guides work on gender equality in humanitarian action and aligns with the 2024 IASC Gender Policy.	Does your entity have an organizational strategy/policy that aligns with the 2024 IASC Gender Policy?	IASC member survey or Q to GRG members	Yes No
Priority area 12: Peer-to-peer support and experience sharing to include gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls as a learning priority for humanitarian leaders including in P2P missions.	P2P/EDG, HCT	12.1	Percentage of EDG/P2P missions where the means of integrating gender into the humanitarian response are highlighted in the Action Plans as an area of strategic concern	Does the Action Plan include specific actions to improve the integration of gender into the humanitarian response?	Mission Action Plans and Reports	Yes No
	P2P/ EDG	12.2	Percentage of EDG/P2P missions where Terms of Reference contains provisions for reviewing compliance with IASC Gender Policy.	Do EDG/P2P ToRs contain provisions for reviewing compliance with IASC Gender Policy?	Mission ToRs and Reports	Yes No
Priority Area 13: IASC holds itself accountable to its policy commitments on gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls by regularly reflecting and acting on the findings of the IASC Gender Accountability Framework.	HC/HCT	13.1	Percentage of HCTs that have taken key actions to implement the recommendations contained in the preceding IASC Gender Accountability Framework Report	Has the HCT taken key actions to implement the recommendations contained in the IASC Gender Accountability Framework Report? Please describe key actions taken in the reporting year to implement the recommendations pertaining to the HCTs.	GiHA WG+ consult	Yes No  If yes, please describe the actions taken to implement the recommendations contained in the IASC GAF Report.