



RESOURCING CNAP3: HALLUCINATION OR A PLAN WITH A BUDGET?

by Beth Woroniuk

At the 4th International Conference on Financing for Development earlier this year Bob Rae, then Canada's Ambassador to the United Nations, addressed the opening plenary in his capacity (at the time) as ECOSOC (Economic and Social Council) president. He noted "It was a wise person who once pointed out that strategy without resources is better called hallucination."

Dedicated resources have long been considered a prerequisite for the successful implementation of Women, Peace and Security (WPS) national action plans (NAP). However, most WPS NAPs lack budgets and include little clarity on how NAP activities will be financed. Canadian civil society advocates have consistently highlighted the importance of dedicated budgets and resources. The final report on the 2022 consultations, organized by the WPSN-C, feeding into CNAP 3 included a recommendation on resourcing: "Dedicated funds, costing, and budgeting for all CNAP3 activities and goals are necessary."

Despite these recommendations, to date, Canada's WPS NAPs and their progress reports fall short of both allocating and reporting on resources and budgets. If we follow Ambassador Rae's insight, does that make them a 'hallucination' rather than a full-fledged strategy?

Tracking Investments and Resources in Previous CNAPs

Previous CNAPs and their progress reports provided little information on resource allocations and commitments. Initially, CNAP1 reporting on CNAP1 contained almost no detail on budgets, programming expenditures or human resource allocations. In those early years, analysts outside of government attempted to examine data available through other sources. The final reports on the first CNAP (2014-2015 and 2015-2016) provided incomplete data.



Chapter 5

by Beth Woroniuk

With CNAP2 there was a new effort to track GAC WPS programming investments. Using a combination of the OECD-DAC Purpose Codes, GAC's gender equality marker and various definitions of fragile contexts,² an annex in the [2017-2018 summary progress report](#) provided some information on GAC WPS disbursements. This data looked at overall total and breakdown by country and CNAP2 objective. This practice continued with the 2018-2019 and [2019-2020 progress reports](#). (See the 2017-2018 progress report for an explanation of the methodology used.)

² The OECD-DAC (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee) tracks and monitors development finance. They use a combination of 'purpose codes' and 'markers' to analyze investment trends, including allocations to gender equality and women's empowerment. GAC, and other OECD members report annually and the numbers are available in an online [database](#). GAC uses a 4-point [scale](#) to 'code' initiatives on the extent to which they focus on gender equality outcomes:

- GE - 3 Targeted - Gender equality is the principal objective of the initiative: The initiative was designed specifically to address gender inequalities and would not otherwise be undertaken. All outcomes in the logic model are gender equality outcomes.
 - GE - 2 Fully integrated - There is at least one intermediate gender equality outcome which will achieve observable changes in behaviour, practice, or performance that will contribute to gender equality.
 - GE - 1 Partially integrated - There is at least one gender equality outcome at the immediate outcome level which will achieve a change in skills, awareness, or knowledge that contributes to gender equality.
- GE - 0 None - There are no gender equality outcomes.



Table 1 - Projects Advancing the WPS Agenda

	2019-2020	2018-2019	2017-2018	2016-2017
Total disbursed	\$679M	\$ 497M	\$408 M	\$221 M
Number of projects	261 GE2 127 GE3	226 GE2 78 GE3	215 GE2 55 GE3	n/a
Disbursements by CNAP2 Objective (\$ millions)				
Gender-responsive peacebuilding, peacemaking, and post-conflict state-building, including support to women and women's groups working on peace-related issues	21.8	24.5	27	14.6
Prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence, including ending impunity and providing services to survivors, and addressing sexual exploitation and abuse	50.4	55.7	60.4	27.8
Promotion and protection of women's and girls' human rights and empowerment in fragile and conflict-affected settings, including support to a gender-responsive security sector, women's political participation, girls' primary education and combatting violent extremism	205	130	106.3	81.7
Advancing gender equality in humanitarian settings	170	100	100.7	47.7
Sexual and reproductive health and rights in fragile, conflict-affected states and humanitarian settings	222.6	160	113	49.3
Strengthening the capacity of peace operations to advance WPS	9.2	25.5	0.66	0



The final progress report on CNAP2 (covering 2021-2022 and 2022-2023) abandons the annex on resource tracking with no reason provided. It does, however, include some anecdotal examples of WPS funding, including:

- \$14 million to support the UN Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women's emergency support to WROs for COVID response in conflict-affected countries;
- 97% of Canada's humanitarian assistance projects integrated gender equality considerations in 2020.
- \$41.7 million to support the work of humanitarian partners in sexual reproductive health and rights (SRHR).

The failure to continue tracking resources is regrettable. Data provided in the first three reports indicates dramatic increases in funding over the initial period of CNAP2. Given the absence of ongoing reporting, we do not know if this trend continued.

As well, questions can be asked about the reported increases in WPS investment. Were they, in fact, as dramatic as reported, and did they have an impact? Some analysts have questioned the usefulness of including GAC GE2 initiatives when looking at gender equality investments. In theory, this marker tracks progress that successfully "integrates" gender equality consideration (including analysis and results), but these ratings are done internally with no external quality control or accountability. Thus, it is argued, the reported numbers may inflate or exaggerate meaningful gender equality investments.

CNAP2 reporting on WPS investments was an improvement on the CNAP1 progress report. At first glance, there was a significant increase in WPS programming carried out by GAC. However, given the fact that an Annex on investments was not included in the progress report covering the final years of CNAP2 and an overall lack of solidity of the methodology, this conclusion is somewhat shaky.



What are the commitments in CNAP3?

Turning to the new CNAP, there does not appear to be a significant improvement. Overall, there are few commitments to increased WPS investments and no information on specific budget allocations. The brief mention of “resourcing” in CNAP3 is worth quoting in its entirety:

“Commitments in Foundations for Peace: Canada’s National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security will be delivered through partner programs, practices, policies and operations. In addition to integrating women, peace and security into existing lines of funding, the Government of Canada will continue funding women, peace and security through the Peace and Stabilization Operations Program at Global Affairs Canada. The Government of Canada is also dedicating resources for the coordination of the action plan, including for coordinating and supporting partners, supporting civil society partnership and engagement, and monitoring, evaluation and learning.” (p. 35)

There are general commitments in CNAP3 and the departmental implementation plans to capacity building, new tools, disaggregated data, systematic use of Gender Based Analysis Plus (GBA+), and reporting. All of these institutional initiatives require resources, both human and financial, but there are no budgets or new allocations. It is not clear how these activities are to be financed (especially in an environment where departments are being called to reduce expenditures) and where the funds will come from.

In addition to institutional investments, civil society has called for new programming expenditures. For example, support for women peacebuilders, initiatives aimed at preventing and responding to conflict-related sexual violence, investments in SRHR in conflict-affected contexts, partnering with local and global actors working to implement the WPS agenda, and so on. The GAC department plan includes general mentions and commitments in these areas, but there are no promises to increase or track spending expenditures.



CNAP3's monitoring, evaluation and learning framework does include two key performance indicators (KPIs) related to resourcing, out of a total of 13 KPIs:

- KPI 1.1: % of total international assistance invested in fragile and conflict-affected situations for the purpose of supporting women's organizations and women's networks (international and local) and advancing women's rights and gender equality for programming and/or institutional strengthening.
- KPI 4.1: % of total of humanitarian assistance projects that include sexual and/or gender-based violence or sexual and reproductive health and rights components.

These KPIs are important, but they are incomplete and confusing. Will KPI 1.1 include all gender equality investments, as in GAC's GE3 marker, or just investments that support women's organizations and networks? Will KPI 4.1 provide one total that combines both SRHR and sexual gender-based violence investments? Will other GAC WPS investments be tracked and reported on?

As well, these KPIs only related to GAC. There does not appear to be a commitment to track and report investments by other CNAP3 partners.

Conclusion

Despite the ongoing recognition that to be effective, WPS NAPs require dedicated resources and costed budgets, CNAP3 fails to meet this global standard. While it does include two KPIs on resourcing, these indicators lack clarity and only relate to GAC (and only part of GAC's WPS programming). Furthermore, there are no commitments to ensure dedicated staff across all implementing partners, despite these human resources being necessary to ensure implementation.



Chapter 5

by Beth Woroniuk

It is not too late to rectify some of these absences. Progress reports could include, for example:

- information on staffing: full-time equivalents in each partner department working at least 50% of WPS issues, for example;
- program expenses: for GAC this could be GE3 initiatives (number and budget) in conflict-affected contexts, number and budgets for initiatives supported by embassies/high commissions (including Canada Fund for Local Initiatives) on WPS. There have also been consistent calls for tracking support for women's rights organizations in conflict-affected contexts/women's peacebuilding organizations;
- major investments in institutional strengthening (development of tools, training, etc.) by each partner department;
- new initiatives with dedicated budgets across partner departments.

With this information (and an analysis of increases or decreases by year), we would have a much better sense of whether CNAP3 is a strategy without resources, a hallucination, or a meaningful contribution to global peace, security, and gender equality.