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# Introduction

Gender-based violence (GBV) is a serious human rights violation and major public health issue. GBV is under-reported but known to happen in all contexts. Women and girls everywhere are disproportionately affected and are at heightened risk. Asylum-seekers, refugees, stateless persons, internally displaced persons, and returnees (collectively referred to as persons of concern (PoC) by the Client) are at-risk of GBV, irrespective of their age, gender or other diversity considerations.

The Client’s Efforts to tackle GBV amongst people of concern has always involved a coordinated, multi-sectoral GBV prevention and response model involving activities targeting individuals, households, and communities as well as national levels. Interventions targeting individuals, households, and communities involve case management, referral to specialist services including material, medical, legal and psychosocial assistance, and measures to address safety and security. Activities targeting communities and the national level involve awareness-raising, advocacy and training interventions on GBV prevention and response as well as assistance towards the establishment and maintenance of sectoral GBV procedures and mechanisms that coordinate interagency efforts.

The client’s GBV programming is generally organized within the context of a budgeting, planning, and results-measurement framework. Operations choose intervention areas, determine budget needs (OP), allocate budgets available (OL), dedicate staff, determine baseline values within each area of intervention, set targets, and eventually report progress against each target set. Since 2022, the Client employs COMPASS, a comprehensive budgeting, planning, and results-measurement framework that requires from operations in member countries to develop multi-year strategies for their areas of interventions. Until 2021, operations in countries employed Focus and Hyperion to complete budgeting, planning, and reporting of results measured.

The shift from Focus/Hyperion to COMPASS came along with a revamping of the results measurement framework. Until end of 2021, operations were required to allocate budgets and set targets across the nested levels of objectives, outputs, and indicators. Within the multi-year strategies required by COMPASS, operations allocate budgets and report targets and results across a set of impact and performance (i.e., output) indicators. This in turn allows determining what operation-level factors predict the achievement of targets specified for the different impact and performance (i.e., output) indicators. The analysis below is taken from a report on the budgetary and programmatic patterns within the global GBV programming of the Client. The analysis presents the key summaries of multilevel logistic regression analyses to determine what operation-level factors predict achievement of GBV-related impact targets.

# The data

To carry out the different analyses summarized in this report, data from different sources were combined. Data on both budget and results measurement for the period of 2015 until 2021 were extracted from Focus using the business-intelligence tool Global Focus Insights.

Even though budget and results data were extracted from Global Focus Insights, both data sets had to be merged, nonetheless. This was possible since both budget and results data exhibit the same organizational structure. Within the Focus/Hyperion results-measurement framework, the results chain consists of indicators nested within output areas, which in turn are nested within objectives. The objectives can be interpreted as the overall programmatic areas the Client is committed to. GBV programming is comprised within the objective ‘Risk of GBV is reduced and quality of response improved'. Hence, all indicator and output data within this objective were included into the analyses outlined below. Budgets were defined at the output level, which then rolled up to the level of objectives. Again, all budget data associated with the objective ‘Risk of GBV is reduced and quality of response improved' were included into the analytical work outlined below.

Table 1: Indicators within objective ' Risk of GBV is reduced and quality of response improved’.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output** | **Indicator** | | **Type** |
| N/a | 1 | # of reported incidents of GBV | impact |
| N/a | 2 | Extent community is active in GBV prevention and survivor centred protection | Impact |
| N/a | 3 | Extent known GBV survivors receive appropriate support | Impact |
| Access to medical services facilitated | 4 | # of reported GBV incidents for which survivors receive medical assistance | performance |
| Advocacy conducted | 5 | # of advocacy interventions made on GBV prevention and response | Performance |
| Capacity development supported | 6 | # of partner, government and staff trained on GBV prevention and response | Performance |
| 7 | # of PoC trained on GBV prevention and response | Performance |
| Legal assistance provided | 8 | # of persons convicted of GBV related crimes | Performance |
| 9 | # of persons prosecuted for GBV related crimes | Performance |
| 10 | # of reported GBV incidents for which survivors receive legal assistance | Performance |
| Material assistance provided | 11 | # of reported incidents for which survivors receive material assistance | Performance |
| 12 | # of survivors enrolled in income generating and occupational activities | Performance |
| Participation of community in GBV prevention and response enabled and sustained | 13 | # of awareness raising campaigns on GBV prevention and response conducted | Performance |
| 14 | # of community-based committees/groups working on GBV prevention and response | Performance |
| 15 | # of community led activities on safety and security | Performance |
| 16 | # of men's groups working on GBV prevention and response | Performance |
| Psychosocial counselling provided | 17 | # of reported GBV incidents for which survivors receive psychosocial counselling | Performance |
| Safe and survivor cantered GBV procedures and coordination mechanisms functional | 18 | % of sectoral plans addressing GBV within 60 days of an emergency | Performance |
| 19 | % of GBV-related partners actively participating in coordination mechanisms | Performance |
| 20 | Interagency SOPs for GBV response agreed upon and functioning (yes/no) | Performance |
| Safety and security for GBV survivors provided | 21 | # of reported GBV incidents for which survivors are provided with a safe space | performance |

As table 1 highlights, under the objective ‘Risk of GBV is reduced and quality of response improved’, GBV programming was structured across 10 output and 3 impact areas. The operations that wished to engage with GBV programming allocated budget across those 10 output areas. Within the Focus results-measurement framework, the 13 impact areas and 10 output areas were operationalized through altogether 21 indicators. Operations that selected GBV as an area of intervention determined baseline and target values for each indicator and then measured progress against each of the indicators. Using objective and output as the main reference points allowed merging budget and results-measurement data. Thus, measurement and budget data could be linked up at both the level of objectives and outputs but not at the indicator level. Indicators within impact areas were labelled impact indicators whereas indicators within output areas were labelled performance indicators. Within the multilevel logistics regression models, impact and performance indicators were analysed separately.

Staffing data was obtained from the Client’s Division of Human Resources (DHR).[[1]](#footnote-1) The only way to determine the relevance of a position for GBV programming was through its job title. Only job titles that contained the acronym ‘GBV’ (e.g., Senior GBV Officer), or related indications, were treated as relevant to GBV programming. Admittedly, this might have been just a crude yardstick by which to determine the GBV relevance of staffing. Especially, protection staff has often been found to work across the units of child protection, community-based protection, and GBV. However, such granular data on the actual time allocation across the different units of protection staffing was not available. Thus, filtering staffing data through their job titles was the only way to obtain a rough estimate of the workforce allocated to GBV programming across operations and reporting years.

Staffing data was also not structured in terms of the results chain. It was therefore not possible to relate GBV staff to specific indicators or output areas. Thus, staffing data was only related to operations and reporting years. The full data set derived consisted of 3754 data points and comprised 107 operations. In the context of this report, operations included all in-country presences, offices of chief of missions, liaison offices, national offices, country offices, and multi-county offices maintained by the Client (see annex I for a list of operations). However, budget, staffing, and results data were not available for all operations across all reporting years. Unavailability of data in a given year or location was interpreted as the corresponding operations not allocating budget or staffing or not engaging with results measurement for that given year.

# The associations between target achievement and operation-level factors

To determine what operation-level factors measured by the Client predicted the achievement of impact targets, a series of regression models were estimated. Within each model, the key outcome of interest was whether or not targets set were reached, a binary variable. It was binary since a target was either met (i.e., the event) or not met meet. Within survey analysis, multivariate models that centre around a binary outcome variable are estimated through logistic regression. Its overall aim is to estimate the odds of a given event occurring and how these odds are shaped by the various characteristics (e.g., location, reporting years) exhibited by operations. Whereas probabilities are normally expressed in percentages, odds express a likelihood of an outcome to occur as a ratio of something happening (e.g., a target reached) to something not happening (e.g., a target not reached). For example, if the odds of a European country meeting the target for a given indicator is 1:5, then one would expect 1 out of 6 European operations to have met the target for the indicator of interest.

Within logistics regression analysis, one examines the change in odds of an event to occur that is associated with the different characteristics exhibited by the different subjects within the sample. If for example, higher odds of an event to occur are associated with being a member of the Americas, then one would expect that by and large a country from the Americas exhibits higher odds for reaching the target than a country that is not located in the Americas. For each country, however, several data points were collected. The data points collected for each country are not independent of each other. Technically speaking, results and resource data points across the years are nested within operations and thus may exhibit some level of dependency. For example, one would expect a big country that works with large communities of refugees to attract bigger OL budgets than a country that is hardly exposed to any refugee situation. The logistics regressions estimated were thus multilevel models (i.e., results and resource data nested within the level of country).

Table 4 in the annex II presents the regression results involving the impact targets. As it highlights, a base model (1) was estimated first to determine the level of dependency within the data. The Intracluster correlation (ICC’s) for the impact model was 0.044. This suggests that around 4.4 percent of the chances of meeting targets are explained by between-country differences. This is not substantial. To ensure robustness of the regression results, it was decided to estimate the regressions as multilevel models, nonetheless.

In subsequent rounds, the base model was increasingly expanded. (a first model specified dummy indicators representing the different regions was tested as well. This level-2 random effects model did not improve fit and thus is not reported here.) Starting with model (2), dummies for the type of indicator (see also table 1 on page 3; reference was performance/impact indicators 1) were included as additional predictors. Within the impact analysis, impact indicator 2 was excluded since only a very small number of countries set targets here. In model (3), a predictor for the reporting year was included. With model (4), dummies for the population groups were added (the group of refugees served as the reference). In Model (5), the target, expressed as a percentage improvement over baseline, was added as a predictor. Since baseline values were determined mainly for impact indicators, this model was not part of the performance analysis. In model (6) of both the impact as well as performance analyses, the total OL budget allocated to the output area the target fell into were added. In model (7), the total budget was broken down into OL allocations to admin, staff, internal, and external projects. In models (8), (9), and (10), different operationalizations of staff allocations to CBP programming were explored. All continuous predictor variables were group mean centred. Dummy variables were coded as 0.5/-0.5.

To examine if any augmented model improves fit over the previous one, likelihood-ratio tests were performed. Comparing the different estimation results reveals that model 5 was the best fitting model. The model attains a Tjur’s coefficients of determination of D = 0.155. Thus, the models exhibit only weak to moderate explanatory power. Most likely, there are additional sets of factors beyond those included in the current analysis that are important predictors of operations (not) reaching their impact and performance targets.

For various mathematical reasons, logistic regressions do not operate with odds but with the natural logarithm of odds (i.e., the log odds). This renders interpreting the output table of a logistic regression cumbersome. It is for this reason that for the final impact model the regression coefficients were converted into the odds. Table 2 below present the results of the convergence into odds. The predictor variables highlighted blue are the ones that were found to be statistically significant predictors of whether or not a country has reached a self-set impact/performance target.

A comment on dummy indicators is warranted. Across both sets of analyses, two sets of dummy indicators were included: type of targets (i.e., impact or performance) and type of population group targeted (e.g., refugees or stateless people). Within each set, a reference is employed (i.e., impact/ performance indicator 0 as well the sub-population of refugees). These references are not included into the analysis. Thus, indicators included into the model represent the average difference in (log) odds with respect to the reference group.

Table 2: Odd ratios associated with the final impact model (5)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Odds | Confidence interval | |
| 2.50% | 97.50% |
| (Intercept) | 0.88 | 0.65 | 1.18 |
| Impact indicator 1 (yes/no) | 1.62 | 1.12 | 2.34 |
| Impact indicator 2 (yes/no) | 2.75 | 1.94 | 3.88 |
| Stateless persons (yes/no) | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.71 |
| returnees (yes/no) | 1.01 | 0.57 | 1.81 |
| Internally displaced (yes/no) | 0.72 | 0.49 | 1.06 |
| populations of concern (yes/no) | 0.44 | 0.15 | 1.33 |
| Target as %-change over baseline | 0.73 | 0.63 | 0.85 |

*Note. Also see model (5) on page 28 for the log odds. Effect sizes that are statistically significant are highlighted light blue.*

As for impact (see table 2), the type of impact indicator seemed to matter. Targets set for the impact indicator ‘Extent community is active in GBV prevention and survivor centred protection’ had 1.62 times more chance of being reached compared to the targets set for the indicator ‘# of reported incidents of GBV’ (the reference). Targets set for the impact indicator ‘Extent known GBV survivors receive appropriate support’ had 2.75 times more chance of being reached compared to the targets set for the indicator ‘# of reported incidents of GBV’. It also appears to matter for which population group targets were set. Targets set for refugees (the reference) as well as returnees and for all populations of concerns had equal chance to be reached. However, targets set for refugees had 1.39 (=) times more chance of being reached compared to targets set for internally displaced people. Finally, the level of target seemed to have mattered as well. On average, decreasing an impact target by 1 percentage point over baseline was associated with a 1.37 (=) times more chance of being reached. The latter result can be interpreted as operations being required to set smart impact targets. On the one hand, setting easy targets might not have resulted in significant improvements within the lives of the population of concern. On the other hand, setting overambitious targets was associated with higher risk of those targets not being reached.

# Conclusions

In terms of programme performance, targets on impact indicators seemed to be increasingly reached. In 2021, slightly less than 65 percent of impact targets were reached. The proportion of performance targets reached stayed the same across the years. in 2021, slightly less than 55 percent of performance targets were attained. To determine factors that explain the extent to which targets were reached, a series of multilevel logistics regression analyses was carried out. As for impact, the type of indicator, the type of population group targeted and the difference between target and baseline values seemed to explain parts of the likelihood of reaching a target on average. As for performance, the type of indicator, the type of population group targeted, and OL budget allocations seemed to explain parts of the likelihood of reaching a target on average. However, the models estimated exhibited only moderate explanatory power at best. Thus, the regression analyses performed should be replicated with additional sets of explanatory factors. For example, the institutional setting and strength at the country level may explain some of variation in reaching targets.

# Annex I: The operations included into the analysis.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Regional bureau** | **Type** |
| Afghanistan | Asia and the Pacific | Country office |
| Albania | Europe | Country office |
| Algeria | Middle East and North Africa | Country office |
| Angola | Southern Africa | Country office |
| Argentina | Americas | Multi-country office |
| Armenia | Europe | Country office |
| Aruba | Americas | National office |
| Australia | Asia and the Pacific | Multi-country office |
| Austria | Europe | National office |
| Azerbaijan | Europe | Country office |
| Bangladesh | Asia and the Pacific | Country office |
| Belarus | Europe | Country office |
| Belgium | Europe | Multi-country office |
| Belize | Americas | National office |
| Bosnia & Herzegovina | Europe | Country office |
| Botswana | Southern Africa | Presence |
| Brazil | Americas | Country office |
| Bulgaria | Europe | Country office |
| Burkina Faso | West and Central Africa | Country office |
| Burundi | East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes | Country office |
| Cameroon | West and Central Africa | Multi-country office |
| Canada | Americas | Country office |
| Central African Republic | West and Central Africa | Country office |
| Chad | West and Central Africa | Country office |
| Chile | Americas | National office |
| China | Asia and the Pacific | Country office |
| Colombia | Americas | Country office |
| Congo (Democratic Republic of the) | Southern Africa | Country office |
| Congo (Republic of the) | Southern Africa | Country office |
| Costa Rica | Americas | Country office |
| Côte d'Ivoire | West and Central Africa | Country office |
| Croatia | Europe | Country office |
| Cuba | Americas | Presence |
| Curacao | Americas | National office |
| Cyprus | Europe | Country office |
| Czech Republic | Europe | National office |
| Denmark | Europe | Presence |
| Djibouti | East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes | Country office |
| Dominican Rep. | Americas | National office |
| Ecuador | Americas | Country office |
| Egypt | Middle East and North Africa | Country office |
| El Salvador | Americas | Country office |
| Eritrea | East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes | Country office |
| Estonia | Europe | Presence |
| Ethiopia | East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes | Country office |
| France | Europe | Country office |
| Gabon | West and Central Africa | National office |
| Georgia | Europe | Country office |
| Germany | Europe | Country office |
| Ghana | West and Central Africa | Country office |
| Great Britain & Northern Ireland | Europe | Country office |
| Greece | Europe | Country office |
| Guatemala | Americas | Country office |
| Guinea | West and Central Africa | National office |
| Guinea-Bissau | West and Central Africa | National office |
| Guyana | Americas | National office |
| Haiti | Americas | National office |
| Honduras | Americas | Country office |
| Hungary | Europe | Multi-country office |
| India | Asia and the Pacific | Office of chief of mission |
| Indonesia | Asia and the Pacific | Country office |
| Iraq | Middle East and North Africa | Country office |
| Ireland | Europe | National office |
| Islamic Republic of Iran | Asia and the Pacific | Country office |
| Israel | Middle East and North Africa | Country office |
| Italy | Europe | Multi-country office |
| Japan | Asia and the Pacific | Country office |
| Jordan | Middle East and North Africa | Country office |
| Kazakhstan | Asia and the Pacific | Multi-country office |
| Kenya | East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes | Country office |
| Korea (Republic of) | Asia and the Pacific | Country office |
| Kosovo | Europe | Office of chief of mission |
| Kuwait | Middle East and North Africa | Country office |
| Kyrgyzstan | Asia and the Pacific | National office |
| Latvia | Europe | Presence |
| Lebanon | Middle East and North Africa | Country office |
| Liberia | West and Central Africa | Country office |
| Libya | Middle East and North Africa | Office of chief of mission |
| Lithuania | Europe | Presence |
| Malawi | Southern Africa | Country office |
| Malaysia | Asia and the Pacific | Country office |
| Mali | West and Central Africa | Country office |
| Malta | Europe | Country office |
| Mauritania | Middle East and North Africa | Country office |
| Mexico | Americas | Country office |
| Moldova (Republic of) | Europe | Country office |
| Montenegro | Europe | Country office |
| Morocco | Middle East and North Africa | Country office |
| Mozambique | Southern Africa | Country office |
| Myanmar | Asia and the Pacific | Country office |
| Namibia | Southern Africa | Presence |
| Nepal | Asia and the Pacific | Country office |
| Netherlands, the | Europe | National office |
| Niger | West and Central Africa | Country office |
| Nigeria | West and Central Africa | Country office |
| North Macedonia | Europe | Country office |
| North Macedonia (Republic of) | Europe | Country office |
| Pakistan | Asia and the Pacific | Country office |
| Panama | Americas | Multi-country office |
| Papua New Guinea | Asia and the Pacific | Presence |
| Paraguay | Americas | Presence |
| Peru | Americas | Country office |
| Philippines | Asia and the Pacific | National office |
| Poland | Europe | Country office |
| Portugal | Europe | Presence |
| Qatar | Middle East and North Africa | Country office |
| Romania | Europe | Country office |
| Russian Federation | Europe | Country office |
| Rwanda | East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes | Country office |
| Saudi Arabia | Middle East and North Africa | Multi-country office |
| Senegal | West and Central Africa | Multi-country office |
| Serbia | Europe | Country office |
| Singapore | Asia and the Pacific | Presence |
| Slovak Republic | Europe | National office |
| Slovenia | Europe | Presence |
| Somalia | East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes | Country office |
| South Africa | Southern Africa | Multi-country office |
| South Sudan | East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes | Country office |
| Spain | Europe | Country office |
| Sri Lanka | Asia and the Pacific | National office |
| Sudan | East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes | Country office |
| Sweden | Europe | Multi-country office |
| Switzerland and Liechtenstein | Europe | Presence |
| Switzerland and Liechtenstein | Europe | National office |
| Syrian Arab Republic | Middle East and North Africa | Country office |
| Tajikistan | Asia and the Pacific | Country office |
| Tanzania (United Republic of) | East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes | Country office |
| Thailand | Asia and the Pacific | Multi-country office |
| Togo | West and Central Africa | National office |
| Trinidad & Tobago | Americas | National office |
| Tunisia | Middle East and North Africa | Country office |
| Türkiye (Republic of) | Europe | Country office |
| Uganda | East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes | Country office |
| Ukraine | Europe | Country office |
| United Arab Emirates | Middle East and North Africa | Liaison office |
| United States of America | Americas | Multi-country office |
| Uruguay | Americas | National office |
| Uzbekistan | Asia and the Pacific | Liaison office |
| Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) | Americas | Country office |
| Western Sahara | Middle East and North Africa | Liaison office |
| Yemen | Middle East and North Africa | Country office |
| Zambia | Southern Africa | Country office |
| Zimbabwe | Southern Africa | Office of chief of mission |

# Annex II: Output tables of the multilevel logistics regression models

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 4: Multilevel logistics regression results (impact analysis) | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | *Dependent variable:* | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Impact target reached (yes/no) | | | | | | | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) |
| Impact indicator 1 (yes/no) |  | 0.61\*\*\* | 0.61\*\*\* | 0.65\*\*\* | 0.48\*\*\* | 0.48\*\*\* | 0.48\*\* | 0.49\*\*\* | 0.50\*\*\* | 0.49\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.19) | (0.19) | (0.19) | (0.19) | (0.19) | (0.19) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Impact indicator 2 (yes/no) |  | 1.20\*\*\* | 1.20\*\*\* | 1.22\*\*\* | 1.01\*\*\* | 1.01\*\*\* | 1.01\*\*\* | 1.01\*\*\* | 1.02\*\*\* | 1.02\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.18) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.03) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stateless persons (yes/no) |  |  |  | -1.93\*\* | -1.85\*\* | -1.84\*\* | -1.90\*\* | -1.85\*\* | -1.87\*\* | -1.86\*\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.76) | (0.77) | (0.77) | (0.78) | (0.77) | (0.77) | (0.77) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| returnees (yes/no) |  |  |  | -0.14 | 0.01 | 0.02 | -0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.29) | (0.30) | (0.30) | (0.30) | (0.30) | (0.30) | (0.30) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Internally displaced (yes/no) |  |  |  | -0.39\*\* | -0.33\* | -0.33\* | -0.32 | -0.33\* | -0.33\* | -0.33\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.19) | (0.19) | (0.19) | (0.19) | (0.19) | (0.19) | (0.19) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| populations of concern (yes/no) |  |  |  | -0.90 | -0.82 | -0.81 | -0.83 | -0.81 | -0.79 | -0.81 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.56) | (0.56) | (0.56) | (0.57) | (0.56) | (0.56) | (0.56) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target as %-change over baseline |  |  |  |  | -0.31\*\*\* | -0.31\*\*\* | -0.31\*\*\* | -0.31\*\*\* | -0.31\*\*\* | -0.31\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total OL (in USD) |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.08) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Admin OL (in USD) |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.02 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.10) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| staff OL (in USD) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.04 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.10) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Int. project OL (in USD) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.15\* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.08) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ext. project OL (in USD) |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.13 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.09) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| # of staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.09) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| # of AWF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.09 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.11) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| # of G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.07 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.14) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| # of JPO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.16 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.24) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| # of N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.08 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.22) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) |
| # of P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.14 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.10) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| # of AFF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.08 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.11) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| # of FTA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.10) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| # of Ind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.02 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.30) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| # of TA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.06 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.11) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.40\*\*\* | -0.34\*\* | -0.39\*\* | -0.26\* | -0.13 | -0.13 | -0.13 | -0.13 | -0.14 | -0.13 |
|  | (0.08) | (0.14) | (0.17) | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.15) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 1,110 | 1,110 | 1,110 | 1,110 | 1,110 | 1,110 | 1,110 | 1,110 | 1,110 | 1,110 |
| Log Likelihood | -745.53 | -717.63 | -717.47 | -711.10 | -701.99 | -701.97 | -699.71 | -701.79 | -700.34 | -701.60 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 1,495.07 | 1,443.27 | 1,444.93 | 1,438.20 | 1,421.98 | 1,423.94 | 1,425.43 | 1,423.59 | 1,428.68 | 1,429.21 |
| Bayesian Inf. Crit. | 1,505.09 | 1,463.32 | 1,469.99 | 1,478.30 | 1,467.09 | 1,474.06 | 1,490.59 | 1,473.71 | 1,498.85 | 1,494.37 |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Note:* | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | | | | | |

1. Global Focus Insights also provides data on staffing for the period of 2015 until 2021. In terms of GBV-related staff, differences between Focus and DHR workforce data do not seem to be too far off. Within Focus, 416 GBV related positions across all operations and across all 7 years were counted. Within the DHR data it was 466. It was decided to use DHR data within the current analysis since it was deemed to be more accurate in terms of its job-title descriptions. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)