



Campaign for the Gender Equality  
Architecture Reform at the United Nations  
European Focal Point

# Funding, ODA, Governance and Structural Factors Relevant to the Establishment of a New UN Gender Equality Architecture

- Prepared by The Varda Group<sup>1</sup>, 9 June 2009

\*\*\*\*\*

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
1. Introduction: Purpose of Paper and Relevant Gender Equality Considerations.....	2
2. Finances, Staffing, Offices and European Union Member State Contributions for Selected UN Entities.....	4
2.1 Finances, Staffing, Offices and European Union Member State Contributions for Four Existing Gender-Equality Entities.....	5
2.1.1 UNIFEM.....	6
2.1.2 DAW.....	7
2.1.3 OSAGI.....	7
2.1.4 INSTRAW.....	8
2.2 Finances, Staffing, Offices and European Union Member State Contributions for Five Other UN Entities.....	8
2.2.1 UNICEF.....	9
2.2.2 UNDP.....	10
2.2.3 UNFPA.....	11
2.2.4 UN-HABITAT.....	12
2.2.5 UNAIDS.....	12
2.3 Gender Equality Financing as Driver in Achieving MDG Goals.....	13
2.4 Gender Equality-Targeted Bilateral, Multilateral and Total OECD-DAC ODA.....	14
2.4.1 Bilateral ODA.....	14
2.4.2 Multilateral ODA.....	15
2.4.3 Total ODA.....	16
2.5 Other Finance-Related Comments and Recommendations.....	16
3. Governance and Structural Aspects of the New Entity.....	17
3.1 UNICEF.....	17
3.2 UNDP.....	17
3.3 UNFPA.....	18
3.4 UN-HABITAT.....	19
3.5 UNAIDS.....	20
3.6 Observations Involving Governance and Structural Considerations.....	21
4. Conclusions.....	21

Annexes (listing at p. 22)

**Executive Summary:** *This paper examines budgets, staff levels, offices and the European Union Member State contributors to the four existing UN gender equality and women’s empowerment entities (UNIFEM, DAW, OSAGI, and INSTRAW) and five other UN entities (UNICEF, UNDP, UNFPA, UN-HABITAT and UNAIDS), to help assess and support the most effective arrangements for a new, “composite” UN women’s organization.*

<sup>1</sup> This paper was commissioned by Oxfam Novib on behalf of the European GEAR Focal Point. The paper was prepared by The Varda Group’s Clifton Curtis, with Kelly Rigg providing administrative oversight, and Varda sub-contractee Sharon Kotok contributing main text and annex research. The paper presents independent research and does not necessarily reflect the views of Oxfam Novib and/or the European GEAR Focal Point.

*Financial considerations are the principal focus, with data and related information supporting the view that achieving a \$1 billion or greater budget for the new women's entity as soon as possible is a modest funding target, yet extremely important to achieving success in effectively addressing critical gender-related issues and needs. These are difficult financial times, but the current state of affairs reinforces the importance of delivering critically needed resources in support of gender equality and women's empowerment, as those efforts are **"powerful multipliers of development efforts...and catalysts for the reduction of poverty and the achievement of all the MDGs."**<sup>2</sup>*

*For the existing gender equality architecture, UNIFEM is the cornerstone, generating over \$215.4 million (97%) of their combined \$221 million funding. With very encouraging recent progress in growing its financial base, UNIFEM has reinforced its leadership role in being able to attract new and additional resources for the new entity. Targeting \$1 billion as a benchmark for the new entity's annual budget is very reasonable, given the required budgets to meet MDG3, and the fact that the current \$221 million budget of the existing four gender equality entities is less than 1% of the \$27 billion that the United Nations and all its agencies and funds spends each year.*

*Billions of bilateral and multilateral ODA flows address gender targeted initiatives; billions more are needed; and while those flows are mostly government-led, the new, UN women's entity, through its US-G, Executive Board and staff must be strong enough, financially, to effectively carry out its multi-dimensional and multi-sectoral responsibilities and opportunities. Numerous advocates of a financially strong women's entity have held up UNICEF, with an annual budget in excess of \$3 billion, as exemplifying a realistic scale of funding for the new entity to achieve as it takes root, quickly gaining experience and donor confidence. Moreover, once up and running, the new women's entity would be well positioned to promote leveraging of existing and additional gender-targeted bilateral as well as multilateral donations, drawing on the OECD giving patterns, and linking those funds with recipient country co-financing, serving as an investment counselor for both the donors and recipients on the most effective uses of the funds.*

*Complementing the financial needs, governance and structure-related information and observations for five other UN organizations highlights various modalities or functions to consider as features that would enhance the new entity's decision-making capabilities and strengthen its operational capacity. Creation of the new entity provides opportunities to much more effectively rationalize multifaceted tasks that require attention, supplanting a somewhat confusing, overlapping, dysfunctional aggregation of organizational missions, priorities and programmes by the existing gender-equality architecture. There are exciting opportunities to break new ground in creating an entity that will function responsibly, while innovating, reaching out and responding to existing and new gender-related needs and opportunities.*

*When considering existing features of other UN entities, those offer constructive approaches on several fronts, including: UNICEF combines extensive operational work protecting and empowering a particular group with authoritative normative work; UNDP's high-level executive board offers a model for creating a decision making body that inspires confidence by a wide range of funders, while also providing expert policy and operational guidance; UNFPA's shift to a more field-centred organizational structure and lessons learned from scaling up operations; and UNAIDS with its Committee of Cosponsoring Organizations, extending the reach of the core UNAIDS mission substantially. Other recommendations include involving communications strategies, NGO participation and other possibilities for strengthening the operational capabilities of the new entity. At the same time, other UN entities also provide models to be avoided in the establishment of the women's entity. A lack of sustainable, financial resources; operational capacity; authority and seniority; and*

---

<sup>2</sup> OECD-DAC. 2009. "DAC Guiding Principles for Effectiveness, Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment," OECD, 9 March 2009, Preamble (bolded emphasis added).

*restricted recruitment and financing regulation render the existing structures of UNFPA, UN-HABITAT and UNAIDS, at different levels, as undesirable precursors for the women's entity.*

## **1. Introduction: Purpose of Paper and Relevant Gender Equality Considerations**

This research paper provides information and perspectives in favour of establishing a well-funded, \$1 billion USD annually, new, composite UN gender entity. It does so by examining current funding for gender at the UN level, funding for several other UN organizations, as well as needs “on the ground” to meet Millennium Development Goal 3 (MDG3) and the financial requirements to do so. Bilateral and multilateral ODA data also attest to the need for a well-funded new entity. In looking at several other UN organizations, governance and structural modalities are also highlighted for comparison and potential application in relation to the “option D” composite entity outlined in the DS-G’s papers from 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2008 and 13<sup>th</sup> March 2009,<sup>3</sup> to help ensure that the new entity make<sup>d</sup> decisions effectiv<sup>el</sup>y, and has a strong, operational capacity.

The universe of functions relevant to the UN gender equality architecture process, for purposes of creating an effective, composite entity, is substantial. They involve important concepts and functions such as coherence, authority, need for full/ambitious funding, advocacy, its catalytic role, substantive support to other UN bodies, accountability, coordination, mainstreaming, country-based programming, monitoring, research and analysis, among others. The manner in which these and other functions are addressed will be critical to the success of the new entity, with the DS-G’s iterative papers having explored many of those functions. **Annex I** contains two complementary listings of those functions.<sup>4</sup>

Dating back to the 1970s, commitments on financing for gender equality and women’s empowerment have been made by Governments, internationally, including but not limited to the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (1979), the Fourth World Conference on Women’s Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (1995), the 23<sup>rd</sup> special session of the General Assembly (2000), and the Beijing+10 Declaration (2005).

The 1995 Beijing Platform for Action conveys the necessarily broad reach of those commitments, emphasizing *inter alia* that “funding will need to be identified and mobilized from all sources and across all sectors.”<sup>5</sup> At the Beijing+5, 23<sup>rd</sup> Session of the General Assembly, the Governments’ resolution stressed the need for continued international cooperation to strengthen the flow of financial resources for the Beijing Platform for Action and “to ensure that commitments for gender equality, development and peace are **fully realized**”<sup>6</sup>, through diversified actions, including but not limited to<sup>7</sup>:

- “Incorporate a gender perspective into the design, development, adoption and execution of all budgetary processes, as appropriate, in order to promote equitable, effective and appropriate

---

<sup>3</sup> United Nations. 2009. “Further Details on Institutional Options for Strengthening the Institutional Arrangements for Support of Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women,” (5 March 2009), prepared by DSG in response to the General Assembly resolution on System-wide Coherence (A/RES/62/277); and “Institutional options to strengthen United Nations work on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women,” DSG, (23 July 2008).

<sup>4</sup> **Annex I**, Part I, lists the eight (8) functions of a new gender equality and women’s empowerment entity, as previously outlined by the DSG’s papers, note 3, *supra*, 5 March 2009 (para. 9a-h). Part II is an informal compilation, by Varda, of various governance and institutional modalities drawn from paragraphs 12-63 of the DS-G’s 5 March 2009 paper.

<sup>5</sup> United Nations. 1995. Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing, 4-15 September 1995, chap. 1, resolution 1, annex II, paragraph 345.

<sup>6</sup> United Nations. 2000. General Assembly resolution S-23/3 (10 June 2000), annex, paragraph 1 (bolding emphasis added).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, the five-point listing, sequentially, is drawn from paragraphs 73(b)(c), 76(c), and 101(i)(j)(l).

resource allocation and establish adequate budgetary allocations to support gender equality and development programs that enhance women’s empowerment”;

- “Increase, as appropriate, and effectively utilize financial and other resources in the social sector...to achieve gender equality and women’s empowerment as a central strategy for addressing development and poverty reduction”;
- “Provide national machineries with the necessary human and financial resources, including through exploring innovative funding schemes, so that gender mainstreaming is integrated into all policies, programmes and projects”;
- “Identify and implement development-oriented and durable solutions which integrate a gender perspective to external debt and debt servicing problems of developing countries...including the option of [ODA] debt cancellation, in order to help them finance programmes and projects targeted at development, including the advancement of women”;
- “Support the Cologne initiative for the reduction of debt, particularly the speedy implementation of the enhance [HIPC] Debt Initiative; ensure the provision of adequate funds for its implementation and implement the provision that funds saved should be used to support anti-poverty programmes that address gender dimensions”;
- “Call for...reaffirmation [of] the yet to be attained internationally agreed target of 0.7 percent of the [GNP] of developed countries for [ODA] as soon as possible, thereby increasing the flow of resources for gender equality, development and peace”.

Those and numerous other international commitments convey powerful messages in support of the advancement of women. Regrettably, governments have failed miserably in translating those promises into action. While all concerned are well aware of the serious financial crisis facing the global community, strengthened and accelerated delivery of financial and human resources for effective implementation of agreed gender equality and women’s empowerment commitments offers tremendous potential to contribute substantially to sustainable development in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## 2. Finances, Staffing and European Union Member State Contributions for Selected UN Entities

At present, four entities comprise the existing gender equality architecture within the UN: UNIFEM, DAW, OSAGI, and INSTRAW. Those entities and their budgets are described herein, and also in tabular detail in **Annex II**. Combined, the budget of those 4 entities is US \$ 221 million, with UNIFEM’s \$215.4 million dollar budget, in terms of income, representing over 97% of their combined budget. Five other entities – UNICEF, UNDP, UNFPA, UN-HABITAT and UNAIDS – are similarly profiled, providing added reference points for comparison, and those five entities are also described herein, and in tabular detail as well in **Annex II**. As per **Table 1**, below, a summary comparison of the budgets reflects wide diversity in the budget (and staff levels) of the nine entities.

**Table 1**  
**Comparison of Budget Totals and Staffing for the 4 Gender and 5 Other Entities<sup>8</sup> (US \$ Millions)**

	UNIFEM 2008	DAW 2008	OSAGI 2008	INSTRAW 2008	Subtotal Women’s Entities	UNICEF 2008	UNDP 2008	UNFPA 2008	UN- HABITAT 2008	UNAIDS 2008
Total Income	215.4	1.15	0.418	4.12	<b>221.088</b>	3,390	5,463	845.3	165.8	290.8
Total Expenses	118	-	-	0.94	-	3,098	4,270	701,9	161.2	244.7

<sup>8</sup> DAW, OSAGI, UN-HABITAT and UNAIDS are on biennial 2006-7 and 2008-9 budget cycles. Financial details for 2008 were available for UN-HABITAT and UNAIDS, but for DAW and OSAGI, the figures presented are 50 % of the biennial 2008-9 budget. Limited information was available from DAW, OSAGI and INSTRAW with respect to detailed budgets.

Total Staff	230	28	14	12	<b>284</b>	7,200	3,334	1,031	318	900
-------------	-----	----	----	----	------------	-------	-------	-------	-----	-----

European Union Member States have contributed substantially to the UN's existing gender architecture, especially that of UNIFEM. **Table 2**, below, summarily highlights the top European Union Member State donors to those entities, as well as to five other UN organizations (with rankings in parentheses next to the amount). In looking ahead to the financial needs of the consolidated new women's entity, past European Union contributions to gender-related matters suggests that their Member States will continue to be in the forefront of funding this critically important programmatic and cross-cutting gender-related agenda.

**Table 2**  
**Top 5 European Union Member State Donors for 4 Gender and 5 Other Entities<sup>9</sup> (US \$ Millions)**

	UNIFEM 2008	DAW 2008	OSAGI 2008	INSTRAW 2008	UNICEF 2008	UNDP 2008	UNFPA 2008	UN- HABITAT 2008	UNAIDS 2008
Denmark					80.4 (5)	96.6 (5)	54.4 (3)		12.4 (4)
Ireland									11.7 (5)
Italy	10.9 (2)			0.74 (2)				2.2 (5)	
Netherlands	9.5 (4)				142.8 (2)	202.4 (2)	100.8 (1)	2.4 (4)	48.8 (1)
Spain	98.4(1)			1.473 (1)	101.8 (4)	146.9 (4)	32.2 (4)	18.8(1)	
Sweden	5.9 (5)				97.8 (3)	186.0 (3)	68.5 (2)	11.0 (2)	43.2 (2)
UK	9.6 (3)				212.8 (1)	285.1 (1)	53.4 (3)	5.2 (3)	21.1 (3)

### **2.1 Finances, Staffing, Offices and European Union Member State Contributions for Four Existing Gender-Equality Entities**

As a general, UN-centred comparison, the existing gender equality architecture's combined budget of \$221 million, involving UNIFEM, DAW, OSAGI and INSTRAW, is less than 1/100<sup>th</sup> (0.83%) of the \$27 billion that the United Nations and all its agencies and funds spends each year.<sup>10</sup> When viewed in these or similar contexts, with the critical tasks facing the new women's entity, targeting \$1 billion or more for a new women's organization annual budget to help achieve gender equality and women's empowerment is by no means excessive.

With this overview information and perspectives, the following subsections provide more detailed organizational descriptions and finance, staffing and European Union Member State donor information for each of the four, existing gender equality entities within the UN system.

<sup>9</sup> For DAW and OSAGI, no donor contribution data was available online or provided, with the core of DAW's limited budget funded by the regular UN budget; and for INSTRAW there were only four listed EU donor contributors who contributed \$10,000 or more (see Annex II (D))

<sup>10</sup> Global Policy Forum. 2009. "UN Finance," by Global Policy Forum, one page fact sheet states that "[t]he United Nations and all its agencies and funds spend about \$27 billion each year or about \$4 dollars for each of the world's inhabitants."

**2.1.1 UNIFEM:** “UNIFEM is the women’s fund at the United Nations. It provides financial and technical assistance to innovative programmes and strategies to foster women’s empowerment and gender equality. Placing the advancement of women’s human rights at the centre of all of its efforts, UNIFEM focuses its activities on four strategic areas: strengthening women’s economic security and rights; ending violence against women; reversing the spread of HIV/AIDS among women and girls; and achieving gender equality in democratic governance in times of peace as well as war.”<sup>11</sup>

Created by a UN General Assembly resolution in 1976, following a call from women’s organizations attending the 1975 UN First World Conference on Women in Mexico City, UNIFEM’s mandate is to:

- “Support innovative and experimental activities benefitting women in line with national and regional priorities;
- Serve as a catalyst, with the goal of ensuring the appropriate involvement of women in mainstream development activities, as often as possible at the pre-investment stage; and
- Play an innovative and catalytic role in relation to the UN’s overall system of development cooperation.”<sup>12</sup>

Focusing on its recent financial status, UNIFEM’s income and expenses for 2008, relative to 2007, have increased by nearly 100%. That increase benefited significantly from UNIFEM’s creation of a new “100/100” Campaign, with its goal being to enlist 100 Governments to commit to \$100 million in core grants by 2011. As a result of this new campaign, in 2008 core resource commitments grew from \$44 to \$51 million (16% increase); and the number of government donors grew from 49 in 2007 to 80 in 2008 (63% increase).<sup>13</sup> The campaign is an important advance, given that core monies are far more predictable and reliable over time.

For 2008, UNIFEM’s overall income was 215.4 million, expenses at \$118 million, and a fund balance of \$96.5 million to carry forward to the 2009 budget.<sup>14</sup> That sizeable fund balance is due the generosity and foresightedness of the Government of Spain’s \$64.8 million start-up of a Gender Equality Trust Fund (GETF) which will be used to fund important activities in line with UNIFEM’s mandate.<sup>15</sup> Most of that GETF contribution is targeted for competitive grant disbursements to governments and NGOs in two tranches: one in the latter half of 2009; and a second in 2010. Clearly, in reviewing the UNIFEM budget, the \$215.4 million in income is extremely abnormal, in contrast with prior years, e.g, 2007 - \$129.8 million, and 2006 - \$63.3 million, and because 46%/\$98.4 million of its income was from one donor, the Government of Spain, far exceeding any prior contributions by that Government. More detailed tabular data on UNIFEM is available at **Annex II (A)**.

UNIFEM’s staff totals 230, of which 58 are Professional Core, and 172 are Project Contracts; with about 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of all staff based at headquarters, and 2/3<sup>rd</sup>s in the field. They are on the ground in about 80 countries, with the number varying from 1 to 30 persons in specific countries.

---

<sup>11</sup> UNIFEM. 2008. UNIFEM Annual Report 2007-2008, “Mission & Mandate,” (inside cover page). For more detailed information on UNIFEM, see [www.unifem.org](http://www.unifem.org)

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> UNIFEM. 2009. “UNIFEM’s 100/100 Campaign,” UNIFEM Annual Report 2008-2009, p. 23.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, “Special Trust Funds,” UNIFEM Annual Report 2008-2009, p. 20

With income of \$215.4 million in 2008, UNIFEM's top 5 European Union Member State contributors were: Spain (\$98.4 million /46% of the total income)<sup>16</sup>; Italy (\$10.919 million); UK (\$9.555 million); Netherlands (\$9.544 million), and Sweden (\$5.923 million). For more detailed tabular data on European Union contributors, **see Annex II (A)**, last table.

**2.1.2 DAW:** "The Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW) advocates the improvement of the status of women of the world, and the achievement of their equality with men....Together with Governments, other entities of the [UN] system, and [NGOs/CSO,... DAW actively works to advance the global agenda on women's rights, gender equality and the empowerment of women, and ensure that women's voices are heard in international policy arenas."<sup>17</sup>

Established in 1946, DAW's main responsibilities are:

- "To support formulation of policy, global standards and norms on gender equality and women's empowerment at the global level, including through analysis and research;
- To promote, support and monitor the implementation of international agreements on gender equality and empowerment of women, including the Beijing Platform for Action....';
- To support the implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women and its Optional Protocol; and
- To promote the mainstreaming of gender perspectives across all sectors, both within and outside the [UN] system."<sup>18</sup>

For the 2008-2009 biennium, DAW's budget is \$1.15 million per year, exclusive of posts. Effective as of July 2009, it will have 28 staff, including 18 professional and 10 general services staff. For some additional tabular data on DAW, **see Annex II (B)**.<sup>19</sup> No government contributor data was available.

**2.1.3 OSAGI:** "The Office of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women (OSAGI)"...created in March 1997... "comprises a Principal Social Affairs Office in charge of Gender Mainstreaming and the Focal Point for Women in the Secretariat."<sup>20</sup> Its "main objective is to promote and strengthen the effective implementation of the Millennium Declaration, Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action..., and the Outcome Document of the special session of the General Assembly on Beijing + 5." It is charged with providing follow-up implementation tasks through "oversight and policy guidance to [DAW] on substantive servicing of the [UNGA], ECOSOC, the Commission on the Status of Women, the CEDAW Committee..., "<sup>21</sup> and other collaborative activities.

OSAGI plays a catalytic role and develops new strategies and programmes to advance gender equality and the empowerment of women in all sectors of society, through:

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, p. 23. Spain's \$98.4 million contribution in 2008 was a combination of its \$64.8 million special grant to establish the Gender Equality Trust Fund; a \$5.2 million grant for UN Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women; a \$5.8 million core grant; and a \$22.6 million cost-sharing contribution.

<sup>17</sup> United Nations. 2009. DAW/Division for the Advancement of Women, "Mission Statement," in "About the Division, [www.un.org/womenwatch/daw](http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw), also contains other relevant detailed information on their activities and functions.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> DAW. 2009. Finance/staffing Information provided by DAW via email on April 3 and April 9, 2009. After providing initial data, DAW advised that further financial or other organizational data should be based solely on website or other publicly available information.

<sup>20</sup> OSAGI. 2009. Home Page/"About OSAGI," [www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/aboutosagi.htm](http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/aboutosagi.htm)

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.



- Advising, representing, and assisting the S-G on gender issues to render the global Secretariat more sensitive to those issues;
- Facilitating, monitoring, advising, and advocating overall policy goals of the Organization with regard to gender analysis and mainstreaming throughout the UN;
- Assisting in the design of policies and strategies for the improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat and the UN system; and
- Providing leadership to various UN Task Forces focused on the above-stated issues.<sup>22</sup>

For the current 2008-2009 biennium, the OSAGI budget (exclusive of core staff) is \$ 0.418 million per year, of which \$ 0.123 million is core funding, and \$ 0.294 million extra-budgetary funding, information that was provided by OSAGI. For a more detailed statement of finances, see **Annex II (C)**.<sup>23</sup> With OSAGI based at UN Headquarters, New York City, staffing as of July 2009 will involve, in addition to the AS-G post, 10 Professionals and 4 General Service staff. Regarding Government contributions, as with DAW, no Government contributor data was available.

**2.1.4 UN-INSTRAW:** As follow-up to the 1975 First World Conference of Women, in 1983 the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) officially opened in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic. Its core mission is to develop research and training programs that contribute to the empowerment of women and the achievement of gender equality worldwide.<sup>24</sup>

“Through alliance building with governments, international organizations, academia, civil society, the private sector and other actors, INSTRAW: conducts action-oriented research from a gender perspective that has a concrete impact on policies, programs and projects; creates synergies for effective knowledge management and communication on gender issues; strengthens the capacities of key stakeholders to integrate gender perspectives in policies, programmes and projects; and builds a sustainable, transparent and efficient institution that conveys women’s voices.”<sup>25</sup>

For 2008, INSTRAW’S income was \$4.18 million, while its expenses totalled \$0.94 million, resulting in a funding carryover of \$3.179 million. For additional tabular data on INSTRAW, see **Annex II(D)**. Staffing, at present, includes 4 Professional Staff (3 of which are unfilled as of May 2009), 5 General Services Staff, and 3 Project Officers.

Based on publicly available, annual report information for 2007 and 2008, contributors to the INSTRAW’S \$4.18 income in 2008 include 4 European Union Member States: Spain (\$1.473 million/35% of the total income); Italy (\$0.740 million); Greece (\$0.015 million) and Slovenia (\$ 0.010 million).<sup>26</sup>

## **2.2 Finances, Staffing, Offices and European Union Member State Contributions for Five Other UN Entities**

For the purpose of providing a comparative analysis of the current financial commitments among the four gender equality entities and other relevant entities, a similar review of resources for UNICEF, UNDP, UNFPA, UN-HABITAT, and UNAIDS was undertaken. Those entities and their budgets are described herein, and also in tabular detail in **Annex II**, in the subsections listed herein .

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> OSAGI. 2009. Information provided by OSAGI via email on April 3 and April 9, 2009. After providing initial data, OSAGI advised that further financial or other organizational data should be based solely on website or other publicly available information.

<sup>24</sup> UN-INSTRAW. 2008. UN-INSTRAW 2007-2008 Annual Report; “Who We Are,” [www.un-instraw.org](http://www.un-instraw.org); Work Plan and Operational Budget for 2009, INSTRAW/EB/2008/R.11 (24 March 2008, p. 9; INSTRAW brochure (undated, with 35 photos of people’s faces on front and back cover); and email/phone exchanges with INSTRAW in April 2009.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, brochure, “What we do...”

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, email/phone exchanges in April 2009.

As noted earlier, UNICEF, with its thematic focus on children, has an annual budget in excess of \$3,390 million, providing a model for funding the new gender equality-centred organization. UNDP, with its annual budget at \$5,634 million, coordinates international development work, including global and national work to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, especially that of reducing extreme poverty by 50% by 2015. While UNDP's cross-cutting agenda is more diverse than the mandate of the new gender entity, the gender entity's agenda has important parallels with respect to its handling of finances, staffing and donor contributions initiatives.

For UNAIDS, its Unified Budget and Workplan and Programme Coordinating Board involving 10 Cosponsoring organizations, financed exclusively from voluntary funds, provides another model that deserves review and consideration as offering avenues for coordination and engagement with the broader network of international organizations whose agenda involves important work on gender equality and women's empowerment programmes and activities. These and related features are relevant comparisons to take into account in considering the information provided in the following five subsections.

**2.2.1 UNICEF:** UNICEF, the world's leading advocate for children, was established in 1946, by GA resolution 57(I), to provide emergency assistance to children in war-ravaged countries following World War II. In 1953, the General Assembly, in resolution 802(VIII), placed the fund on permanent footing and charged it with addressing the long-term needs of children and mothers in developing countries. UNICEF's priority areas, as set out in its medium-term strategic plan for 2006-2009, are:

- Young child survival and development;
- Basic education and gender equality;
- HIV/AIDS and children;
- Child protection from violence, exploitation, and abuse; and
- Policy advocacy and partnerships for children's rights.<sup>27</sup>

UNICEF derives its income entirely from voluntary funds. The public sector, including governments, intergovernmental organizations, and intergovernmental arrangements, contribute two-thirds of the resources. (107 governments contributed to UNICEF in 2008.) Private groups and some 6 million individuals contribute 29 percent. National committees raise the largest portion of private sector contributions. Currently there are National Committees in 36 countries in the industrialized world, each established as an independent local non-governmental organization. Private-public partnerships are also large contributors, particularly in the area of health.<sup>28</sup>

In 2008, UNICEF's total income was \$3,390 million. UNICEF received contributions of \$1,052 million to regular resources (i.e. contributions that are untied) and \$2,305 million to other resources (i.e. contributions that are earmarked for specific purposes). Overall expenditures in 2008 were \$3,098 million. The five top European Union Member State contributors to UNICEF's \$2,997 million income in 2007 were: UK (\$213 million/over 6% of the total income), Netherlands (\$196 million), Sweden (\$168 million), Spain (\$102 million) and Denmark (\$80 million). The European Commission contributed \$152 million.<sup>29</sup>

"Income from non-DAC countries (\$21 million in 2007), while important, is yet to reach a significant percentage of the total. As part of its resource mobilization strategy, UNICEF is investing in partnerships with

---

<sup>27</sup> New Zealand. 2007. United Nations Handbook 2007-2008, published by the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, p. 185.

<sup>28</sup> UNICEF. 2009. UNICEF Annual Report 2008, pp. 43-45.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

emerging donors as China, India, Kuwait, Oman, Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, as well as the new European Union Members.”<sup>30</sup>

UNICEF is present in 190 countries, and in 2008 it collaborated with 155 countries and territories. It has seven regional offices (in Panama, Switzerland, Thailand, Kenya, Jordan, Nepal, and Senegal) and 127 country offices (some offices cover more than one country). The regional and country offices carry out UNICEF's mission through a program of cooperation developed with the host government. Overall management and administration takes place at headquarters in New York, where global policy on children is shaped.<sup>31</sup> Some 88% of UNICEF's approximately 7,200 posts are located in the field.<sup>32</sup> For more detailed tabular data on UNICEF, see **Annex II (E)**.

**2.2.2 UNDP:** UNDP began its operations in 1966 under GA resolution 2029 (XX) (1965), which combined the UN Expanded Program of Technical Assistance (EPTA) with the Special Fund. GA resolution 2688 (XXV) (1970) defined the organizational structure and activities.<sup>33</sup>

“UNDP is the main body responsible for coordinating development work, especially global and national efforts to reach the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), with particular emphasis on halving extreme poverty by 2015.” UNDP focuses on: reducing poverty, fostering democratic governance, managing energy and the environment for sustainable development, supporting crisis prevention and recovery, and responding to HIV/AIDS.<sup>34</sup> In all its activities, UNDP encourages the protection of human rights and the empowerment of women.<sup>35</sup> UNDP also administers special funds and programs, including: the UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), UN Volunteers (UNV), and the UN Capital Development Fund (UNCDF). In addition, UNDP publishes the annual Human Development Report.<sup>36</sup>

UNDP's financial resources are derived primarily from voluntary contributions by governments. “UNDP has co-financing arrangements with donor and recipient governments, as well as with multilateral financing institutions. Co-financing contributions (including cost-sharing by recipient governments and trust fund contributions) make up an increasingly significant component of UNDP's revenue.”<sup>37</sup>

In 2007, UNDP's total income (contributions, interest, and other income) was \$5,463 million. UNDP received contributions of \$1,088 million to regular resources (i.e., contributions that are co-mingled and untied), and \$3,703 million to other resources (i.e., contributions that are earmarked for specific purposes). Overall UNDP programme expenditures in 2007 were \$4,270 million.<sup>38</sup> In 2008, the five top European Union Member State contributors to UNDP were: UK (\$285.1 million/over 5% of the total income), Netherlands (\$202.4 million), Sweden (186 million), Spain (\$146.9 million), and Denmark (96.6 million).<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> UNICEF. 2009. Annual Report to the Economic and Social Council, E/2009/6, E/ICEF/2009/3, p. 4, paragraph 13.

<sup>31</sup> UNICEF. 2009. <http://www.unicef.org/about/structure/index.html>

<sup>32</sup> Ibid, at [http://www.unicef.org/about/who/index\\_faq.html](http://www.unicef.org/about/who/index_faq.html)

<sup>33</sup> Supra, note 27, United Nations Handbook 2007-2008, p. 193.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> UNDP. 2009. <http://www.undp.org>

<sup>36</sup> Supra, note 33.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid, p. 194.

<sup>38</sup> UNDP/UNFPA. 2008. Executive Board of UNDP and UNFPA – Annual Review of the Financial Situation, 2007, DP/2008/39, p. 1; UNDP 2008. UNDP Annual Report 2008;

<sup>39</sup> UNDP. 2009. UNDP Annual Report 2008: UNDP Resources, p. 35; UNDP 2009. DP/2009/11/add.2 “Statistical Annex”

UNDP is present in 166 countries and is the largest provider of development grant assistance in the UN system. "In each country office, the UNDP Resident Representative normally also serves as the Resident Coordinator of development activities for the United Nations system as a whole. Through such coordination, UNDP seeks to ensure the most effective use of UN and international aid resources."<sup>40</sup>

The total number of proposed posts for 2008-2009 is 3,334 (736 international professional, 614 national professional, and 1984 general services and other categories of staff). 85 percent of the total number of posts is proposed for country offices, while 15 percent are allocated for headquarters. For more detailed tabular data on UNDP, see **Annex II (F)**.<sup>41</sup>

**2.2.3 UNFPA:** "UNFPA was set up by the Secretary-General in 1967, after UNGA resolution 2211 (XXI) (1966) called on UN system organizations to provide assistance in the field of population. In 1969, the Secretary-General entrusted the Fund's management to the Administrator of UNDP and renamed it the UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA). GA resolution 3019 (XXVII) (1972) placed the Fund under the General Assembly's authority and designated the UNDP Governing Council to be its governing body, subject to conditions to be established by ECOSOC. ECOSOC resolution 1763 (LIV) (1973) set down UNFPA's aims and purposes and tasked the Fund with playing a leading role in promoting population programs."<sup>42</sup>

"UNFPA's mandate, as established by ECOSOC in 1973 and reaffirmed in 1993, is: (1) to build the knowledge and the capacity to respond to needs in population and family planning; (2) to promote awareness in both developed and developing countries of population problems and possible strategies to deal with these problems; (3) to assist their population problems in the forms and means best suited to the individual countries' needs; (4) to assume a leading role in the UN system in promoting population programs, and to coordinate projects supported by UNFPA."<sup>43</sup> For the period 2008 to 2011, UNFPA has proposed three interconnected strategic goals in the following focus areas: population and development, reproductive health and rights, and gender equality.<sup>44</sup>

UNFPA is funded entirely by voluntary contributions from governments, intergovernmental organizations, private sector groups, foundations, and individuals. In 2008, UNFPA's total income (contributions, interest, and other income) was \$845 million. UNFPA received contributions of \$429 million to regular resources (i.e., contributions that are co-mingled and untied), and \$366 million to other resources (i.e., contributions that are earmarked for specific purposes). Overall UNFPA expenditure in 2008 was \$702 million.<sup>45</sup> The top five European Union Member State contributors to UNFPA's \$845 million income in 2008 were: Netherlands (\$101 million/nearly 12% of the total income), Sweden (\$69 million), Denmark (\$54 million), United Kingdom (\$53 million), and Spain (\$32 million). The European Commission contributed \$36 million.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> UNDP. 2009. <http://www.undp.org/about/>

<sup>41</sup> UNDP. 2009. Executive Board of UNDP and UNFPA – UNDP and UNIFEM Estimates for the Biennial Support Budget, 2008-2009, Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, DP/2008/5, p. 6, paragraph 19.

<sup>42</sup> *Supra*, note 27, p. 197.

<sup>43</sup> UNFPA. 2009. <http://www.unfpa.org/about/faqs.htm#mandate>

<sup>44</sup> UNFPA. 2007. Executive Board UNDP and UNFPA: UNFPA Strategic Plan, 2008-2011: Accelerating Progress and National Ownership of the ICPD Program of Action, Report of the Executive Director, DP/FPA/2007-17.

<sup>45</sup> UNFPA. 2008. Executive Board of UNDP and UNFPA: UNFPA Statistical and Financial Review, 2007, DP/FPA/2008/5 (Part I, Add.1), p. 3, UNFPA Annual Report 2008.

<sup>46</sup> UNFPA. 2009. Executive Board UNDP and UNFPA: UNFPA – Funding Commitments to UNFPA: Report on Contributions by Member States to Regular and Co-Financing Resources for 2008 and Future Years, DP/FPA/2008/9, pp. 13-18, UNFPA Annual Report 2008.

Worldwide, in 2007, UNFPA had 1,031 core staff in authorized budget posts. Forty-six percent of professional staff were women—one of the highest percentages among UN organizations. Seventy-seven percent of UNFPA’s approved core posts were in the field; while the other 23% (232) are in New York headquarters, including 3 out-posted in Geneva. For more detailed tabular information on UNFPA, see **Annex II (G)**.<sup>47</sup>

**2.2.4 UN-HABITAT:** UNGA Resolution 32/162 (1977) established the UN Commission on Human Settlements and its secretariat, the UN Centre for Human Settlements. The Centre has its headquarters in Nairobi, Kenya. GA Resolution 56/205 (2001) upgraded the Commission and its secretariat into the UN Human Settlements Program (UN-HABITAT). The Commission became the Governing Council of UN-HABITAT, which was moved from ECOSOC to be a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly.<sup>48</sup>

UN-HABITAT is “charged with coordinating human settlement activities within the UN system and for facilitating the global exchange of information on shelter and sustainable human settlement development.”<sup>49</sup> It also “helps governments create policies and strategies aimed at strengthening management capacity at both national and local levels. It focuses on promoting shelter for all, improving urban governance, reducing urban property, improving the living environment, and managing disaster mitigation and post-conflict rehabilitation.”<sup>50</sup>

For 2008, UN-HABITAT’s income totalled \$165.8 million. The organization’s funding comes from three sources: UN Regular budget allocations approved by the General Assembly (around \$11.6 million); voluntary contributions to UN Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation (\$65.5 million); and voluntary contributions for technical cooperation (\$88.7 million). Of all the voluntary contributions received by UN-HABITAT in 2008 (\$154.2 million), 87% (\$134.2 million) were earmarked for specific purposes. Overall UN-HABITAT expenditure for 2008 was \$161.2 million.<sup>51</sup> In 2008, the top five European Union Member State contributors to UN-HABITAT’s estimated \$165.8 million in income were: Spain (\$18.83 million/nearly 11% of the total income), Sweden (\$11.99 million), United Kingdom (\$.5.2 million), Netherlands (\$2.42 million), and Italy (\$2.25 million). The European Commission contributed \$6.78 million.<sup>52</sup>

Worldwide, in 2007, UN-HABITAT had 318 staff: 188 international professional, 8 national professional, and 122 general services. For more detailed tabular data on UN-HABITAT, see **Annex II (H)**.<sup>53</sup>

**2.2.5 UNAIDS:** As the main advocate for global action on HIV and AIDS, UNAIDS leads, strengthens, and supports an expanded response aimed at preventing transmission of HIV, providing care and support, reducing the vulnerability of individuals and communities to HIV, and alleviating the impact of the epidemic. It is a joint, unified program of the UN, that has been operational since January 1996, and it has ten

---

<sup>47</sup> UNFPA. Executive Board of UNDP and UNFPA: UNFPA Statistical and Financial Review, 2007, DP/FPA/2008/5 (Part I, Add.1), p. 15.

<sup>48</sup> Supra, note 27, pp. 210-211.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> UN-Habitat. 2009. Draft Work Programme and Budget for the Biennium 2010-2011, Report by the Executive Director, HSP/GS/22/5, pp. 8-9.

<sup>52</sup> UN-HABITAT. 2008. Financial Report for the Biennium Ended 31 December 2007 and Report of the Board of Auditors, HSP/GC/22/INF/5, pages 34-38; 2008-2009 Unified Budget and Workplan, “Executive Summary.”

<sup>53</sup> HSP/GC/22/INF/4 Status of voluntary contributions to the United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation as of December 2008.

Cosponsors – UN system organizations that contribute efforts and resources to the AIDS response – comprised of UNICEF, UNDP, UNFPA, UNESCO, WHO, World Bank, UNHCR, WFP, UNODC, and ILO.<sup>54</sup>

Elimination of gender inequality is a targeted focus of UNAIDS, with the following priority actions:<sup>55</sup>

- “Top leadership at every level of society must speak out against stigma, discrimination, gender inequality and women’s empowerment;
- Laws and policies that protect women and girls against sexual violence, disinheritance and gender discrimination of all kinds... must be enacted, publicized and enforced;
- Women must be adequately represented in policy- and decision-making on AIDS;
- Laws and policies that directly address gender equality and bias against people perceived to be at heightened risk for HIV, including sex workers and men who have sex with men, must be enacted and enforced;” and
- “Changes in laws and policies must be accompanied by adequately funded “know your rights” and social mobilization campaigns against gender inequality and HIV related stigma and discrimination.”

For 2008, UNAIDS had an income of \$290.92 million and expenses of \$244.69 million, with a fund balance of \$46 million.<sup>56</sup> Government contributions are responsible for over 95% of external funding. For expenses, funds transferred to Cosponsors, and interagency activities account for over one-half of their expenses.<sup>57</sup> The 5 top European Union Member State donors for UNAIDS’ \$290.9 million income in 2008 were: Netherlands (\$48.83 million / nearly 17% of the total income); Sweden (\$43.25 million); UK (\$21.08 million); Denmark (\$12.39 million); and Ireland (\$ 11.72 million). For more detailed tabular data, see **Annex II (I)**.

UNAIDS has approximately 900 staff, with about 300 located in UNAIDS Geneva HQ and Liaison Offices (in New York, Washington and Brussels), and 600 in the field – including in 83 Country Offices and 7 Regional Support Teams. Of the total number, 550 are Professional Staff Positions and 350 are General Service Staff Positions.<sup>58</sup>

### 2.3 Gender Equality Financing as Driver in Achieving the MDG

Expanding on costing efforts by the UN Millennium Project, a 2007 World Bank study estimated costs of interventions needed to achieve gender equality- focused Millennium Development Goal 3 in low income countries<sup>59</sup> The study clearly makes the point that meeting the MDG3 goal will take a substantial commitment of financial resources – an average of \$5.5 billion per year from 2006 – 2015 if the most conservative, least costly scenario for action is used – in order to achieve the targeted goal by the deadline of 2015. In that study, after first looking at the MDG3-specific investment needs and gender-mainstreaming

---

<sup>54</sup> UNAIDS. 2009. website, “Home,” “Policy and Practice,” and “Gender,” at [www.unaids.org](http://www.unaids.org)

<sup>55</sup> Ibid, “Priority actions to address gender inequalities,” “Gender” section.

<sup>56</sup> UNAIDS/PCB824/09.6 2010-2011 Unified Budget and Workplan and 2008-2009 Reports (1May 2009); UNAIDS. 2009. “Revised Agency Calculations,” 2008-2009 Unified Budget Workplan, p. 119; 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (1 May 2009), UNAIDS/PCB (24)/09.6, also available at: [http://data.unaids.org/pub/InformationNote/2009/20090501\\_ubw\\_2008financialreport\\_96\\_final\\_en.pdf](http://data.unaids.org/pub/InformationNote/2009/20090501_ubw_2008financialreport_96_final_en.pdf); Revised Unified Budget and Workplan 2006-2007, June 2006, p.59; and UNAIDS Unified Budget and Workplan 2004-2005, UNAIDS/PCB (14)03.3, 29 April 2003, p. 9.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

<sup>58</sup> UNAIDS. 2009. Email correspondence from UNAIDS, 30 April 2009.

<sup>59</sup> Grown, Bahadur, Handbury and Elson (2008). *The Financial requirements of achieving gender equality and women’s empowerment*. In M.Buvinic et. al, *Equality for Women: where do we stand on Millennium Development Goal 3?*, World Bank. 2008. The authors provided the calculations for Table 5.5.

investment needs in 5 countries for 2006-2015, those costs were then applied to all MDG investment needs in low income countries, and three scenarios were developed for financing those gender costs, i.e.

“Scenario 1 assumes that gender equality interventions are not financed by domestic resources mobilization...with all gender-equality interventions financed through external resources. Scenario 2 assumes that government resources will partially support gender equality interventions [and] Scenario 3 assumes that the share of government resources spent on gender equality interventions is proportionate to the share of the gender equality intervention costs in total MDG costs, which is the assumption made by the UN Millennium Project analysis. Consequently, the financing gap for gender in scenario 3 reflects the share of gender-equality costs in total MDG costs.”<sup>60</sup>

Accepting the 3<sup>rd</sup> scenario (the most conservative one cost wise) as the preferred assumption, as shown in the bottom two rows of Table 5.5 of that study, the financing gap ranges from \$8.6 billion in 2006 to \$23.8 billion in 2015. Meeting that challenge, among others, will benefit enormously from having a forceful voice and advocate in the upper echelons of the UN system, reaching out to and working with governments, NGOs and the private sector, and others, to help attract and deliver needed monies to those countries, as well as others.

**Table 5.5 Total Gender Costs and Source of Financing for Low-Income Countries (2003 US\$ Billions)<sup>61</sup>**

		Scenario 1		Scenario 2		Scenario 3	
		2006	2015	2006	2015	2006	2015
<b>Achieving the MDGs</b>							
	Investment needs	251.7	560.1	251.7	560.1	251.7	560.1
	Domestic resource mobilization	178.9	399.9	178.9	399.9	178.9	399.9
	Financing gap	72.8	160.2	72.8	160.2	72.8	160.2
<b>MDG3 Specific</b>							
	Investment needs	5.3	35.9	5.3	35.9	5.3	35.9
	Domestic resource mobilization	0	0	0.5	2.5	3.8	25.6
	Financing gap	5.3	35.9	4.8	33.4	1.5	10.3
<b>Mainstreaming Costs</b>							
	Investment needs	24.4	47.3	24.4	47.3	24.4	47.3
	Domestic resource mobilization	0	0	1.5	7.5	17.3	33.8
	Financing gap	24.4	47.3	22.9	39.8	7.1	13.5
<b>MDG3 Specific + Mainstreaming Costs</b>							
	Investment needs	29.7	83.2	29.7	83.2	29.7	83.2
	Domestic resource mobilization	0	0	1.9	10.1	21.1	59.4
	Financing gap	29.7	83.2	27.7	73.2	8.6	23.8
	Financing gap (per capita 2003 US\$)	11	27	10	23	3	8

## 2.4 Gender Equality-Targeted Bilateral and Multilateral OECD-DAC ODA

A significant portion of the OECD countries’ bilateral and multilateral ODA is directed at gender activities. With global ODA from OECD countries having reached \$120,000 million for the first time in 2008, data and studies presented in this section of the paper further support the need for a new women’s organization that has sufficient resources to be fully effective.

**2.4.1 Bilateral ODA:** Once up and running, the new women’s entity would be well positioned to promote leveraging of existing and additional gender-targeted bilateral as well as multilateral donations, drawing on the OECD giving patterns, and linking those funds with recipient country co-financing, serving as investment counsellor for both donors and recipients on the most effective uses of the funds.

Annually, the OECD-DAC prepares a report on bilateral aid in support of gender equality, focused on statistics based on DAC Members’ reporting on the gender equality policy markers. The latest available data

<sup>60</sup> Ibid, p. 230.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid. p. 232. (Emphasis provided by the two coloured rows was inserted in the original.)

is for 2006-2007.<sup>62</sup> In an overview summary, attached as **Annex III**<sup>63</sup>, the data shows that, for each of those two years, \$10,155 million (1/3<sup>rd</sup>) of the \$30,993 million in bilateral ODA targeted gender equality as a principal or significant objective.<sup>64</sup>

Based on those results (50% sample), it is reasonable to assume that a similar 1/3<sup>rd</sup> share of all \$59,153 million of the OECD-DAC bilateral aid targeted gender, since the others either failed to report, due to problems applying the methodology, or they (countries like France, Ireland, and others) had gender marker coverage that was too low to record, or they reported and said they did not target some or all of their gender (the other 2/3rds). Accordingly, an estimated \$20,000 million of the overall \$59,153 million of bilateral ODA had a gender focus.

**2.4.2 Multilateral ODA:** In June 2009, OECD-DAC distributed a new report on multilateral ODA, the first in a series of annual reports that will examine this topic.<sup>65</sup> It is based on the view that mapping the multilateral system will help address fragmentation and poor coordination among organizations, and will help the system become more effective in delivering aid. In contrast with the DAC's bilateral statistics, the multilateral data does not target gender equality as a specific subset of its overall data set. That information gap exists, more generally, among government donors, with few able to provide easily accessible information on gender-targeted or other thematic areas of their multilateral ODA.

Nonetheless, the multilateral data provides a broader picture of the quantity of ODA that is being generated, with the recipients including some who are focused on gender issues, such as UNFPA. In this regard, Table 2.1 shows a three-year average of core contributions by OECD-DAC member countries to key multilateral agencies.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> OECD-DAC Secretariat. 2009. (Bilateral) AID in support of gender equality and women's empowerment, 2006-2007, 24 April 2009 (May 2009), Paris.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid, "Aid at a Glance – Donors' Charts, p. 3

<sup>64</sup> Focusing on the OECD-DAC's 15 European Union Member States and the European Commission, they gave \$9,700 million of targeted gender giving (a subtotal of column 3 of Annex III) out of the total of \$36,375 million in their reported and unreported bilateral ODA (a subtotal of the far right column of Annex III), at a level of targeted gender giving that was even higher (36.5%) than the above 1/3<sup>rd</sup> rate for all OECD-DAC members.

<sup>65</sup> OECD-DAC. 2009. (final) DAC Report on 2006-2007 Multilateral Aid, 2009, June 2009, accessible at: [www.oecd.org/dac/scalingup](http://www.oecd.org/dac/scalingup). See also, [www.oecd.org/documentprint/0,3455,en\\_2649\\_34487\\_42458595\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/documentprint/0,3455,en_2649_34487_42458595_1_1_1_1,00.html)

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., p. 25.



**Table 2.1 Core contributions provided by DAC member countries to the major multilateral agencies 2004-06**

Gross disbursements, three-year average 2004-06 (constant 2006 USD million)

Donor	UN Agencies	EC	The World Bank Group	Regional Dev. Banks	The Global Fund	Other multilateral agencies	Multilateral ODA, total	Multilateral as share of gross ODA (%)	Multilateral as share of gross ODA excl. debt relief (%)	Multilateral (excl. EC) as share of gross ODA excl. debt relief
Australia	51	-	132	61	14	30	290	16	17	17
Austria	31	224	65	35	-	12	366	28	53	21
Belgium	53	375	131	30	12	28	629	33	41	16
Canada	279	-	248	173	126	137	963	26	28	28
Denmark	317	203	99	52	22	83	775	36	37	28
Finland	107	143	39	19	3	16	326	40	43	24
France	199	1,922	394	197	225	317	3,255	28	39	16
Germany	253	2,104	589	177	81	91	3,295	30	39	14
Greece	10	161	17	0	0	9	198	51	51	9
Ireland	85	112	62	6	15	2	282	35	35	21
Italy	249	1,286	274	122	77	122	2,129	52	72	29
Japan	917	-	1,452	440	105	144	3,058	19	24	24
Luxembourg	20	25	14	11	2	5	78	28	28	19
Netherlands	448	426	328	100	64	53	1,418	26	28	19
New Zealand	18	-	8	6	0	20	52	21	21	21
Norway	507	-	162	91	30	9	799	28	28	28
Portugal	11	126	13	18	1	4	173	27	45	12
Spain	116	787	198	141	38	62	1,343	37	45	19
Sweden	431	227	118	88	58	45	967	28	30	23
Switzerland	121	-	151	51	4	48	375	22	24	24
United Kingdom	492	1,487	688	173	121	120	3,082	28	37	19
United States	621	-	1,188	330	438	259	2,836	11	12	12
<b>Total DAC</b>	<b>5,334</b>	<b>9,609</b>	<b>6,373</b>	<b>2,322</b>	<b>1,438</b>	<b>1,614</b>	<b>26,690</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>19</b>
<i>Share of total multilateral ODA</i>	20	36	24	9	5	6	100			

Source: DAC Aggregate Statistics

For the European Union Member State donors, Table 2.1 illustrates both the diversity and quantity of giving to key multilateral recipients by them, with the top five, in terms of total multilateral ODA, being: Germany (\$3,295 million); France (\$3,255 million); UK (\$3,082 million); Italy (\$2,129 million); and Netherlands (\$1,418 million). As with the OECD-DAC bilateral ODA, the new women's agency, once established, will be extremely well positioned to counsel those governments, for example, on the "win-win" opportunities that come from targeting gender-equality initiatives, knowing that such a focus includes a "multiplier" effect benefiting broader development-related interests, including all of the MDG goals.

**2.4.3 Total ODA in 2008:** On 30 March 2009, OECD DAC released a preliminary, 4-page statement announcing the most recent net official development assistance (ODA) by its 22 member countries. In 2008, total net ODA from members of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) members rose by 10.2% in real terms from USD \$103,500 million to USD \$119,800 million.<sup>67</sup> This is the highest dollar figure ever recorded.

According to the report, it represents 0.30% of members' combined gross national income (GNI); the DAC EU countries contributed \$70,000 million (58%) of the \$120,000 million total; with the 5 largest donors being the US (\$26,900 million), Japan (\$17,400 million), Germany (\$ 15,900 million), France (\$12,400 million) and UK (\$11,800 million); and with five donors exceeding the UN target of 0.7% of GNI (Denmark, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden).<sup>68</sup> The combined net ODA of the 15 European Union Member States rose by 8.6% in real terms to \$70,200 million, representing 59% of all DAC ODA. As a share of GNI, net ODA from DAC European Union Members rose to 0.42%.<sup>69</sup>

This data is encouraging, on the one hand, with total ODA reaching 120,000 million in 2008. However, given the current, potentially prolonged fiscal crisis facing developing countries, in particular, around the world,

<sup>67</sup>OECD-DAC. 2009. Press release, "Development aid at its highest level ever in 2008," see preliminary data at: [www.oecd.org/documentprint/0,3455,en\\_2649\\_34487\\_42458595\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/documentprint/0,3455,en_2649_34487_42458595_1_1_1_1,00.html)

<sup>68</sup> Ibid, at p. 2.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

even more ODA will be needed in 2009 and beyond from European Union Member States and others to help ensure that development efforts, including those embodied in the poverty, gender-equality and other MDG goals, do not fall further beyond the 2015 goals and targets. For the new women's entity, as with the bilateral and multilateral data provided earlier, a tremendous opportunity exists for the consolidated new, well-funded entity to exercise a convening role in working with the European Union and other donor governments and ODA recipients to identify and fund existing and new initiatives aimed at the advancement of women throughout the world.

## **2.5 Miscellaneous Finance-Related Comments and Recommendations**

- **Pledging Session:** For various UN initiatives, on special occasions one or more key supporters of a convention, agency, fund, program or special initiative have joined together to co-host a pledging roundtable or high-level forum, with the participants discussing financing needs and pledging core grants or other financial commitments. For the new women's entity, such a session could be hosted by several of the most financially supportive governments, historically, using the occasion to announce generous pledges and commitments. Those governments, in turn, would invite European Union and other OECD governments, and potentially others, e.g., BRIC countries, foundations/public charities, NGOs, and private/corporate sector, to generate pledges of financial support. If, for example, a decision were made in the latter part of 2009 to establish the new entity, select the US-G head and consolidate the existing gender architecture, leaving funding levels and other decisions to be worked out, going forward, a timely pledging session could be convened at an appropriate time, thereafter, to galvanize strong support for a substantial annual budget at a scale of \$1 billion or more.

- **Media Strategy:** With the goal of achieving a strong, coherent, well-funded new women's entity, a key focus of its start-up should be the development and roll-out of a multi-media, multi-faceted communications strategy associated with fundraising as a key focus, geared to reach various targeted audiences;

- **Core Message/s:** Developing new or stronger core messages (along with existing ones) can help galvanize support in creating a strong, well-funded new women's organization. As one expert noted, there needs to be a "mindset change" about the importance of addressing gender equality. One example of a message that might resonate, if imaged and pitched effectively, is the concept that gender equality and women's empowerment are "the multipliers of development efforts," providing incredible returns on investment, including significant advances in reducing poverty and achieving all the MDG goals, as quoted earlier.<sup>70</sup>

## **3. Governance and Structural Aspects of the New GE Entity**

This section provides additional information focused on governance and structure elements of the five entities for which finance matters were considered in Part 2.2, above, including organizational descriptions. In relation to governance and structure, considerations such as Executive Board arrangements, field outreach, and Cosponsor arrangements are highlighted. These and related functions are addressed below.

### **3.1 UNICEF**

"UNICEF reports through its Executive Board to ECOSOC, which in turn reports to the General Assembly. UNGA Resolution 48/162 (1993) decided that the UNICEF Executive Board should be reconstituted to comprise 36 members (previously 41). The Board is responsible for providing inter-governmental support to, and supervision of, the Fund's activities and for ensuring that UNICEF is responsive to the needs and priorities of recipient countries. It also approves UNICEF's policies, country programs, and budgets."<sup>71</sup> The Board meets in one annual and two regular sessions each year. In addition, a joint session of the Executive Boards of UNDP/UNFPA, UNICEF, and WFP convenes once a year.

---

<sup>70</sup> Supra, note 2, DAC Guiding Principles.

<sup>71</sup> Supra, note 27, United Nations Handbook 2007-2008, pp. 185-186; and A/RES/48/162, pp. 7-8.

Membership of the Executive Board is based on equitable geographic representation and other relevant factors. The Board is made up of representatives from 36 countries, who serve on a rotating basis: eight from African states, seven from Asian and Pacific states, four from Eastern European states, five from Latin American and Caribbean states, and twelve from Western European and Other states. Board terms are three years.<sup>72</sup>

As reflected by the Executive Board arrangements for UNICEF, as well as UNDP and UNFPA, which follow below, they are very similar in their structure and representational arrangement. As suggested in the UNDP section, its Executive Board provides in various respects the best model for the new women's entity, and one option worth seriously considering is to have the new women's entity, like UNFPA, overlap in its membership and meetings with those of UNDP.

### 3.2 UNDP

UNGA Resolution 48/162 (1993) transformed the UNDP Governing Council into an Executive Board, which is subject to the authority of ECOSOC. The Board is responsible for providing inter-governmental support to, and supervision of, the activities of UNDP and the UN Population Fund (UNFPA), in accordance with the overall policy guidance of the General Assembly and ECOSOC. The Board is also responsible for ensuring that UNDP and UNFPA are responsive to the needs and priorities of recipient countries. The Board meets in one annual and two regular sessions each year. The annual session alternates between New York and Geneva. The regular sessions are held in New York. In addition, a joint session of the Executive Boards of UNDP/UNFPA, UNICEF, and WFP convenes once a year.<sup>73</sup>

Membership of the Executive Board is based on equitable geographic representation and other relevant factors. The Board is made up of representatives from 36 countries, who serve on a rotating basis: eight from African states, seven from Asian and Pacific states, four from Eastern European states, five from Latin American and Caribbean states, and twelve from Western European and Other states. Board terms are three years.<sup>74</sup> The UNDP board has also worked in an extended but autonomous relationship with UNIFEM, with substantial authority delegated to the women's fund, while simultaneously remaining accountable to the UNDP administrator.<sup>75</sup>

Through its dual role as both manager of the Resident Coordinator (RC) system and as a development actor working to provide program support and technical and policy advice to national partners, UNDP is working with its UN system partners to strengthen the UN development system's coherence and effectiveness. "UNDP has been working to strengthen its management of the RC system so that the RC function is owned by the UN development system in a way that is collegial, participatory, and transparent. In many countries, UNDP has introduced Country Directors to focus exclusively on managing the UNDP program to enable the RC to focus more on strengthening the coherence of the UN Country Team to respond to national development policies."<sup>76</sup>

"In the context of growing efforts of the UN system towards enhanced coherence and efficiency at the country level and increasing joint UN activities, UNDP is often called upon to play the role of administrative agent for multi-donor trust funds. (A multi-donor trust fund is a funding instrument through which donors

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

<sup>73</sup> Supra, note 27, United Nations Handbook 2007-2008, pp. 7-8.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> United Nations. 1984. UNGA A/RES/39/125, "Future Arrangements for the Management of the VDFW of 1984," Annex, 14 December 1984; and Annex to the letter dated 23 November 2004 from Permanent Representatives...to the Secretary-General, "Organizational Assessment: UNIFEM Past, Present and Future," Section 2, 1 December 2004.

<sup>76</sup> UNDP Annual Report 2008, p. 7.

pool resources to support national priorities and facilitate UN agencies to work and deliver in close coordination and collaboration.) [From 2004 through 2007,] UNDP managed more than \$3 billion in trust funds on behalf of the UN system and donors.”<sup>77</sup>

The UNDP Executive Board model is very attractive as a model for the new women’s entity. As a high-level voice and advocate for women within and outside the UN system, it would be very appropriate for the new entity to focus substantial energies, with a highly regarded Board, on setting goals and priorities, with fundraising a cornerstone to the success of its strategic planning

With the new entity having an Executive Board that has demonstrated the ability to work effectively, Governments should feel confident, soon, that they can turn over substantial core funds to that Board to invest in priority challenges, knowing it will be spent wisely. Furthermore, given its extremely important, catalytic role, a major part of the new entity’s budget should be passed on to other institutions, recipient governments and NGOs to undertake operational/on-the-ground activities, rather than the new entity devoting significant time itself engaging directly in those activities.

### **3.3 UNFPA**

UNFPA is a subsidiary organ of the UN General Assembly. Its role within the UN system is to address population and development issues, with an emphasis on reproductive health and gender equality. UNFPA receives overall policy guidance from the General Assembly and ECOSOC. It reports to its governing body, the UNDP/UNFPA Executive Board, on administrative, financial, and program matters. UNFPA works in close collaboration with many other development and humanitarian agencies (particularly WHO, UNICEF, UNDP and UNAIDS) in the field.<sup>78</sup>

The UNDP/UNFPA Executive Board is responsible for providing inter-governmental support to, and supervision of, the activities of UNDP and the UNFPA, in accordance with the overall policy guidance of the General Assembly and ECOSOC, and for ensuring that UNDP and UNFPA are responsive to the needs and priorities of recipient countries. The Board also approves UNFPA’s programs and budgets. The Board meets in one annual and two regular sessions each year. The annual session alternates between New York and Geneva. The regular sessions are held in New York. In addition, a joint session of the Executive Boards of UNDP/UNFPA, UNICEF, and WFP convenes once a year.<sup>79</sup>

Membership of the Executive Board is based on equitable geographic representation and other relevant factors. The Board is made up of representatives from 36 countries, who serve on a rotating basis: eight from African states, seven from Asian and Pacific states, four from Eastern European states, five from Latin American and Caribbean states, and twelve from Western European and Other states. Board terms are three years.<sup>80</sup>

In 2007, Board Members “approved a new organizational structure for UNFPA, designed to make the Fund an even more field-centred, efficient, and strategic partner to the countries it serves. The reorganization entails strengthening of country offices through additional and upgraded posts, staff training, and additional resources for technical assistance. It also entails the establishment of regional offices in Bangkok, Bratislava, Cairo, Johannesburg, and Panama City, supported by six sub-regional offices. The location of these offices was decided following extensive consultation with other UN agencies to ensure regional alignment, co-location, and increased coordination of UN agencies in the field. The reorganization also entails changes at

---

<sup>77</sup> Ibid, p. 9.

<sup>78</sup> <http://www.unfpa.org/about/unsystem.htm>

<sup>79</sup> Supra, note 27, United Nations Handbook 2007-2008, pp. 7-8.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid.

headquarters, including a new Program Division and restructured Technical Division. These changes aim to strengthen UNFPA's capacity to support effective programs, to ensure UNFPA's leadership in substantive areas, and to facilitate knowledge sharing throughout the organization and with partners.”<sup>81</sup>

UNFPA's strengthened field-centred operations merits review by the new women's entity, with regard to ongoing collaboration and partnership with on-the-ground gender equality entities at the regional, sub-regional and national levels.

### **3.4 UN-HABITAT**

UN-HABITAT is governed by a Governing Council of 58 Member States, elected by ECOSOC for a four-year term. Its membership is made up of 16 members from African states, 13 from Asian states, six from Eastern European states, 10 from Latin American and Caribbean states, and 13 from Western European and Other states. The Governing Council, which meets every two years, approves the organization's biennial work program and budget, and provides overall policy guidance, management, and supervision. The Governing Council reports to the General Assembly through ECOSOC.<sup>82</sup>

“The governments have representatives in Nairobi with whom senior UN-HABITAT officials meet regularly throughout the year in the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR).”<sup>83</sup> “The CPR, not being a decision-making body, enjoys a considerable degree of freedom to provide advice and to engage in the exchange of ideas on behalf of member states.”<sup>84</sup> It does not, however, enjoy the same degree of authority and effectiveness of the UNDP/UNICEF Executive Board model due to its existence within the structure of a much larger board. Unlike other UN Funds and Programs, “UN-HABITAT receives a contribution from the UN regular budget. While this represents less than 10 percent of UN-HABITAT's total budget, it remains a significant source of funding for core staff.”<sup>85</sup> .

### **3.5 UNAIDS**

“UNAIDS has a secretariat headquartered in Geneva and offices in more than [80] countries. The organization is guided by a Programme Coordination Board (PCB), which serves as its governing body. This comprises 22 Member States elected by ECOSOC with a regional distribution (five African states, five Asian, two Eastern European, three Latin American and Caribbean, and seven Western European and Other), as well as the [ten] co-sponsors [UNICEF, UNDP, UNFPA, UNESCO, WHO, the World Bank, UNODC, ILO, WFP, and UNHCR] and five NGOs, including associations of people living with HIV/AIDS.”<sup>86</sup>

“The Committee of Cosponsoring Organizations (CCO) comprises representatives from the 10 UNAIDS co-sponsors and the UNAIDS Secretariat. It meets twice a year to consider matters concerning UNAIDS and to provide co-sponsor input into UNAIDS' policies and strategies. The UNAIDS Executive Director is Secretary of

---

<sup>81</sup> <http://www.unfpa.org/about/reorganization.htm>

<sup>82</sup> Supra, note 27, United Nations Handbook 2007-2008, p. 211.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

<sup>84</sup> HSP/GC/22/2/Add.3 “Addendum: Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Governance Structure of UN-HABITAT: Note by the Executive Director,” page 8.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Supra, note 27, United Nations Handbook 2007-2008, pp. 217-218. For the five NGOs on the PCB, those representatives can advise and express opinions but they cannot vote, as indicated in J. Greenberg and P. Donovan, “Civil Society Participation in the Proposed New UN Agency for Women,” 8 December 2008, at [www.aids-freeworld.org](http://www.aids-freeworld.org)

the CCO. From 1 July each co-sponsor rotates annually as Chair of the CCO ... The PCB membership ... also rotates among co-sponsors.”<sup>87</sup> It meets twice a year, with its focus being to consider matters concerning UNAIDS and to provide inputs into the policies and strategies of UNAIDS. The ECOSOC resolution 1994/24, which defined the programme, explained, “The Cosponsors will share the responsibility for the development of the programme, contribute equally to its strategic direction and receive from it policy and technical guidance relating to the implementation of their HIV/AIDS activities. In this way, the programme will serve to harmonize the HIV/AIDS activities of the Cosponsors.”<sup>88</sup>

A recent UNAIDS Program Coordinating Board Workplan included several outputs directed at improved engagement with their Cosponsoring organizations, including the need for increased transparency and better information flows with the PCB and Committee of Cosponsoring Organizations, that provide opportunities for UNAIDS staff to engage with partners in advancing UNAIDS’ mission and goals.<sup>89</sup> More broadly, several issues, including relations among Cosponsors and the Secretariat, and realignment of UNAIDS core policies and activities with clearer priorities for its Cosponsors that define distinct niches, are being addressed in an independent evaluation, with a draft currently open for consultations, and a final report targeted for release by late 2009.<sup>90</sup> For the new women’s entity, there might be some lessons and opportunities learned from more closely assessing UNAIDS’ efforts to engage Cosponsor partners more directly in collaborative work, and from accessing and reviewing the independent UNAIDS review.

### **3.6 Observations Involving Other Governance and Structural Considerations**

- **Gender Equality as both strategic objective and core function:** A major, organizational, strategic restructuring is underway at FAO. As it nears implementation, one of the 11 strategic objectives will focus on gender equality. Some said gender work should be a core function within all the objectives, not one itself. Others said it should be both, and that approach was approved. As a result, the gender programme at FAO, with both its own objective and engagement with the 10 other strategic objectives, integrates gender into the 2-5 organizational results markers being set for each of them.<sup>91</sup> Within FAO, and via outreach with member states, this new arrangement provides lots of new opportunities to focus on important gender issues, both as a focused objective, and as cross-cutting actions. The new women’s entity, while monitoring its development, could promote similar efforts with other international and national bodies.

- **NGO Participation:** The Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) that grew out of the Earth Summit, in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, established a variety of progressive models for NGO/CSO stakeholder participation in international decision making. Among other features, they include having self-selected representatives slotted to speak on key panels or near the start of plenary discussions, attending “informal” or “contact” negotiating sessions to observe and report back to the broader plenary, and having documents formally distributed to all delegates (and in limited instances translated into other UN languages). Process-related practices such as those, and similar models in other international thematic work, should be seriously considered in the context of the new women’s entity’s work and activities.

- **Accountability Mechanisms:** For chemicals management, internationally, the Strategic Approach to Chemicals Management (SAICM) is a landmark initiative in international cooperation to protect human health and the environment, with a mission to minimize significant adverse impacts from chemicals by

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid, ECOSOC resolution 1994/24, “Joint cosponsored [UN] programme on [HIV/AIDS], 26 July 1994

<sup>89</sup> Ibid, PCB Bureau Workplan, March 2009-December 2009, 23 March 2009

<sup>90</sup> Supra, note 70; also UNAIDS website section on current independent evaluation.

<sup>91</sup> Information provided by FAO via phone interview on 29 April 2009.

2020.<sup>92</sup> Adopted in 2006, Governments, inter-governmental organizations, NGOs and industry meet every three years to review progress on an agreed Global Plan of Action involving work areas, activities, actors, targets/timetables, and indicators of progress. SAICM provides an important, voluntary, accountability function to help Governments and other stakeholders keep focused on their targets, timetables and indicators. As such, SAICM provides a model to consider for creating a similar women's entity mechanism that unites the wide range of actors involved in addressing gender equality and women's empowerment.

#### **4 Conclusions**

As the process for establishing a new, gender equality architecture moves forward, financing will be a key test of whether decision makers want the new entity to succeed. This paper offers support for the entity to have a well-funded, \$1 billion or more annual budget. As decisions are taken to establish the new entity, and during its initial start-up process, political will needs to coalesce around ensuring that the new entity is fully and ambitiously funded. The same is true with respect to governance and structural features, with the information and views provided supporting progressive, participatory and other constructive features. With the necessary will and support, a highly effective, high-profile, new women's entity can emerge, providing critically needed leadership, decision-making and operational capacity on behalf of gender equality and women's empowerment.

---

<sup>92</sup> UNEP. 2006. "Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management: SAICM texts and resolutions of the International Conference on Chemicals Management," Dubai, UAE, 4-6 February 2006; see also SAICM's website, [www.saicm.org](http://www.saicm.org) for more detailed information.

**Funding, ODA, Governance and Structural Factors Relevant to  
Establishment of a New UN Gender Equality Architecture**  
Prepared by The Varda Group, 9 June 2009

**Annexes**

<b>Annex I:</b> Key Functions of the New Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Entity.....	23
<b>Annex II:</b> Finance, staffing and EU donor tables for the four existing gender equality entities and five other UN entities.	
II (A) UNIFEM.....	25
II (B) DAW.....	27
II (C) OSAGI.....	28
II (D) UN-INSTRAW.....	29
II (E) UNICEF.....	31
II (F) UNDP.....	33
II (G) UNFPA.....	35
II (H) UN-HABITAT.....	37
II (I) UNAIDS.....	39
<b>Annex III:</b> OECD/DAC Bilateral EU ODA Table Focused on European Union Member States.....	41



## Annex I

### Key Functions of the New Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Entity<sup>93</sup>

**Part I.** Listing of 8 functions as outlined by the Deputy Secretary-General's papers of 23 July 2008, and 5 March 2009 ("*Further Details on Institutional Options for Strengthening the Institutional Arrangements for Support to Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women,*" paragraph 9):

- (a) Lead innovative and catalytic country-driven programming, gender mainstreaming and capacity-building, and provide targeted technical cooperation and capacity-building in line with national strategies;
- (b) Provide substantive support to the UN bodies (CSW, the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly and the Security Council) where commitments, norms and policy recommendations on gender equality and gender mainstreaming are discussed and agreed upon;
- (c) Build on the comparative advantage of UN actors, lead and coordinate the system's strategies, policies and actions on gender equality and women's empowerment, and promote effective system-wide gender mainstreaming;
- (d) Ensure accountability of the UN system, including through oversight, monitoring and reporting of system-wide performance;
- (e) Undertake global, regional and national advocacy efforts on issues critical to gender equality and women's empowerment to ensure that emerging, under-recognized and under-resourced issues receive national, regional and global attention;
- (f) Undertake new and consolidate existing research and analytical work, to support overall objectives, including acting as a clearing house for knowledge and experience on gender equality and empowerment of women from all parts of the UN system;
- (g) Monitor the implementation of the 12 critical areas of the Beijing Platform for Action, the Outcome Document of the twenty-third Special Session of the General Assembly, and the Security Council resolutions 1325 (2000) and 1820 (2008); and
- (h) Monitor and report on system-wide compliances with intergovernmental mandates on gender balance at senior/decision-making levels.

...The new entity would also maintain and strengthen collaboration between Member States, the UN system and civil society in pursuit of gender equality and women's empowerment.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Part II.** Following the section quoted in Part I, above, para. 11 of that 5 March 2009 paper states: "Keeping in mind the above-mentioned functions together with the gaps and challenges, the following provides further detailed modalities of the institutional options." Based on functions described in paragraphs 12-63 of the DSG's 5 March 2009 "institutional options" paper, the following 12, complementary key modalities are to:

- (a) Consolidate OSAGI, DAW, UNIFEM, and INSTRAW, with their specific mandates, and carry out the eight functions outlined in the paragraph 9 of the DS-G paper of 5 March 2009, and in so doing, offer the greatest potential (compared to the status quo, department and fund options) to address the identified gaps and challenges facing the new entity, with a key function being coordination and catalytic programming to fill programmatic gaps;
- (b) Combine Headquarters policy and normative support functions currently performed by Departments with those for the country level operational and technical support characteristics of Funds and Programmes, achieving desired synergies among policy research, analysis and substantive support

<sup>93</sup> Supra, note 4; and repeated in the Part I and Part II descriptive listings provided in the body of this Annex.

for intergovernmental processes ( para 9b, f, g, and h), enhance system-wide coordination and accountability (9c and d), including developing an accountability framework with goals and indicators;

- (c) Report to an Executive Board with features that are well known/tested and yet provide opportunity for innovation given the breadth of the its proposed mandate, with that body supervising the entity's activities in accordance with overall policy guidance of the GA and ECOSOC; and provide oversight of operational programmes, plans and financial resources of the entity and would encourage and examine new programme initiatives (with due regard to the budgetary authority of the GA); and report to the GA through the ECOSOC in accordance with their respective mandates;
- (d) Executive Board would establish effective ways to engage with CSW, CEDAW and other relevant bodies, and work closely with all UN entities engaged in gender mainstreaming, with this work funded by the regular budget;
- (e) CSW would remains a functional Commission of ECOSOC with its current mandate, with ECOSOC continuing to provide the UN system with cross-sectoral coordination and overall guidance on a system-wide basis including objectives, priorities and strategies, in the implementation of the policies formulated by the GA and review and evaluate the reports on the work of the UN system on their efforts to mainstream a gender perspective in all their policies and programmes;
- (f) Executive Head would be at U-S-G level, appointed by the S-G, would be a member of CEB, and would have two AS-G's;
- (g) At country level, the entity would work closely with other UN entities in preparation of Common Country Assessments and the UN Development Assistance Framework (CCAs/UNDAF) and through joint projects; and to achieve greater coherence and effectiveness, the entity's representatives at country, sub-regional and regional levels would be co-located with those of other UN entities;
- (h) In order to maximize the contribution of civil society, the Head of the Entity would establish a mechanism for periodic consultation, which in part would involve the entity developing solid partnerships with women's organizations and other stakeholders to ensure that it best meets the needs of women on the ground;
- (i) Over time, a large share of its staff would be located at country and regional levels based on need, demand and availability of resources, but given that there are over 150 UN programme countries, an incremental approach initially might be needed, with scaling up likely to take several years;
- (j) Regional directors would be members of the RDTs located at UN regional hubs, they would fully participate in regional programming from its inception, and their work would include joint regional programmes with other UN entities, support to Member States, strategic positioning and collaboration with UN actors (e.g. Regional Commission), other regional and civil society organizations, among other tasks appropriate at regional levels;
- (k) Representatives at the country level would be a member of the UNCT, providing coherent and timely policy advice and programming ideas in support of national development strategies and poverty reduction strategies, among other tasks appropriate at the country level, and that person would chair the inter-agency gender theme group, and the entity, overall, would have a clear mandate, including staffing and positioning – to seamlessly support countries broader agreements and processes into national level programmes and policies; and
- (l) Funding for the entity would be from both voluntary and assessed contributions, with Member States determining the balance between these two sources of funding, joint proposals with other UN system entities is an important goal, and in order to facilitate voluntarily-funded operational activities, authority would be delegated to the Executive Head of the entity in financial and procurement matters, as well as for recruitment and administration of staff, consultants and other experts in relation to operational activities.

## Annex II (A)

### UNIFEM – Finance, Staffing, Country Presence and European Member State Contributions<sup>94</sup>

INCOME (US \$ Millions)	2007 <sup>95</sup>	2008
- Regular Contributions <sup>96</sup>	43.784	51.199
- Cost-sharing Contributions	55.175	64.961
- Violence Trust Fund Contributions	15.970	18.268
- Gender Equality Trust Fund Contributions		64.767
- Sub-Trust Fund Contributions	3.372	5.182
- Interest Income	3.190	4.253
- Reimbursable Support Services	7.439	5.763
- Other Income	0.883	1.003
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>129.813</b>	<b>215.396</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>		
- General Resources	21.412	42.350
- Cost Sharing	38.547	48.683
- Violence Trust Fund	2.442	10.691
- Sub-Trust Funds	4.416	2.619
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>66.817</b>	<b>104.343</b>
Management and Admin Costs	3.751	3.351
Technical and Reimbursable Service Costs	7.170	10.207
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>10.921</b>	<b>13.558</b>
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>77.738</b>	<b>117.901</b>
<b>EXCESS/SHORTFALL - INCOME VS EXPENSES</b>	<b>52.075</b>	<b>97.495</b>
<b>RESERVES/FUND BALANCES, END OF PERIOD</b>	<b>52.075</b>	<b>97.495</b>

Total Income (2004-2008) (US \$Millions): 2008 (215.4); 2007 (129.81); 2006 (63.29); 2005 (57.8); 2004 (51.15)

<sup>94</sup> Supra, note 14, UNIFEM Annual Report 2008-2009 (May 2009), with financial statement and lead contributors at p. 23; and staffing data via UNIFEM emails.

<sup>95</sup> For UNIFEM, its 2007 income/expense-related numbers are included to provide a side-by-side comparison of 2007 and 2008 amounts, given the significant 2008 increase in income and expenses.

<sup>96</sup> Regular contributions = core contributions; cost share income is directed at targeted UNIFEM projects; VTF was created in 1996, and involves projects thereunder, as do STF contributions; and GETF was created in 2008)

**ANNEX IV (A) - UNIFEM (cont...)**

<b>STAFFING</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
- Professional Core Staff		58
- Project Contracts (2/3 <sup>rd</sup> field; 1/3 <sup>rd</sup> HQ)		172
<b>TOTAL STAFFING</b>		<b>230</b>

<b>EU Member State and European Commission Contributions</b> <b>( USD \$ Millions)</b>	<b>2008 Core</b>	<b>2008 Non-Core (Cost-Share and Trust Funds)</b>	<b>2008 Total</b>	<b>2007 Total</b>
European Commission		3.350	3.350	2.519
Austria	0.234	1.305	1.539	0.827
Belgium	0.168	1.732	1.900	0.833
Cyprus	0.006		0.006	
Denmark	2.088	0.881	2.969	2.575
Estonia				0.028
Finland	1.129	1.284	2.476	1.089
France	0.185	0.058	0.243	1.395
Germany	2.217	0.323	2.540	2.397
Greece	0.015		0.015	0.015
Ireland	0.776	0.900	1.676	1.752
Italy	2.950	7.969	10.919	4.862
Luxembourg	1.513		1.513	1.205
Malta	0.001		0.001	
Netherlands		9.544	9.544	0.365
Slovenia	0.020	0.015	0.035	0.025
Spain	5.829	92.545	98.374	13.821
Sweden	3.661	2.262	5.923	10.752
United Kingdom	5.217	4.338	9.555	12.387
<b>Total Contributions</b>	<b>26.009</b>	<b>126.506</b>	<b>152.515</b>	<b>57.063</b>

**Annex II (B)**

**DAW - Finance, Staffing and European Union Member State Donor Tables<sup>97</sup>**

	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>
<b>INCOME</b> (50/50 for 2008-9 biennium) ( US \$ Millions)		
- Regular Budget (excluding posts)	0.248	0.248
- Extra-budgetary	0.902	0.902
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>1.150</b>	<b>1.150</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>	-	-
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>		
<b>EXCESS/SHORTFALL - INCOME VS EXPENSES</b>		
<b>RESERVES/FUND BALANCES, END OF PERIOD</b>		

	<b>April 2009</b>	<b>1 July 2009</b>
<b>STAFFING</b>		
- Professional Staff	17	18
- General Services Staff	10	10
<b>TOTAL STAFFING</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>28</b>

<sup>97</sup> Supra, note 19; Information provided by DAW via email on April 3 and April 9, 2009. No data was found indicating that European Union Member State or other Government contributions were given to DAW during the past 2-3 years.

**Annex II (C)**  
**OSAGI - Finance, Staffing and European Union Member State Donor Tables<sup>98</sup>**

<b>INCOME</b> (50/50 for biennium 2008-9) (US \$ Millions)	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>
- Regular Budget (excluding posts)	0.123	0.124
- Extra-budgetary	0.294	0.294
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>0.418</b>	<b>0.418</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>	-	-
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	-	-
<b>EXCESS/SHORTFALL - INCOME VS EXPENSES</b>	-	-
<b>RESERVES/FUND BALANCES, END OF PERIOD</b>	-	-

<b>STAFFING</b>	<b>April 2009</b>	<b>After 1 July 2009<sup>99</sup></b>
- Professional Staff	6	10
- General Services Staff	4	4
<b>TOTAL STAFFING</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>

<sup>98</sup> Supra, note 23, Information provided by OSAGI via email on April 3 and April 9, 2009. No data was found indicating that European Union Member State or other Government contributions were given to OSAGI in the past 2-3 years.

<sup>99</sup> The staff increase was due to a General Assembly decision to increase resources for the Development Pillar as of 1 July 2009.

**Annex II (D)**  
**UN-INSTRAW - Finance, Staffing and European Union Member State Contributions<sup>100</sup>**

<b>INCOME (US \$ Millions)</b>	<b>2008</b>
- Core (all voluntary contributions)	2.316
- Extra-budgetary (included above for 2007)	1.801
- Interest	--
- Other Miscellaneous Income	--
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>4.118</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>	
- Staff and other Personnel Costs	0.720
- Travel	0.065
- Contractual Services	0.039
- Operating Expenses	0.054
- Acquisitions	0.027
- Program Support Costs	0.033
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>0.938</b>
<b>EXCESS/SHORTFALL - INCOME VS EXPENSES</b>	<b>3.179</b>
<b>RESERVES/FUND BALANCES, END OF PERIOD</b>	<b>5.244</b>

<b>STAFFING</b>	<b>2009</b>
- Professional Staff (3 unfilled as of 5/09)	4
- General Services Staff	5
- Project Officers	3
<b>TOTAL STAFFING</b>	<b>12</b>

<sup>100</sup> Supra, note 24. UN-INSTRAW. 2008. UN-INSTRAW 2007-2008 Annual Report; "Who We Are," [www.un-instraw.org](http://www.un-instraw.org); Work Plan and Operational Budget for 2009, INSTRAW/EB/2008/R.11 (24 March 2008, p. 9; INSTRAW brochure (undated, with 35 photos of people's heads on front and back cover); and email/phone exchanges with INSTRAW in April 2009.

**Annex II (D)**  
**UN-INSTRAW (cont...)**

<b>European Union Member State Contributions</b> <b>(US \$ Millions)</b>	<b>2008</b>
Greece	0.015
Italy	0.740
Slovenia	0.010
Spain	1.473
<b>Total Contributions</b>	<b>2.238</b>



**Annex II (E)**  
**UNICEF – Finance, Staffing and European Union Member State Contributions<sup>101</sup>**

<b>INCOME (US \$ Millions)</b>	<b>2008</b>
from <b>Governments</b>	
- to Regular Resources (un-earmarked)	615.731
- to Other Resources	1,269.214
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>1,884.927</b>
from <b>National Committees</b> and Other Contributions	
- to Regular Resources	436.004
- to Other Resources	452.421
SUBTOTAL	888.452
from Intergovernmental Organizations	154.537
from Nongovernmental Organizations	173.370
from Inter-organizational Arrangements	255.601
Other Income (minus cost of goods delivered)	33.007
<b>TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS - (less items related to biennial support budget)</b>	<b>3,389.998</b>
	<b>3,372.540</b>
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	
<b>EXPENSES</b>	
Program assistance and Program Support	2,808.000
Management and Administration	251.000
Write-offs/prior period adjustments	39.000
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>3,098.000</b>
<b>EXCESS/SHORTFALL – INCOME VS EXPENSES</b>	
<b>RESERVES/FUND BALANCES, END OF PERIOD</b>	

**Total Income 2002-2007** (US \$ Millions): 2008 (3,390); 2007 (2,997); 2006 (2,768); 2005 (2,747); 2004 (1,969); 2003 (1,680)

<sup>101</sup> Supra, notes 29 and 30, UNICEF. 2008. Data on UNICEF are from the following: A/63/5/Add 2, Annex I “UNICEF Financial Report and Audited Financial Statements for the Biennium Ended 31 December 2007 and Report of the Board of Auditors;” UNICEF Annual Report 2008; and [http://www.unicef.org/about/who/index\\_faq.html](http://www.unicef.org/about/who/index_faq.html)

**ANNEX II (E) - UNICEF (Cont...)**

<b>European Union Member State and European Commission Contributions (US \$ Millions)</b>	<b>2008 Regular Resources</b>	<b>2008 Other Resources</b>	<b>2008 Total</b>
European Commission		152.411	152.411
Austria	2.182	0.993	3.175
Belgium	4.716	5.480	10.196
Bulgaria	0.007		0.007
Cyprus	0.028		0.028
Czech Republic	0.216	0.522	0.738
Denmark	37.579	42.836	80.415
Estonia	0.056	0.341	0.397
Finland	22.693	8.171	30.864
France	18.488	2.969	21.457
Germany	8.254	8.100	16.354
Greece	0.300	0.432	0.724
Hungary	0.147		0.147
Ireland	25.113	8.648	33.761
Italy	17.699	24.269	41.968
Latvia			
Lithuania		0.032	0.032
Luxembourg	3.933	6.382	10.315
Netherlands	53.362	142.826	196.188
Poland	0.200	0.220	0.420
Portugal	0.300	0.020	0.320
Romania	0.089		0.089
Slovakia	0.013		0.013
Slovenia	0.032	0.101	0.133
Spain	23.316	78.518	101.834
Sweden	71.896	97.841	167.734
United Kingdom	37.961	174.859	212.820
<b>Total Contributions</b>	<b>328.580</b>	<b>603.560</b>	<b>932.140</b>

**Annex II (F)**  
**UNDP – Finance, Staffing and European Union Member State Contributions<sup>102</sup>**

<b>INCOME (US \$ Millions)</b>	<b>2008</b>
- Contributions to Regular Resources	1,087.570
- Cost-sharing Contributions	2,594.164
- Contributions to Other Resources	1,109.425
- Contributions to UNCDF, UNIFEM, UNV, UNSO	264.971
- Management Services Agreements	407.247
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>5,463.377</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>	
- Program expenses :regular + cost share	3,036.100
- Programme expenses: Funds and Trust Funds	1,233.700
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>4,269.800</b>
- Other expenditure	
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	
<b>EXCESS/SHORTFALL – INCOME VS EXPENSES</b>	
<b>RESERVES/FUND BALANCES, END OF PERIOD</b>	

**TOTAL INCOME 2002-2007 (in US \$ Millions): 2007 (5,634); 2006 (5,114); 2005 (5,119); 2004 (4,241); 2003 (3,429)**

**Annex II (F) – UNDP (cont...)**

<b>STAFFING</b>	<b>2006-2007</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>
- International Professional Staff	640	736
- National Professional Staff	615	614

<sup>102</sup> Supra note 39, UNDP. 2008. Data on UNDP are from the following documents: DP/2008/39 “Annual Review of the Financial Situation, 2007, Report of the Administrator” and DP/2008/5 “UNDP and UNIFEM Estimates for the Biennial Support Budget, 2008-2009”; UNDP Annual Report 2008.; DP/2009/11/Add.2 “Annual Report of the Administrator. Statistical Annex”

- General Service and other categories	2,034	1,984
<b>TOTAL STAFFING</b>	<b>3,289</b>	<b>3,334</b>

<b>European Union Member State Contributions (US \$ Millions)</b>	<b>2008 Regular Resources</b>	<b>2008 Other Resources</b>	<b>2008 Total</b>
Austria	7.300	3.600	10.900
Belgium	18.400	9.700	28.100
Denmark	73.100	23.500	96.600
Finland	25.700	10.300	36.000
France	43.200	9.800	53.000
Germany	42.200	46.700	88.900
Ireland	34.000	12.000	46.000
Italy	23.600	62.300	85.900
Luxembourg	4.400	20.000	24.400
Netherlands	116.600	85.800	202.400
Portugal	1.800	2.300	4.100
Spain	60.900	86.000	146.900
Sweden	109.600	76.400	186.000
United Kingdom	96.300	188.800	285.100
<b>Total Contributions</b>	<b>657.100</b>	<b>637.200</b>	<b>1,249.300</b>

**Annex II (G)**  
**UNFPA – Finance, Staffing and European Union Member State Contributions<sup>103</sup>**

<b>INCOME (US \$ Millions)</b>	<b>2008</b>
- Contributions to Regular Resources	428.800
- Contributions to Other Resources	366.100
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>794.900</b>
- Interest Income	23.600
- Other Income	26.800
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>845.300</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>	
- Program activities	587.200
- Technical Advisory Program	0.000
- Net biennial support budget plus misc.	114.700
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>701.900</b>
<b>EXCESS/SHORTFALL – INCOME VS EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>143.400</b>
<b>RESERVES/FUND BALANCES, END OF PERIOD</b>	<b>411.500</b>

**TOTAL INCOME 2002-2008** (in US \$ Millions): 2008 ( 845); 2007 (752); 2006 (606); 2005 (565); 2004 (506)

	Hdqtrs	Field	Geneva	Total
<b>STAFFING in 2007</b>				
- Professional Staff	123	372	2	497
- General Services Staff	109	424	1	534
- International Employees				235
- National Employees				796
<b>TOTAL STAFFING</b>				<b>1,031</b>

<sup>103</sup> Supra, notes 45 and 46, UNFPA 2008. Data on UNFPA are from the following documents: DP/FPA/2008/9 “UNFPA – Funding Commitments to UNFPA: Report on Contributions by Member States to Regular and Co-Financing Resources for 2008 and Future Years” and DP/FPA/2008/5 (Part I, Add.1) “UNFPA – Statistical and Financial Review, 2007.” DP/FPA/2009/2 “UNFPA Statistical and financial review 2008”; UNFPA Annual Report 2009.

**ANNEX II (G) - UNFPA (Cont...)**

<b>European Union Member State Contributions (US \$ Millions)</b>	<b>2008 Regular Resources</b>	<b>2008 Other Resources</b>	<b>2008 Total</b>
European Commission, including ECHO		35.819	35.819
Austria	1.832		
Belgium	3.886		
Denmark	48.017	6.339	54.356
Estonia			
Finland	24.206	7.300	31.506
France	3.698		
Germany	26.677		
Ireland	6.807	5.549	12.356
Italy	5.900	3.631	9.531
Latvia			
Luxembourg	2.600	15.995	18.595
Malta			
Netherlands	58.538	42.273	100.811
Spain	14.000	18.251	32.155
Sweden	60.902	7.794	68.510
United Kingdom	30.721	22.793	53.414
<b>Total Contributions</b>			<sup>104</sup>

<sup>104</sup> The donor information obtained for 2008 includes only the biggest donors for regular and non-regular resources, therefore the total contributions of EU Member States cannot be calculated.

**Annex II (H)**  
**UN HABITAT – Finance, Staffing and European Union Member State Contributions<sup>105</sup>**

<b>INCOME (US \$Millions)</b>	<b>2008</b>
UN Regular Budget	11.600
Human Settlements Foundation General Purpose	20.000
Human Settlement Foundation Special Purpose	45.500
Technical Cooperation	88.700
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>165.800</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>	
UN Regular Budget	<b>10.750</b>
Human Settlements Foundation General Purpose	23.900
Human Settlements Foundation Special Purpose	53.950
Technical Cooperation	72.600
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>161.200</b>
<b>EXCESS/SHORTFALL – INCOME VS EXPENSES</b>	
<b>RESERVES/FUND BALANCES, END OF PERIOD</b>	

**TOTAL INCOME 2002-2008** (in US \$ Millions): 2008 (165,80) 2007 (155.35); 2006 (155.35); 2005 (122.8); 2004 (122.8); 2003 (120.65)

	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>STAFFING</b>		
- International Professional Staff	188	
- National Professional Staff	8	
- General Services Staff	122	
<b>TOTAL STAFFING</b>	<b>318</b>	

<sup>105</sup> Supra, notes 51 and 52, UNAIDS. 2008. Data on UN-HABITAT are from the following documents: HSP/GC/22/5 “Draft Work Programme and Budget for the Biennium 2010-2011: Report by the Executive Director”; HSP/GS/22/INF/5 “UN-HABITAT: Financial Report for the Biennium Ended 31 December 2007 and Report of the Board of Auditors: Note by the Secretariat.”; UN-HABITAT Annual Report 2008 and HSP/GC/22/INF/4 “Status of voluntary contributions to the United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation as of December 2008.”

**ANNEX II (H) – UN HABITAT (cont...)**

<b>European Union Member State and European Commission Contributions (US \$ Millions)</b>	<b>2008 Regular Resources</b>	<b>2008 Other Resources</b>	<b>2008 Total</b>
European Commission		6.778	6.778
Austria	0.098		0.098
Belgium		0.222	0.222
Cyprus	0.004	0.342	0.346
Czech Republic	0.122		0.122
Finland	0.736	0.346	1.082
France	0.296	0.188	0.484
Germany			
Greece	0.030		0.030
Italy		2.248	2.248
Luxembourg			
Netherlands	1.001	1.417	2.418
Poland		0.500	0.500
Portugal	0.102		1.102
Slovenia	0.006		0.006
Spain	2.582	16.245	18.827
Sweden	2.687	8.303	10.990
United Kingdom	1.462	3.701	5.163
<b>Total Contributions</b>	<b>9.126</b>	<b>40.290</b>	<b>49.452</b>



**Annex II (I)**

**UNAIDS – Finance, Offices, Staffing and European Union Member State Contributions<sup>106</sup>**

<b>INCOME (US \$ Millions)</b>	<b>2008</b>
<i>Unified Budget and Workplan</i>	
- Governments	245.215
- Cosponsoring Organizations	4.000
- Other Voluntary Contributions	0.354
- Other Revenue	4.348
<i>Non-Unified Budget and Workplan</i>	
- Governments	29.468
- Co-Sponsoring Organisations	1.618
- Other voluntary contributions	4.086
- Other revenue	1.828
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>290.917</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>	
- Contractual services; staff costs	189.014
- General operational expenses	28.747
- Direct financial cooperation	11.669
- Miscellaneous	15.260
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>244.690</b>
<b>EXCESS/SHORTFALL – INCOME VS EXPENSES</b>	
<b>RESERVES/FUND BALANCES, END OF PERIOD</b>	46.006

**Total Income 2002-2007** (in U.S. \$ Millions): 2009 (242.41); 2008 (290.9); 2007 (228.5); 2006 (228.5); 2005 (125.235)

<sup>106</sup> Supra, note 62, UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board. 2009. "Revised Agency Calculations," 2008-2009 Unified Budget Workplan, p. 119; 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (1 May 2009); UNAIDS/PCB824)/09.6 2010-2011 Unified Budget and Workplan and 2008-2009 Reports (1May 2009)Revised Unified Budget and Workplan 2006-2007, June 2006, p.59; and UNAIDS Unified Budget and Workplan 2004-2005, UNAIDS/PCB (14) 03.3, 29 April 2003, p. 9.

**ANNEX II (I) - UNAIDS (Cont...)**

<b>STAFFING</b>	<b>2008</b>
- Headquarters Staff	300
- Field Staff	600
<b>TOTAL STAFFING</b>	Over 900

<b>European Union Member State CONTRIBUTIONS (in US \$ Millions)</b>	<b>2008 Core</b>	<b>2008 Non-core</b>	<b>2008 Total</b>
Austria		5.477	5.477
Belgium	4.717		4.714
Denmark	10.097	2.296	12.393
Finland	11.682		11.682
France	1.775	0.518	1.693
Germany	2.726	0.052	2.758
Greece	1.415	0.157	1.572
Ireland	9.034	2.690	11.724
Italy		0.090	0.090
Luxembourg	3.933	0.265	6.578
Netherlands	48.517	0.313	48.830
Poland	0.048		0.048
Portugal	0.301		0.301
Spain	5.829	1.107	6.939
Sweden	38.822	4.423	43.245
United Kingdom	15.361	5.717	21.078
<b>Total Contributions</b>	<b>154.257</b>	<b>23.105</b>	<b>177.362</b>

## Annex III

Aid in support of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, 2006-2007 average (US million)<sup>107</sup>

	2006-2007						
	Principal	Significant	Sub-Total: Gender Equality focused	Not targeted	Total: aid screened	Not screened	Memo: Sector allocable, total
Australia	62	273	336	554	889	594	1,483
Austria	14	46	60	171	231	82	313
Belgium	41	214	254	255	509	456	966
Canada	101	814	915	851	1,765	23	1,788
Denmark	32	324	357	488	844	0	844
Finland	14	121	135	248	382	8	390
France	..	..	..	..	..	..	4,673
Germany	175	2,343	2,518	1,619	4,137	1,690	5,827
Greece	3	64	67	110	177	0	177
Ireland	..	..	..	..	..	..	471
Italy	..	..	..	..	..	..	677
Japan	28	848	875	7,532	8,407	53	8,460
Luxembourg	..	..	..	..	..	..	151
Netherlands	164	333	497	3,154	3,651	0	3,651
New Zealand	14	121	134	54	188	0	188
Norway	150	415	565	1,279	1,843	0	1,843
Portugal	..	..	..	..	..	..	234
Spain	144	218	362	1,201	1,563	623	2,187
Sweden	190	1,149	1,339	274	1,613	0	1,613
Switzerland	72	14	86	269	355	410	764
United Kingdom	289	1,367	1,656	2,782	4,437	274	4,712
United States	..	..	..	..	..	..	17,741
<b>Total bilateral</b>	<b>1,492</b>	<b>8,663</b>	<b>10,155</b>	<b>20,838</b>	<b>30,993</b>	<b>4,213</b>	<b>59,153</b>
<i>Memo: EC</i>	161	2,660	2,822	6,245	9,067	421	9,489

*Note: An activity can target gender equality as a "principal objective" or "significant objective." Principal means gender equality was an explicit objective of the activity and fundamental in its design. Significant means gender equality was important, but secondary, objective of the activity. Not targeted means that the activity was screened for promoting gender equality, but was found to not be targeted to it.*

<sup>107</sup> Supra, notes 62 and 63, OECD-DAC Secretariat. 2009. "(Bilateral) Aid in support of gender equality and women's empowerment, 2006-2007," Aid at a Glance – Donors' Charts, p. 3, (May 2009), Paris.