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Introduction & Methodology

Energy is essential to survival and a fundamental right, yet it is a routinely neglected need in humanitarian response. There is a growing global consensus that affordable, reliable, sustainable, and modern energy for all is essential to sustainable development and effective humanitarian response. Sustainable Development Goal 7\(^1\) and the Global Plan of Action for Sustainable Energy Solutions in Situations of Displacement\(^2\) demonstrate the wide global commitment to improving energy access globally. However, much work remains on how to improve energy access in emergencies in an inclusive manner, addressing the specific needs of women and girls and mitigating risks of gender-based violence (GBV). The Energy in Emergencies: Reducing Risks of Gender-based Violence (EEMRG) initiative is a two-year program funded by the U.S. Department of State’s Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, and implemented by Mercy Corps and the Women’s Refugee Commission (WRC). It aims to improve safety and opportunities for women and girls through access to energy in emergencies by creating training and technical resources on energy access, gender, and GBV risk reduction for humanitarian practitioners working across sectors. Through development of training materials, EEMRG will address GBV risk mitigation and, where possible, prevention, but will not address GBV response.

Current humanitarian programming is missing opportunities to equitably meet the energy needs of affected communities. In contexts where energy access is disrupted by emergencies, women, girls, and children — the usual custodians of household energy — are most impacted. They can find themselves in perilous circumstances when accessing wood fuel from contested sources, or moving among unfamiliar and untrusted community members in the dark to use latrines, visit markets, or collect water. While many groups are affected by inequitable energy access, EEMRG focuses on women and adolescent girls in all their diversity because they are consistently being left behind, face heightened risks of GBV associated with energy access, and their unmet energy needs exacerbate marginalization across all facets of their lives. For instance, energy poverty in displacement settings often means that forests are depleted in the collection of firewood. Women and adolescent girls are typically responsible for firewood collection due to gender norms, expectations, and roles. Women and girls are often exposed to risks of GBV during firewood collection. Tensions between displaced and host communities over forest depletion may lead to intercommunal violence. Often this intercommunal violence is targeted at women and girls who are collecting the wood. Energy access is not an adequate response to GBV; however, it can help minimize the frequency and/or severity of GBV.

EEMRG is underpinned by the principle of “do no harm,” that is, humanitarian actors must ensure that their activities and assistance meet basic needs while not exacerbating risks faced by displaced populations — particularly women and girls — by neglecting their energy needs. But beyond supporting “do no harm” principles, and basic needs, energy access is an enabler of other critical humanitarian, development and equity outcomes. Energy access broadens the tools, social and productive activities, and information available to women and girls, and is a key enabler for recovery, environmental protection, and socio-economic development, and leveling societal power imbalances. For these reasons, humanitarian actors have a responsibility to proactively support women and girls’ energy access.

EEMRG will take an intersectional approach to closely examine how other identity characteristics (such as age, ability, socioeconomic status, displacement status, sexual orientation and gender identity, ethnicity and race,}

---

\(^1\) Sustainable Development Goal 7 aims to ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all. Further information on targets available here: [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg7](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg7)

religion, etc.) contribute to discrimination and marginalization and compound issues of gendered energy access. Inclusive energy taken forward by EEMRG is both a commitment and the means to be intentional to ensure that women, girls, boys, and men in all their diversity benefit from energy programming.

This report synthesizes the current state of knowledge and practice around energy access in emergencies and how access to energy intersects with gendered opportunities and GBV risks faced by women and girls living through emergencies. The report incorporates findings from 28 global expert interviews3 and a literature review that examined the growing body of guidance and research on energy access in emergencies.4 For the full methodology, see Annex 1: Methodology. This report is also grounded by two case studies on the state of practice in Jordan and Uganda, which include findings from interviews and conversations with 182 refugees and host community members, 16 market actors, and 20 humanitarian practitioners (see Annexes 4 & 5).

The report lays a foundation for a global humanitarian curriculum on inclusive energy access and reducing the risk of exposure to GBV in emergencies, and culminates with a clear set of capacity-building objectives. It will ensure that existing resources and knowledge are appropriately leveraged, and that EEMRG training materials, guidance, and tools respond to the most important gaps in knowledge and practice.

The audiences for this report are humanitarian generalists and energy and GBV experts, who we hope will confirm and challenge conclusions, ensuring that the report lays an accurate foundation from which we can develop training materials, guidance, and tools around energy and GBV in emergencies for practitioners across sectors.

Key Terms & Concepts

There is no definitive guide to energy concepts or terminology,5 especially within the humanitarian sphere, so the definitions below have been constructed from a variety of sources, with leading sources acknowledged where appropriate. Throughout this report, we consider energy needed for critical daily activities, including cooking, heating, powering, and lighting.

Energy Source: A source from which useful energy can be extracted or recovered. Energy sources are classified into two groups — renewable and nonrenewable. Renewable and nonrenewable energy can be converted into secondary energy sources such as electricity and hydrogen.

Energy Access: Having sufficient access to clean, reliable, and affordable energy sources people need for their wellbeing.6 Sustainable development goal (SDG) 7 sets a clear and ambitious target for global energy access: “Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all.”7 Energy access is an important leverage point toward greater gender equity and reduced risk of exposure to GBV, especially when bolstered by other supportive policies and actions.

---

3 Global expert KII questionnaire available on request.
4 EEMRG Annotated Bibliography of 145 reviewed sources available here.
5 https://www.iea.org/energyaccess/methodology/
6 Adapted from https://policy.practicalaction.org/policy-themes/energy/total-energy-access/measurements-and-definitions
7 https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg7
**Renewable Energy:** “Renewable energy, often referred to as clean energy, comes from natural sources or processes that are constantly replenished. For example, sunlight keeps shining or wind keeps blowing, even if their availability depends on time and weather.”

**Appliance:** Equipment, powered by electricity or other energy sources, that accomplishes some function or task (e.g., light bulb, electric fan, cookstove, refrigerator, radio).

**Energy Poverty:** The situation in which people lack equitable, clean, reliable, and affordable energy sources, negatively affecting their wellbeing. Energy access and energy deficits exist on a continuum. In an effort to move away from binary definitions of energy access, the World Bank created guidance to establish standardized energy access tiers. The World Bank’s Energy Sector Management Assistance Program (ESMAP) developed a five-tier system for classifying energy access. ESMAP uses multiple dimensions (attributes) to define energy access, including availability, duration, evening availability, affordability, legality, quality, and reliability (see infographic, above).

Assessing energy poverty using an intersectional approach (considering age, sex, associations, abilities, identities) is essential to effectively addressing energy needs.

**Energy Spheres:** The physical spaces in which people require energy access, including home, work/productive, and public areas. Energy needs in different spheres are highly influenced by social norms, roles, and responsibilities assigned to women, men, boys, and girls.

**Age:** “denotes the different stages in a person’s life cycle. It is important to know where a person is in his or her life cycle, because capacities and needs change over time. Age influences, and can enhance or diminish, a person’s capacity to exercise his or her rights.”

**Adolescence:** refers to boys and girls ages 10 to 19 who account for an increasing proportion of displaced persons. Adolescents have distinct needs and experience different vulnerabilities from older men, women, and younger children (with whom they are often grouped). Humanitarian programming must be accountable to adolescents, in particular to adolescent girls. This includes increased care-work responsibilities, such as collecting firewood and cooking, as well as contributing directly and indirectly to household livelihoods (which require energy inputs).

---

Diversity: is the “variety of values, attitudes, cultural perspectives, beliefs, ethnic backgrounds, nationalities, sexual orientations, gender identities, abilities, health, social status, skills, and other specific personal characteristics that people possess…. [Humanitarian actors] should recognize, understand and value these differences in each specific context and operation, to ensure that all persons of concern are protected appropriately.”15

Gender: is the socially constructed roles of women and men that are often central to the way individuals define themselves and are defined by others. Unlike sex, gender is not a biological determinant. Gender roles are learned, may change over time, and vary within and between cultures. Gender often defines the duties, responsibilities, constraints, opportunities, and privileges of women and men in their context.16

Gender-based Violence (GBV): is any harmful act that is perpetrated against a person’s will and that is based on socially ascribed (i.e., gender) differences between men and women. It includes acts that inflict physical, sexual, or mental harm or suffering, threats of such acts, coercion, and other deprivations of liberty. These acts can occur in public or private.17

Gender Equality Programming: is non-negotiable and fosters equal enjoyment of rights, opportunities, resources, and humanitarian services to girls, boys, men, and women (referred to as sub-populations). It is achieved through a combination of gender mainstreaming (sometimes referred to as integration) and targeted action and can be broken down into distinct components: i. collection and analysis of sex, age, and disability disaggregated data (SADDD); ii. conducting gender analysis on the impact of the crisis on different subpopulations; iii. consulting sub-populations across the program cycle (e.g., during the assessment, design, implementation, and monitoring); iv. designing projects and programming that ensure safe and equitable access across sub-populations; v. ensuring equal participation and benefit from project components; and vi. addressing risks of GBV through mainstreaming by identifying, mitigating, and monitoring risks, as well as through prevention and response activities.18 Gender equality programming is critical in order to realize SDG 5: gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls, including those affected by conflict and crisis.

Energy, Gender and Resilience: Energy programming that not only accounts for gendered needs, risks, and capacities, but proactively works with communities themselves, and specifically women, adolescents, and youth to develop and implement solutions that will enhance the resilience of affected communities to respond to future stresses and shocks. Addressing displaced and host women and girls’ feelings of insecurity (including threats to physical and psychological well being) — linked to energy access and otherwise — is in itself of great value and should be centered in humanitarian response. In doing so, women and girls’ self-confidence, wellbeing and resilience can be strengthened at individual, household and communal levels.19

15 Ibid
16 Ibid
State of Principles & Standards

When successful, principles distill a community’s cumulative and collective wisdom about what constitutes “good” and “bad” practice. They serve as a collective reference point and minimum standard, preventing failure of programs for reasons that are both predictable and preventable. Today, no single set of principles or standards exist to guide humanitarian practice around energy, much less inclusive energy access and GBV risk reduction in emergencies. And while humanitarian gender and GBV standards do exist, they largely overlook energy access. This section reviews existing humanitarian-energy-gender principles and standards, and ends with a proposal of twelve principles that draw from existing resources. This section draws from a literature review and key informant interviews.

Existing Standards and Principles

Humanitarian specific: The Sphere Handbook (2018) outlines core standards to improve the quality of humanitarian response and improve accountability to affected populations.20 Sphere standards establish that energy needs should be considered in all emergency settings. While Sphere asserts the importance of an affordable fuel and household energy supply for a wide range of activities (including to facilitate lighting, cooking, cooling/heating, health services, and communication), energy is not currently included as a stand-alone or cross-cutting standard.21

Energy specific (humanitarian): Resources from the Moving Energy Initiative have succeeded in explaining and applying many key energy concepts to protracted humanitarian contexts and settings. Their paper, “Heat, Light Power: Saving Lives, Reducing Costs,”22 is a foundational resource defining energy access challenges in protracted crises, barriers preventing the humanitarian community from responding to them, and opportunities that humanitarian, host, and displaced communities stand to gain from improved energy access. In addition, resources from the Global Plan of Action, the SAFE Humanitarian Working Group and Clean Cooking Alliance, and WFP’s SAFE Handbook and FAO’s SAFE guidance note set clear guidance and principles around energy in emergencies.

Energy and environment specific (non-humanitarian): IIED/CAFOD’s Energy Delivery Model23 outlines the enabling factors and barriers to delivering energy services to people living in poverty, including the factors that can make or break a sustainable service. The ESMAP Multi-Tier Classification system,24 under the Sustainable Energy for All (SE4All) initiative, redefines energy access in multidimensional terms, providing clarity on what energy practitioners globally should be aiming to achieve. Lighting Global’s quality standards for both pico and solar home systems set a “baseline level of quality, durability, and truth in advertising to protect consumers” that are relevant for humanitarian organizations and end recipients. The Environment & Humanitarian Action Network works in recognition that the “quality, effectiveness and long-term outcomes of humanitarian action are improved by ensuring that lifesaving and life-sustaining actions are delivered in an environmentally responsible manner. This will enhance populations’ resilience and security, minimize the chance of recurring crises and bridge the perceived humanitarian-development gap by reducing aid dependency through saving livelihoods.”25

Tensions or contradictions in existing humanitarian-energy principles: Potential areas of tension on energy access issues in existing standards and guidance documents include:

21 ibid.
24 https://www.esmap.org/node/55526
A tendency for energy needs to be discussed primarily through the lens of household needs and cooking and fuel requirements in particular. This focus runs the risk of de-emphasizing other critical energy needs. Of the three energy spheres (household, productive, and public), household energy needs tend to receive the most attention in existing standards and guidance. This limits both the scale and focus of potential solutions. For example, there is a tendency to propose lower cost small-scale lighting rather than considering more complex, integrated systems (e.g., large solar systems, grid or mini-grid services) that would serve the needs of multiple energy spheres and market segments. This has potential and under-studied implications for meeting the energy needs of different sub-populations (such as adolescent girls) who may be better served by energy interventions focused on another sphere of access (i.e., public vs. household).

Some resources discuss energy access in emergencies as the sole responsibility of humanitarian actors, while others focus on opportunities and benefits of partnering with private sector and government-led electrification and energy strategies/plans. In addition, the lack of clear ownership and responsibility around energy in the humanitarian sector leads to each sector viewing the issue from a narrow, sector-specific lens, reducing overall efficiencies or consideration of broader potential impacts and benefits that could result from a more holistic approach.

While most resources acknowledge and encourage market-based programming, only a few (notably from MEI) discuss the market distortion risks of long-term direct distributions and the challenges this poses for transitioning to sustainable solutions.

A number of energy in emergencies resources introduce or test market systems development approaches. In some cases, resources build from established market development terminology and frameworks. In others, they create new, energy-specific frameworks and terminology.

Wide consensus does not exist within the energy community on how humanitarian settings are classified and defined (rapid onset, protracted crisis, displacement setting, etc.) or around the appropriate response activities for different response settings. Some organizations and initiatives, including the Smart Communities Coalition (SCC), MEI, and the Global Plan of Action (GPA), focus on camps and declared emergencies, while others (e.g., SAFE) take a broader approach that could include internally displaced persons and more classic recovery settings.

There is some risk that the push for affordable, reliable, clean energy in our programming is not matched by operational practices within humanitarian organizations that by and large still rely on diesel generators in off-grid environments. There is a risk that, by not walking the talk, humanitarian organizations are not leveraging opportunities for program implementation.

When designing programs that involve distribution of energy products, humanitarians may face a tension around quantity vs. quality of products. Choosing lower priced, and lower quality, products will have important consequences, including shorter product life spans, creation of consumer distrust of entire product categories (e.g., solar lamps or solar systems if a displaced person’s first experience is negative), and increased electronic waste due to short life cycles of low quality products.

---

26 Leading market systems development training and resources available through the Springfield Center, the BEAM exchange, and the Markets in Crises community of practice.
GBV Risk Mitigation Principles and Standards
A number of humanitarian gender- and GBV-focused standards and guidance exist and are widely endorsed across communities of practice. However, the majority of these do not consider energy or do so in a cursory manner. Where connections are made, there is a focus on fuel and lighting, with less focus on powering, heating, and cooling. The Sphere Handbook (as previously discussed) and the International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC) Minimum Standards for protection, gender, and inclusion in emergencies are exceptions. IFRC’s Minimum Standards for protection, gender, and inclusion in emergencies discusses energy as linked to specific sectors — health, food security and livelihoods, shelter and safety issues. Key GBV standards and principles resources include:

- **UNFPA’s Minimum Standards for Prevention and Response to Gender-Based Violence in Emergencies** outlines foundational standards, mitigation, prevention and response, and coordination and operational standards. The Standards focus on four key approaches: survivor-centered, rights-based, community-based, and do no harm.

- **Inter-Agency Standing Committee’s (IASC) Guidelines for Integrating Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action: Reducing risk, promoting resilience and aiding recovery** outlines guiding principles and a framework for all humanitarian actors to mitigate the risks of exposure to GBV in emergencies.

- **WRC’s proposed standards articulated in Strengthening GBV Prevention & Response in Urban Humanitarian Contexts: Building Capacity Across Cities** outlines strategies for mitigating GBV risks for displaced populations in urban humanitarian contexts and a proposed framework for humanitarian actors to mitigate GBV in urban humanitarian contexts.

- **Call to Action on Protection from Gender-Based Violence in Emergencies** (Call to Action) is a multi-stakeholder initiative supported by governments, UN agencies and NGOs which outlines collective and targeted actions consolidated into six key outcomes to foster accountability so that responses universally prioritize GBV risk mitigation and services for GBV survivors.

- **IASC Guidelines on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action** provides a framework for mainstreaming the inclusion of persons with disabilities in GBV programming and humanitarian action, more broadly.

- **IFRC’s Minimum Standards for protection, gender, and inclusion in emergencies** establish minimum standards for Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, on protection, gender, and inclusion (PGI) in emergencies. They promote adequate lighting in and around health facilities; lighting around food distribution sites for food and livelihood interventions; ensuring access to safe firewood or other domestic energy sources; lights in and around communal areas (e.g., latrines, bathing facilities); and shelters with a safe cooking area.

- **Oxfam’s Minimum Standards for Gender in Emergencies** outline minimum standards for gender equality and key actions to achieve each minimum standard.
Real Time Accountability Partnership’s GBV Accountability Framework guides humanitarian actors (service providers, GBV coordinators, humanitarian leaders, and donors) on steps to combat GBV within their respective mandates.36

**Gender and Age-Responsive Programming Standards and Principles:**

Crisis and conflict have profoundly different impacts on women and girls than on men and boys.37 Women and girls most often hold less power in society; have less access to and control over assets and are thus more dependent on others for survival; are less visible to humanitarian responders; and navigate intersecting factors of their marginalization (for example, disability).38 Due to social norms and expectations linked to age and sex, adolescent girls often assume care taking, care work, and marriage roles and responsibilities, which impede their ability to go to school and socialize with peers. In humanitarian crises, these trends are often exacerbated. Humanitarian actors need to better incorporate age and gender into response interventions and seize on opportunities to integrate these standards and principles where clear complementarities with energy exist — collecting fuel, cooking, well-lit latrines, etc. Leading standards and principles around gender and age responsive programming in emergencies include:

- IASC Gender and Age Marker (GAM) provides a framework encompassing 12 gender equality measures to monitor and evaluate the incorporation of gender and age into humanitarian projects to ensure consistent analysis and gender equality programming.39

- Gender Practitioners Collaborative’s Minimum Standards for Mainstreaming Gender Equality elaborates eight standards to mainstream gender equality.40

- Age and Disability Capacity Building Program’s Humanitarian Inclusion Standards for Older People and People with Disabilities informs the design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of humanitarian programs, helps practitioners to strengthen accountability to people with disabilities and older people, and supports advocacy, capacity building, and preparedness measures on age and disability across the humanitarian system.41

- WRC’s Including Adolescent Girls with Disabilities in Humanitarian Programs: Principles and Guidelines underscores fostering adolescent girls’ participation and strengthening their protective assets which help to mitigate the risks of violence, abuse, and exploitation.42

- The IASC Gender Handbook43 provides humanitarian actors with guidance to ensure that gender is adequately integrated into humanitarian planning and programming.

**Conflicts/Convergences: Gender, GBV Mitigation and Age-responsive Programming**

A key gap in addressing gender, GBV risk mitigation, and age in emergencies in existing standards and guidance...
documents is intersectionality, or rather a failure to take an intersectional approach. Few resources account for overlapping discrimination and marginalization (e.g., gender, age, disability, class, and ethnicity). A gender-transformative and protective approach to energy programming must take into account power relations and the ways multiple forms of discrimination impact the needs of different groups/sub-groups, their exposure to GBV, and their capacity to mitigate these risks. In many cases, the focus on assessment and monitoring is limited to analysis based on predetermined and static “vulnerable” profiles, without considering how, for example, the intersection of gender, age, and disability may influence access to and control over energy, as well as change over time. Intersectionality is imperative in order to ensure that the design and implementation of energy programming is transformative, protective, and inclusive.

In some cases, there is a tension as to whether or not the humanitarian imperative is to ensure that programming, including energy programming, is gender transformative — given implications for resourcing operations and implementation (e.g., staff and partner knowledge and skills and funding/feasible duration). Given the scale of displacement and need, as well as dwindling humanitarian funding, changing norms may be considered by some as beyond feasible. However, simply identifying and working around existing power inequalities may have dire negative unintended consequences and undercut the sustainability of energy programming, as well as opportunities to enhance the wellbeing and empowerment of women and girls through energy interventions. EEMRG materials will take a gender-transformative approach that centers the humanitarian-development nexus, providing “gold” and “silver” standards that account for different operating environments and potential partnerships.

**Proposed Principles: Inclusive and Gendered Energy Programming in Emergencies**

In light of the gap in established principles for inclusive and gendered energy programming in emergencies, EEMRG synthesized a number of leading humanitarian response, energy, and gender resources to develop a set of eleven principles. The proposed set of principles offers a summary of what the energy and GBV sectors know lead to positive program outcomes. These principles are expected to evolve as practice in this area matures, but they will serve as a basis to develop EEMRG training materials on energy, GBV, and gender in emergencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Endorsements/Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Energy is a basic need and a human right:** Energy access is essential to survival, as well as to a safe and dignified existence for all, regardless of gender, age, or other characteristics, during humanitarian crises and recovery periods. In order to ensure accountability to affected populations, energy access must be integrated into the work of all sectors across all phases of response. | Sphere standards recognize that “fuel and other energy sources are necessary for lighting, cooking, thermal comfort and communication.”

The Global Plan of Action for Sustainable Energy Solutions in Situations of Displacement recognizes the consequences of energy poverty in displacement settings for recovery, safety, and gender equality. |

---

## Principle (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endorsements/Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| IASC GBV guidelines and the IASC Gender Handbook acknowledge the importance of access to cooking fuels and energy.  

Access to safe and sustainable energy is a basic human need. Without it, the forcibly displaced — particularly women and children — may be at increased risk and have less time to rebuild their lives. |

“A rights-based approach seeks to analyze and address the root causes of discrimination and inequality to ensure that everyone, regardless of their gender, age, ethnicity or religion, has the right to live with freedom and dignity, safety from violence, exploitation and abuse…”

### Mainstreaming inclusion:

Proactively ensuring inclusion of host and displaced individuals in all their diversity across the program cycle is critical to guaranteeing that they are able to fully participate, safely access, and benefit from energy interventions.

...ensure inclusiveness and accessibility for specific groups of concern, including women, adolescent girls and boys, older persons, the young, persons with disabilities, people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual or intersex, and women and men belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities or indigenous groups....

“Inclusion in emergency programming focuses on using the analysis of how people are excluded to actively reduce that exclusion by creating an environment where differences are embraced and promoted as strengths. Providing inclusive services means giving equitable access to resources for all.”

Energy interventions and technical solutions should be sensitive to the unique needs and challenges of women and girls, who are disproportionately impacted by the lack of energy access.

Energy poverty has a direct effect on women’s and girls’ quality of life as they are traditionally the family members spending time collecting firewood over long distances in often remote locations, which exposes them to risks of sexual and gender-based violence, including rape and sexual assault.

---
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**Principle**

**Participation and accountability:** In order to be accountable to affected populations and center affected populations as agents of change in energy interventions, community members — including host community members — must be engaged and listened to across the program cycle.

**Endorsements/Citations**

Refugees should not be perceived as passive receivers of relief, but rather as part of a community whose needs, ideas, and solutions can be fully integrated into response planning... Refugees should not be regarded as helpless beneficiaries but as agents of change with talents and valuable skills. Solutions should build on local skills and capacities and achieve a compromise between technical efficiency and being culturally appropriate.  

Participation does not refer to passive inclusion. Participation should include the active and meaningful contribution of all impacted by the emergency from design through implementation and programme review. Meaningful contribution encompasses the instrumental voices and opinions of all affected women, girls, men and boys that help actors to better understand needs and empower affected members in a community.

Displaced people, host communities and host governments must be involved from planning to implementation to ensure that their needs and priorities are reflected.

**Gender Norms transformation:** Energy programmers should address not only the symptoms of gender/age energy inequality, but also the structural causes of inequality to contribute to lasting changes in gender equitable safe access and control over resources.

**Endorsements/Citations**

“Crisis changes social and cultural structures quickly, which can serve as opportunities to redefine gender norms and contribute to the balancing of power in gender relations. The potential for transformative change addresses the structural causes and consequences of gender inequality, with the aim of achieving lasting, empowering change in the lives of women, girls, men and boys [in all their diversity]. Different strategies and approaches can be adopted to ensure that the human rights of women, girls, men and boys are promoted equally and that gender equality is achieved.”

**Age-responsive interventions:** Inequitable access to and control over energy resources and assets is compounded by age-associated inequality; programming should proactively address age-associated differences, vulnerabilities, and risks.

**Endorsements/Citations**

As girls and boys come into adolescence, gender norms and expectations further solidify. Parents often isolate their daughters to protect them from threats, but this also prevents them from accessing humanitarian services, and benefitting from program activities — including activities meant to enhance energy access and control, and thus strengthen their resilience.

---


Principle

(Cont.) Old people and people with disabilities are often overlooked in humanitarian relief and response and they may find it harder than others to access the assistance and protection they need. Minimum Standards for Age and Disability Inclusion in Humanitarian Action

Age can affect women, men, girls and boys differently…humanitarian assistance [must be] responsive to their gender-specific vulnerabilities, needs and capacities.58

Energy as an enabler and tool for resilience: In addition to being a right and basic need, inclusive energy access is a means to satisfy a wide variety of humanitarian and development objectives across sectors. Energy interventions must be designed with clear impact pathways that leverage and bolster existing capacities within affected communities to secure the highest priority outcomes. By doing so, energy interventions can strengthen resilience to shocks at individual, household, community, and systems levels.

Energy is not a goal in and of itself but a crucial enabler for humanitarian relief and development. It is intrinsically linked to, and has multiplier effects on, issues such as food security, shelter, protection, health, livelihoods, sustainable management of natural resources and resilience to climate change.59

Shifting humanitarian response from only a needs-based approach to a resilience-based model – one that engages with communities directly to identify and leverage their skills and capacities to develop and implement solutions – will result in higher quality, more inclusive, and more sustainable services and programs that embrace the concepts of dignity and self-determination.60

Such programmes…focus on reinforcing [refugees’] own abilities to address their own needs, thus enabling a transformative change which disrupts gender stereotypes, bridges the humanitarian/development divide and allows for long-term sustainable change.61

Multi-sectoral collaboration: Energy needs are cross-cutting and the collective responsibility of all actors within the humanitarian system and development sector, despite lacking a clear institutional “home” in the humanitarian system.

The collection, supply and/or use of firewood and alternative energy – and consequences thereof, such as rape, murder, environmental degradation and indoor air pollution leading to respiratory infections – is a multi-sectoral issue which cannot be effectively addressed by a singularly-mandated agency or cluster acting alone.62

Energy access for displaced people is not yet recognized as a formal priority in the humanitarian system. Consequently, funding shortages (including for both initial investments and multi-year solutions), inadequate policies and lack of capacity hampers the humanitarian community from providing clean and sustainable energy in situations of displacement.63
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Endorsements/Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Support sustainable energy systems and markets:** While appropriate energy interventions may differ depending on the phase of response, the vast majority of humanitarian response contexts are protracted and underfunded. Working away from addressing energy needs exclusively through short-term donor funded project cycles is critical for long-term impacts. | **Initial emergency relief should transition to more sustainable energy provision centered around the self-reliance of displaced persons. This will mean paying much greater attention to refugee energy access and payment mechanisms, and to the evolution of sustainable market dynamics. Services based on cash or vouchers could play a significant role in this transition.**  

The aid sector needs a new vision for crisis response—one that is market-driven, that leverages the capacities of non-aid actors in local and global economic systems, and that ultimately gives crisis-affected individuals the ability to drive their own decisions and secure their own lives and livelihoods... At a practical level, it involves targeted market support to essential business and local institutions that have more reach and sustainable impact than aid agencies.  

Energy solutions in this context should recognize existing market-based solutions and involve market actors, including existing local energy and technical-services providers within the affected and host communities.  

The complexity involved in energy access for refugees...cannot be addressed solely by humanitarian responses. It needs to be looked at through a systems lens, which considers the wider range of actors, structures, rules, norms and patterns of behavior as well as the solutions offered by the private sector. |

| Progress requires measurement and responsiveness: Building the sex, age, and disability disaggregated data across the program cycle will enable accountability to affected communities (including inclusive, safe, and evidence-based energy access approaches) and allow for adaptations based on ongoing situational analysis. | Without [standardized data about energy in emergencies], humanitarian agencies, NGOs and local governments will be unable to respond effectively to the needs of displaced people, and donors and investors will not consider supporting energy programming without concrete evidence of impact and early recovery will be hindered. Sphere standards include standards and indicators for access to cooking fuels, public, and household lighting.  

The humanitarian sector needs to collect and report disaggregated data on fuel use, energy practices and costs. |

---

Environmental sustainability: The many links between environmental degradation, instability and gender mean that addressing sustainability is foundational to effectively addressing safe energy access via support healthy energy systems and markets and must be considered from the start of a humanitarian response.

Sphere standards acknowledge the risk of deforestation as a result of firewood collection and encourage humanitarians to develop alternative sources.70

Opportunities to strengthen the social and environmental sustainability of development interventions and respond to and manage potential risks needs to begin as early as possible in the planning process.... This is a win-win for people and the environment and fundamental to sustainable development.71

GBV, environmental degradation, and instability are interlinked. Responding to GBV can provide opportunities for both enhanced environmental action and women’s empowerment, but tackling one issue without addressing the other is unlikely to succeed.72

Greening the humanitarian sector: The push for affordable, reliable, clean energy in our programming is critical and should be matched by operational practices within humanitarian organizations.

As humanitarian crises become more protracted and aid budgets face unprecedented scrutiny, agencies could save millions by switching from diesel and oil fuels to cleaner energy sources.73

Investments in renewable energy could be leveraged to meet both operational and program participant needs.74

In the immediate term, these principles will serve as a foundation for EEMRG training materials. In EEMRG interviews with global experts, a majority believed that development of principles could be useful to build consensus and unify actors around best practices and clarify aspirations for future responses. While no clear “home” for this type of exercise or principles themselves emerged in KIs, most interviewees demonstrated awareness of the SAFE Working Group and the Global Plan of Action as relevant convening bodies in the energy in emergencies space.

State of Practice: Inclusive and Gendered Energy Programming in Emergencies

This section offers an inventory of current practice around inclusive energy in emergencies, drawn from the global literature review, interviews with 28 global experts, and research conducted with 182 refugees and host
community members, 16 market actors, and 20 humanitarian practitioners in Uganda and Jordan. While bright spots were easy to identify in individual programs, the global state of practice has quite a distance to travel before more consistently implementing the principles outlined earlier in this report. Experts consulted widely recognized this gap and offered clear visions of how inclusive energy programming can improve.

Practitioner Insights

This section summarizes leading insights from practitioner interviews including current efforts/initiatives, most common technical struggles, and their views on what is needed and where the biggest opportunities exist to improve inclusive energy programming in humanitarian responses in the near future.

Humanitarian Agency & Network Strategies

EEMRG identified the following initiatives and strategies around the energy-gender nexus currently underway among humanitarian agencies and networks:

“Safe access to fuel and energy” is a priority within the Global Compact on Refugees. UNHCR is in the process of refreshing its SAFE strategy for relaunch in 2020 and is finalizing two guidance documents on fuel and lighting. Champions within the agency are highlighting opportunities to consider fuel needs earlier in a response with consideration for how early decisions can impact how fuel needs are met over the long term (for example, establishing liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) supply chains). UNHCR is also sponsoring a Global Refugee Forum in 2019 that will feature energy access.

WFP also has a SAFE initiative, and in 2014 committed to providing SAFE fuel and cooking to 10 million people by 2020. Increasingly, some within WFP are advocating for energy programming to focus beyond GBV risk reduction alone, toward the economic empowerment and poverty-reducing opportunities (including reduced household labor for women through access to labor-saving appliances, and energy-supported income-generating activities).

The Global Plan of Action for Sustainable Energy in Situations of Displacement offers a platform, including data/evidence and capacity-building working groups to accelerate action toward the goal that “every person affected by conflict or natural disaster has access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy services by 2030.”

The Moving Energy Initiative is an international partnership working to improve access to safe and reliable energy for refugees. Since 2014, it has produced a substantial body of literature and research on energy needs for refugees. It is currently developing a new phase of activities, which is expected to focus on capacity building for practitioners, including technical support at the field level.

The mission of the SAFE Humanitarian Working Group is to facilitate a more coordinated, predictable, timely, and effective response to the fuel and energy needs of crisis-affected populations. The working group is currently co-chaired by the Clean Cooking Alliance, Mercy Corps, and IOM. The SAFE working group has worked together with NORCAP to maintain a roster of experts in energy access for deployment to humanitarian crises.

CARE’s starting point for all its interventions in humanitarian settings is gender equality and, as a supporting factor, GBV prevention, mitigation, and response. CARE regularly conducts safety audits that include examining
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energy-related safety risks and opportunities. CARE led development of the forthcoming inter-agency developed Cash Compendium to the GBV guidelines.

IOM has coordinated with CARE on the Shelter and GBV guidelines, and standardizes consultation with women and girls during WASH, CCCM, and health assessments to understand their needs, including those related to fuel. IOM has been involved with ECHO in setting standards for minimum energy consumption (i.e., bandwidth and wattage).

The Cash Learning Project (CaLP) is leading the development of a tip sheet on Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) calculations with the support of CaLP Technical Advisory Group members (including WRC). CaLP aims to ensure that energy is adequately addressed in the MEB. In addition, CaLP supports cash working groups in five countries to calculate the MEB and enhance understanding of what should be considered “basic needs,” including energy.

Lack of Standardized Tools & Approaches
Informants noted that a lack of standard approaches and tools hampered programs to consistently and sufficiently address energy-gender needs across the program cycle. While some standard assessment and design tools incorporate energy-gender issues, global practitioners broadly agreed that energy use and access are not systematically measured, and that there are no clear “go-to” templates for assessing energy uses and needs. As one global NGO practitioner noted, “We don’t go in and do an energy assessment in most cases. But energy needs come up in general needs assessments as well as [in] sector specific assessments for protection and food and livelihoods. Fuel and lighting needs are perpetual, heating sometimes comes up.”

Perhaps more importantly, there is a lack of leading frameworks for measuring “success” of energy interventions. Important questions around impact are unanswered, including, as one practitioner put it, “what does enough energy look like?” And some of the most widely discussed risks or benefits of energy access, such as reduced risks of sexual violence when collecting firewood, have a thin evidence base (discussed further in the case studies annex of this report). In addition, interviewees noted a lack of operational M&E tools that address energy access issues (including post-distribution monitoring [PDM] and evaluation resources).

Regarding energy costs and expenditure, fundamental issues remain around standard approaches to assessing income and expenditure data. An NGO practitioner noted, “We struggle with expenditure data collection in general; should we be collecting at the household or individual level?” Another NGO practitioner noted, “We still do not think of energy and its costs holistically. We need to be looking at transportation costs as energy.” Many practitioners noted the need to examine income holistically (including remittances and seasonal fluctuations), related coping strategies, and to standardize MEB calculation to include energy (and more broadly utility) expenditures including water, gas (cooking), and electricity (lighting/power).

Dissatisfaction with the Status Quo
Overwhelmingly, practitioners expressed dissatisfaction with the current quality of programming around energy access, including the degree to which programming fails to account for gender and promote inclusion. Many practitioners noted a need to broaden the conversation around GBV and energy access beyond mitigating risks of GBV associated with fuel collection toward systematically and holistically addressing energy access as an enabler for gender equality. A number of statements from global practitioners echoed this sentiment:

> "Honestly, we don’t have a lot of conversations about this [energy and gender] beyond firewood. I think educating people more comprehensively related to energy would be useful."
“[I see] ignorance in humanitarian settings about energy access and gender... often seeing gender and energy getting reduced to cook stoves.”

“Thinking about energy only from the protection angle can be limiting.”

The need to diversify strategies to reduce risks and acts of violence came up frequently. One practitioner noted underexploited opportunities to “engage women as participants, leaders of implementation, decision-makers (i.e., of settlement design including energy), and amplify their voices in decision-making spaces.” Others referenced the possibility of building coping mechanisms through improved energy access (via access to information and safer environments). In addition to a desire for more empowerment-focused energy interventions, other practitioners noted a need to link energy interventions to environmental protection and effective natural resource management.

**Toward More Sophisticated Energy Programming**

Many consulted practitioners had a clear vision for how humanitarian energy programming needs to improve, and how this could mitigate risks of exposure to GBV and increase opportunities for affected communities and, in particular, women and girls. Many practitioners felt strongly that quality energy programming, because of its cross-cutting importance and utility, is an ideal entry point to begin to overcome elements of persistent poor practice across the humanitarian system. Others noted missed opportunities due to lack of pre-positioning and leveraging advances in technology. One practitioner noted, “We’re at a moment now where lighting work is not very sophisticated... despite the fact that there is massive room for innovation and gender-sensitive work in this sector.”

Related to the principle of energy as enabler, many interviewees discussed an opportunity to move away from providing specific energy technologies (solar lamps, fuel available, etc.) toward more holistic outcomes made possible through energy access. Interviewees discussed the risks of a product-focused or one-size-fits-all approach, including the likelihood of distributed assets being traded, and persistent use of more familiar, risky, and insufficient options. As one practitioner put it, “The point is not to start with energy, but rather the lived experience of refugees...starting by just talking to people about their lives, and energy will certainly come up.” Other practitioners sought stronger fundamental questions to elicit actionable data: “What are the right first questions to ask when programming energy? Beyond ‘What do we buy, and how do we reduce risks of GBV?’” Another noted, “People are always asking [us as global advisors] ‘What light should we buy?’ But this is not necessarily the right question.”

Others spotted opportunities around the humanitarian-development nexus, especially around strengthening energy markets: “We always talk about bridging the humanitarian-development gap — this is an entry point.” Part of bridging this gap includes a need to design programs with longer runways for systemic, sustainable change (rather than short-term distribution-based programming). As one practitioner put it, “In humanitarian response, the truly short-term responses are a tiny part of the actual humanitarian programming that happens — so we have to think long-term from the start.”

Interviewees painted a clear picture of how improved energy access could enable positive outcomes around GBV risk reduction, gender equity, and beyond. Specific opportunities for improvement highlighted by interviewees include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Programming Improvements</th>
<th>Possible Changes or Impacts with Improved Energy Programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender equity, empowerment, and GBV risk mitigation</td>
<td>Leverage energy programming to transform social norms and gendered power dynamics through changes in household labor distribution and economic empowerment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Area for Programming Improvements

(Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Changes or Impacts with Improved Energy Programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Women and girls co-design solutions to resolve utility and energy access issues resulting from male-centric rental housing markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Energy is routinely addressed in safety audits and gender/protection monitoring and evaluations are conducted jointly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Consultations with affected populations routinely integrate an AGD approach and identify GBV risks related to energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Provision of discrete, targeted energy assistance to GBV survivors by, or in close coordination with, a specialized GBV service provider in a manner that upholds survivor-centered principles, including confidentiality to prevent exposure to further risks or additional harm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social cohesion and inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Host community energy needs are routinely considered alongside those of displaced communities for access/sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Energy access is used to build relationships between populations and to enhance social cohesion (e.g., between displaced people and landlords).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Women and girls with disabilities are routinely engaged as a key population and primary beneficiary for energy access programs, including for livelihoods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livelihoods, household economics, and market systems for long-term outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Clear picture of household economic situation enables efficient and appropriate programming (e.g., promoting sales of appropriately priced energy products and fuel-saving stoves only after basic needs are met).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Sustainable livelihoods programming integrates energy as an input for livelihoods activities and energy-focused enterprises, which are led by or include women as employees, as solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Moving beyond energy interventions focused on “what light to distribute” toward approaches that build long-term energy access solutions from the start of response activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-sectoral and data driven responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Technical experts from complementary sectors are paired together to jointly address complex needs, like energy. A practitioner suggested, “buddying up lighting engineers with GBV specialists — this matching-up helps cut across silos.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Public lighting is prioritized based on community consultations or safety assessments (not on assumptions), enabling wise investments in public infrastructure with fewer unintended consequences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Area for Programming Improvements**

**Possible Changes or Impacts with Improved Energy Programming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Better preparedness work and private sector engagement</th>
<th>Fuel needs are routinely considered alongside nutrition and food security needs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cash and voucher assistance is carefully monitored for impacts on time poverty and associated risks related to energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Links between energy, environment, conflict, GBV risks are clearly articulated and monitored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEED FOR ADVOCACY**

Finally, practitioners recognized that the vision for improved humanitarian response through better energy access programming will not happen from behavior change of practitioners alone. A number of advocacy opportunities were highlighted by interviewees to change the behavior of donors and other critical stakeholders, including cluster leads. Some interviewees stated that, while notable shifts were happening at the ground level, “one challenge is to bring donors on board.”

Several respondents advocated for energy assessments to happen early on in emergencies, which allows groundwork to be laid for programming that results in long-term improvements in energy access for affected communities. As one practitioner noted, “It’s those early days that lock us into ways of doing things.” Respondents noted that if energy needs are first met through distributions of fuel and lighting/powering products, it can be difficult to pivot to more systemic solutions like establishing LPG supply lines and/or mini-grid infrastructure. Donors can incentivize more systemic and long-term energy access in their policies and funding requirements, including promoting engagement of the private sector to deliver energy services and products to affected communities. Others advocated for ensuring that energy is included in Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs): “Where energy gets into HRPs, and is clearly identified as a need, you see a difference in the programming.”

---

One informant described the tension between mainstreaming energy and GBV risk mitigation, and limited humanitarian funding and donor priorities.

“When we prepare the dignity kits we include a flashlight with a solar power bank. We did this during emergency response for cross-border work in Syria and in Myanmar (before the Rohingya crisis, in Rakhine State). It is much more expensive, so this can be an issue because it pushes up costs and you have to justify to supervisors and to donors. It is not in the standards. Women loved it. They don’t have to worry about recharging. We had to explain internally and to donors why it was important. In the end we were probably lucky because in the budget there was some flexibility. I am not sure if justification would be enough in another case. I doubt it will be accepted.”

- UNFPA
Others advocated for the need to promote ownership of energy-related gender and GBV needs throughout all sectors in a predictable way — moving away from the ad hoc status quo that leaves room for sectors to assume others will address energy needs. One respondent called for a new coordination mechanism for energy, while another stated, “We need non-gender and non-protection experts (CCCM, shelter, etc.) to champion energy as a GBV risk mitigation.” However, the expanding understanding that “energy is everyone’s responsibility” also has led to questions about who should take the lead on assessing and designing responses to energy needs. As one NGO representative noted, “Shared accountability can be a weakness…nobody knows where [energy issues] sit”.

State of Knowledge: Inclusive and Gendered Energy Programming in Emergencies

This report has reviewed the state of principles and practice around humanitarian-energy issues. This section examines the state of knowledge, looking at practical tools that exist to support those who design and implement energy-gender interventions. High-level overview documents are not reviewed here as they were covered extensively in the “principles” section of this report. A detailed overview of available case studies that document real world experiences around inclusive energy can be reviewed in Annex 4.

Manuals, Tools, and Other “How-To” Guidance

A global advisor responsible for shelter and settlements noted, “For humanitarians, [energy access] is all new – we have very little experience so we are just learning.” As previously discussed, resources from MEI, the Global Plan of Action, the SAFE working group (including the EnergyCoP), among others, have clearly articulated challenges and opportunities around humanitarian-energy-gender issues. A natural next step for the energy-gender community of practice involves building from this base of literature to produce practical tools that reach humanitarian practitioners and others who design and implement programs. This section reviews available tools by energy source and intervention type, and concludes with a summary of leading gaps. EEMRG will draw from tools listed in this section for training development, and refine existing or consider developing new tools where gaps exist, leveraging where existing resources effectively address gender equity and inclusion and advocating for their improvement where there are critical gaps.

Cooking Fuels and Technologies

Substantial guidance and tools exist to inform good practice in fuel access and technology selection for cooking. Sphere standards, for example, set out clear actions and best practices around meeting cooking fuel needs, with links to SAFE resources that support practitioners to meet the standards. Other resources include FAO’s technical guide on assessing wood fuel demand and safe access to firewood and alternative fuel,76 WFP’s Safe fuel guide,77 and a wide range of resources on stoves. Leading practical cookstove and fuel resources (from both humanitarian and development actors) include:

- The SAFE Decision Tree78 on Factors Affecting Choice of Fuel Strategy in Humanitarian Settings guides practitioners through decision-making questions to develop effective, holistic response activities for the

---


range of concerns associated with the collection, supply, and use of household fuel in humanitarian settings. The framework emphasizes the need for participatory assessments and provides separate trees for “acute” and “protracted” settings.

- The SAFE Matrix on Agency Roles and Responsibilities provides guidance on coordination in energy-based response, and establishes clear responsibility for sectors around fuel needs, while stopping short of establishing fora or procedures for coordination of sector leads on energy issues.

- MEI’s “A review of Cooking Systems for Humanitarian Settings” outlines lessons learned and potential challenges to consider when designing cooking programs in situations of mass displacement. It includes a categorization of available cookstoves, cookstove design considerations, costs, financing and distribution models, and review of factors distinguishing stove needs in displacement settings.

- USAID’s Clean and efficient cooking technologies and fuels summarizes evidence on cooking technologies, combined with guidance on understanding consumer preference and behavior, stove standards, and financing.


Despite this existing body of resources, gaps for practical guidance exist in energy conservation and efficiency, fuelwood management, and other natural resource management strategies.

**Lighting and Electricity**

With greater efficiency, a precipitous drop in prices, local manufacturers and importers, and improving regulatory environments, solar energy is seeing more uptake and practical tools for application in humanitarian responses. Renewables in solar or other off-grid systems can segue into longer-term development contexts due to their independence from drawn-out reconstruction of vulnerable state infrastructure. Key guidance includes:

- Lighting Global’s tip sheet on procurement of stand-alone solar kits for humanitarian aid is an accessible guide documenting critical elements of solar kit procurement, and is a good example of existing “how-to” guidance for practitioners.

- GOGLA’s “Providing Energy Access through Off-Grid Solar: Guidance for Governments” provides a holistic overview of issues for consideration in the design of policies and programs intended to deliver on energy access goals. While designed for governments, many principles and approaches are valid for strategic interventions in humanitarian contexts.

---

Power for All’s “Messaging Guide: Mini-Grids” is a reference tool to help various stakeholders understand the importance of the global mini-grid sector.

Regulatory Indicators for Sustainable Energy (RISE) 2018 provides a global scorecard that summarizes countries’ regulatory environments by tracking the adoption of good-practice policies with respect to energy access, energy efficiency, and renewable energy. Countries are scored on a scale from 1 to 100 and with a “traffic light” system, with green for advanced, yellow for intermediate, and red for early stage.

Gaps not covered in existing guidance include a methodology to establish appropriate ratio of lanterns per household (evidence suggests that a single lamp in NFI kits may mean limited lighting access for females, increasing their exposure to risks of GBV). For both fuel and lighting distributions, guidance does not exist to identify when direct distributions of lighting and fuel items are necessary to meet basic needs versus when continued distributions risk displacing sustainable local markets. For public energy needs, the nuances of public lighting in refugee camps and settlements are starting to be better understood, but clear standards and best practices around public lighting have yet to be defined, including linkages to GBV risk mitigation.

Market-based Programming and Private Sector Engagement

As Sphere standards (2018) establish, “As part of response analysis, market analysis helps to identify what may be the most effective way to meet priority needs: in-kind assistance, service provision, cash-based assistance or a mix of these in context. Market analysis will help identify any constraints on markets, including supply and demand issues, or policies, norms, rules or infrastructure that limit market functioning.” Market-based programming can include a range of activities, from relatively simple cash transfers to increase household purchasing power, to market support and facilitation, where humanitarian and development actors aim to “change market system[s] while not assuming any long-term market function themselves. Their intervention role is temporary and catalytic.” An example of market facilitation includes working with solar lighting companies to increase their presence in refugee camps, or creation of new financing models that improve financial access to needed energy products. While a base of tools and resources exist to support market-based programming activities, gaps are more glaring towards the market facilitation end of the spectrum, with clear opportunities to strengthen equitable energy access and gender and inclusion mainstreaming — through an intersectional approach — across the spectrum.

Resources (including tools and guidance documents) to support market assessments and cash transfer programming are relatively robust:

- For general market assessment and systems tools, the minimum economic recovery standards (MERS) outline a number of fundamental considerations to be adhered to, including the “Assessment and Analysis Standards” and “Enterprise and Market Systems Development Standards.”

- A wide variety of market assessment tools exist, but could benefit from energy-gender mainstreaming, including: Minimum Standard for Market Analysis (MiSMA) (Sphere Partner Standard); Emergency Market Mapping and Analysis (EMMA); Pre-Crisis Market Mapping and Analysis (PCMA); Rapid Assessment for

---

Markets\textsuperscript{94} (RAM); Market Analysis Guidance\textsuperscript{95} (MAG); Participatory Market Systems Development (PMSD) approach;\textsuperscript{96} and Market Assessment Toolkit for Vocational Training Providers and Youth.\textsuperscript{97} CaLP\textsuperscript{98} offers an extensive library of tools and resources to address practical elements of cash and voucher programming, including the market support tip sheet.\textsuperscript{99} The Electronic Cash Transfer Learning Action Network (ELAN)\textsuperscript{100} offers resources specific to digital cash and voucher programming in humanitarian contexts.

Despite this robust library of resources, key program design issues critical to energy and gender remain unresolved and contentious. For example, calculating and incorporating energy needs into Minimum Expenditure Basket calculations is inconsistent. MEBs inclusive of energy expenditures have been accomplished in a number of countries (Niger, Nigeria, Syria, Uganda, among others), but are lacking in others. A clearly agreed upon methodology is not yet established, although the CaLP TAG is working on this (expected completion, late 2019). Key unresolved questions around energy expenditure calculations in the MEB include the best approach to accommodate seasonal fuel cost differences. In addition, aside from WRC’s Toolkit to Optimize Cash-based Interventions for Protection from Gender-Based Violence,\textsuperscript{101} few resources include an explicit focus on GBV, and none include a focus on energy-gender considerations.

Technical resources are even more scare for market facilitation programming. Notably, Sphere standards do not call out market facilitation as a possible activity following response analysis. Existing market facilitation resources come from a limited number of humanitarian-focused publishers (such as MEI), as well as the more development-focused The Beam Exchange\textsuperscript{102} and Practical Action\textsuperscript{103} (which do not cater to crisis contexts or humanitarian audience). Key informants noted a lack of resources to pull from to establish private sector partnerships or assess energy markets specifically. Existing resources (including some developed for non-humanitarian audiences) include:

- CGAP, the Fibr Project, and Lighting Global outline opportunities and risk factors around pay-as-you-go (PAYGo) energy and asset-based financing. CGAP’s wider resources on consumer protection are of value when considering risks posed by new financing models.
- MEI’s “Prices, Products and Priorities”\textsuperscript{104} report could serve as a model for assessing energy costs and expenditures, and the 2019 “Adopting a Market-based Approach” breaks down energy market concepts and parameters for program design in an accessible way.
- Anita V Shankar and Maryalice Onyura’s study “Agency-Based Empowerment Training Enhances Sales Capacity of Female Energy Entrepreneurs in Kenya”\textsuperscript{105} examines female participation in clean cooking value chains and the impact of empowerment-focused activities on business success.

\textsuperscript{100} Mercy Corps. (2016). ELAN. Retrieved from https://elan.cashlearning.org/
Mainstreaming Energy in Gender and GBV-Specific Tools

As one global advisor with a gender remit stated, “I think [energy and GBV mitigation] is a huge gap.” The majority of GBV tools and trainings do not explicitly address energy access; exceptions include CLARA guidance and tools,106 the SGBV Prevention and Response Training Package,107 and Good Shelter Programming: Tools to Reduce the Risk of GBV in Shelter Programmes.108 Examples of key GBV mitigation resources that do not currently mainstream energy considerations include:

- UNICEF’s Gender-Based Violence in Emergencies (GBViE) Program Resource Pack.109
- Mercy Corps’ Measuring Gender Dynamics in Resilience110 tools, which assess women’s agency in households, community groups, and markets using an AGD lens.
- UNHCR’s Reach Out: A Refugee Protection Training Project,111 which increases field staff’s awareness, knowledge, and understanding of GBV.
- UNHCR’s SGBV Prevention and Response Training Package.112
- WRC’s Strengthening Gender-Based Violence Prevention & Response in Urban Humanitarian Settings.113
- WRC’s Building Capacity for Disability Inclusion in Gender-Based Violence Programming in Humanitarian Settings.114
- The Inter-Agency Minimum Standards for Gender-Based Violence in Emergencies Programming115 (forthcoming) present minimum standards for GBV prevention and response programming and define what agencies working on specialized GBV programming need to achieve to present and respond to GBV, and deliver multi sector services.
- GBV Pocket Guide,116 which provides instructions on how to support a survivor of GBV in a context where there is no GBV actor/referral pathway available.
- Age and Disability Capacity Building Programme’s Humanitarian Inclusion Standards, which ensure older people and people with disabilities are able to access assistance and participate in the decision-making processes that affect them.117

---

IA SC Guidelines on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action (forthcoming) which will support stakeholders to coordinate, plan, implement, monitor and evaluate essential actions resulting in the full and effective participation and inclusion of persons with disabilities.

UNICEF’s Including Children with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action, which provides practical actions and tips.118

A number of livelihoods resources already focus on gender and/or GBV mitigation, but could benefit from increased integration of energy needs and considerations:

IRC’s Economic and Social Empowerment (EA$E)119 focuses on mitigating women’s risks of GBV as a result of participating in economic empowerment programs.

CLARA20 provides guidance to (a) assess GBV risks associated with livelihood activities, including a prompt for livelihood activities that are energy-related, such as collecting and selling firewood; and (b) identify corresponding risk mitigation mechanisms. However, this does not gather sufficient data to capture energy inputs for different livelihoods activities and associated GBV risks in collecting/sourcing/accessing/using these inputs, nor to mitigate such risks. The FGD guide uses three pillars of inquiry: activities/interventions, associated risks of GBV, and mitigation strategies (including community-based protection mechanisms) that EEMRG tools can build upon.

The Global Shelter Cluster’s Tools to Reduce the Risk of GBV in Shelter Programmes offers a rare and strong example of how energy-GBV considerations can be mainstreamed into sector-specific guidance. It includes concrete recommendations for lighting and energy provision for GBV mitigation.

Mainstreaming Energy in Age-Responsive Programming

There are several practical tools and trainings on gender- and age-responsive programming. Many of these include participatory, adolescent-led approaches that enable humanitarians to deliver targeted and effective interventions. The majority of gender- and age-focused tools and trainings do not explicitly address energy access, but can be easily tailored to integrate energy needs and preferences:

WRC’s I’m Here Approach service area resource scan includes energy services (e.g., lighting infrastructure, solar charging stations), and could be adapted to determine access to these services for different profiles of adolescent girls, including the hardest-to-reach girls (e.g., married adolescents and adolescents living with disabilities). The “Focus Group Discussion” step helps identify priority needs, protection concerns, and proposed solutions from adolescents themselves, and is an opportunity to learn how adolescents’ prioritize and characterize their energy access and related risks of GBV.

Population Council’s Girl-Centered Program Design: A Toolkit to Develop, Strengthen and Expand Adolescent Girls Programs guides humanitarians to identify which populations of girls they are serving, to determine program structure and content, and to monitor and evaluate outcomes. The toolkit is designed to be adolescent-led.

Assessments & Measurement

Gaps in both the evidence base and assessment and monitoring tools exist in energy-gender programming. Energy needs beyond fuel are absent from leading needs assessment tools and templates, including the Emergency Capacity Building Joint Needs Assessment and MIRA questionnaire templates. As discussed above, a 2016 GACC-led review of evidence on humanitarian cooking projects and GBV found gaps related to evaluation. A recommendation from their report is to “train implementing partners to conduct quality baseline and end-line evaluations that include GBV indicators, in order to build the capacity of energy project stakeholders to properly measure and evaluate protection concerns.” With respect to the inclusion of GBV indicators, risk levels and safety considerations should be monitored, but not the incidence of GBV (including data collection on specific cases). The review posits that “a consortium of researchers, implementers, and GBV and energy experts...should create a common methodology and set of indicators for measuring protection outcomes related to energy access in humanitarian settings…directly applicable for humanitarian and energy practitioners.” Finally, they recommend creation of “a common methodology and set of indicators for measuring protection outcomes related to energy access in humanitarian settings.” An exercise coordinated through the Global Plan of Action’s evidence working group is currently underway and may soon address these recommendations through development of standardized indicators.

Sphere provides limited guidance on indicators and monitoring, suggesting the following relevant indicators: percentage of toilets that have internal locks and adequate lighting; percentage of toilets reported as safe by women and girls; percentage of the affected population who have access to sufficient, safe, and affordable energy supply to maintain thermal comfort, prepare food, and provide lighting; and the number of incidents of harm to people using stoves or storing or sourcing fuel (though this conflicts with GBV best practices that discourage collection of GBV incidence rates). However, EEMRG consultations found few programs with clear results frameworks and expected

---

129 Ibid.
130 Ibid.
impact of energy access. Practitioners often found it difficult to isolate energy needs and struggled to articulate impact objectives where energy needs abounded across productive, community, and consumption spaces. Lack of clear theories of impact make measurement (and improvement of interventions) difficult. The EEMRG curriculum can incorporate and build from Sphere indicators and any potential standard measurements released in the near future, while noting this gap and the importance of robust and quality measurement.

**Energy (Non-humanitarian/Development-Focused)**

Given a gap in humanitarian-focused resources, a number of broadly focused yet practical energy access tools for development and energy-specialist audiences could be adapted for humanitarian programming. In current form, however, many are too lengthy, technical, or otherwise inappropriately packaged to reach humanitarians unfamiliar with energy-specific concepts. Development-oriented energy resources that could be adapted for humanitarian contexts include:

- “Decentralised Energy Solutions — Archetypes and Business Models”[^131] addresses the development of energy access programs within Shell, and contains practical tools for mapping household demand, natural resources, community resources, and energy needs, leading users towards suggested program design.

- Practical Action’s *Total Energy Access Approach*,[^132] including the Poor People’s Energy Outlook series, offers useful frameworks, including energy services and needs, bottom-up energy planning, and rating the health of energy ecosystems, and can be adapted for humanitarian assessments and design tools.

- MIT DLab/Mercy Corps’ *Energy Assessment Toolkit[^133]* is a community-focused approach for identifying energy needs, market opportunities, existing supply chains, community institutions, and private sector, government, and NGO stakeholders. Resources are aimed at development interventions and the private sector, but surveys and other tools could apply and support humanitarian energy programs.

- QSAND (Quantifying Sustainability in the Aftermath of Natural Disasters) is a self-assessment tool to promote and inform sustainable approaches to relief, recovery, and reconstruction after a natural disaster. Its aim is to promote and facilitate sustainable approaches to relief, recovery, and reconstruction in the shelter and settlement operations after a natural disaster so ensuring economic, social, and health benefits to the community in the short and longer term whilst supporting and protecting the natural environment. It considers 8 categories of interventions, including energy as a focus area. It includes specific guidance on assessing and addressing energy demand/supply as well as consumption.[^134]

**Other Gaps in Guidance for Implementing Gendered-Energy Programs**

- Clear definitions and categories for energy access (such as the SE4All access levels) are not widely understood or used in humanitarian responses.

- Examples of urban shelter support in Jordan highlight opportunities to provide guidance beyond energy access alone, to consider and address energy efficiency and conservation.

- There is little in the way of formal guidance or structures for coordinating wider energy activities in emergencies. However, activities and documents from the energy and environment technical working
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[^131]: Internal resource, available from Mercy Corps upon request.
[^134]: http://www.qsand.org/download-qsand-and-online-training/
groups in Jordan and Uganda offer some blueprints for how energy issues can be supported and coordinated in humanitarian response ecosystems. Both of these country contexts benefit from active government involvement and participation in humanitarian response planning and environmental issues.

**EEMRG Project Learning Objectives**

EEMRG has identified learning objectives for a global training toolbox based on the global literature review, consultations with global experts, and a learning objective design workshop held with Mercy Corps and WRC staff in June 2019. Through this process, EEMRG has clarified the learning audience for training materials, which focuses on humanitarian practitioners ranging from generalist managers and field officers, to global advisors and technical specialists. While the training may be of particular interest to humanitarian practitioners with energy, gender, or GBV mandates, EEMRG hopes the training will reach and impact a wider range of practitioners and humanitarian decision-makers.

Feedback on these proposed learning objectives is invited and welcome. EEMRG recognizes that one training is unlikely to cover all of the proposed objectives in sufficient depth, and is working through the Global Plan of Action’s Technical and Capacity Building Working Group to determine which objectives are most critical now, and how the greater community of practice can address remaining gaps.

EEMRG also captured global KII preferences around training formats and platforms to ensure that training resources are accessible to the largest possible practitioner base. These are captured in Annex 2 of this report: “Practitioner Insights on Preferred Training Features.”

**Learning Objectives**

Draft learning objectives were elaborated based on the primary and secondary research undertaken and refined through consultations with key stakeholders. The following learning objectives reflect this process and are representative, yet will continue to be honed during the training, guidance, and tool development process.

After engaging with EEMRG training resources (which may include a mix of stand-alone written guidance, online learning, and in-person training resources), learners will have acquired the following changes in knowledge, skills, and attitudes:

**Knowledge**

- Learners understand energy, gender, intersectionality, power, and GBV core concepts.
- Learners understand how inclusive energy access is critical to humanitarian objectives across a wide range of sectors.
- Learners are aware of approaches that can graduate interventions from short-term humanitarian program cycles to sustainably improve long-term and inclusive access to energy, including market systems development and partnership models with private sector, host communities, and host governments.
Learners understand what healthy inclusive energy coordination looks like, and how to participate and achieve it.

Skills

Learners are able to undertake gender-responsive and inclusive community assessment and monitoring to collect and analyze data on energy access and availability, market conditions, energy needs, and related risks, to inform inclusive program design and improvement.

Learners can develop proposals and budgets (including theories of change and indicators) integrating assessment data about gender-sensitive energy needs and risks, and leveraging existing evidence base around good practices.

Learners are able to use existing tools and create the tools and partnerships they need (including with affected communities) for energy program set-up/start-up.

Learners can design sustainable, market-based, gender-responsive and inclusive energy solutions and distinguish between energy solutions at small and large scale that meet needs within and across the three energy spheres.

Conclusion

This report has highlighted the wealth of resources and materials on energy, GBV, and gender in emergencies — the literature review stopped cataloguing at 145 resources, but could have continued. Consultations with humanitarian energy access practitioners has revealed that a strong, but relatively small, community of energy expertise exists within the humanitarian sector. They have collectively succeeded in making the case about why energy access is important in humanitarian programming, and the links between energy access and gender and GBV. This body of work made it relatively easy to create eleven guiding principles (outlined earlier in this report) that can serve as a foundation for energy access-GBV reduction capacity building efforts.

In interviews, many consulted experts felt that the energy-gender in emergencies conversation is at a turning point, as one practitioner put it:

“In the past, the conversation was more about ‘how do we reduce/prevent risks of GBV’ — now the question is changing to ‘how do we promote access to energy... how do we think about sustainable energy sourcing that’s not degrading the environment?’

The majority of practitioners consulted share a view that energy is a basic need and human right, and can accelerate nearly all humanitarian objectives. However, a majority of energy in emergencies/GBV experts were not satisfied with the current state of humanitarian-energy-gender programming, and offered a clear vision for how it needs to improve, and how this could increase opportunities for women and girls and mitigate risks of GBV, while strengthening the overall quality of humanitarian response.
Another group consulted for this report — humanitarian generalists, or non-energy/GBV experts — have not benefited from immersion in the details of energy-gender resources and debates. Though many recognized that energy-gender programming needs to improve, they were less clear on what exactly should change, or how to do it. As one practitioner put it:

“Honestly, we don’t have a lot of conversation about this [energy and gender] beyond firewood. I think educating people more comprehensively related to energy would be useful.”

EEMRG assessments in Jordan and Uganda (see Annex 4 and Annex 5) also found that most practitioners were unsure about where to look for energy-gender capacity-building resources and programming tools, and unclear about best practices. Nearly all struggled to implement systemic, scaleable responses. At a global level, many leading standard humanitarian assessment and design tools insufficiently address energy-gender issues.

At this point, the case for why to focus on energy-gender in emergencies and (to a large extent) what to work on is clear to experts and some generalist humanitarians. However, practitioners at all levels lack standardized guidance on how to most effectively prepare for, design, and implement programs that address the humanitarian-energy-gender nexus. To address this gap, EEMRG and others working on energy-gender capacity building in the future face three challenges:

- First, how to repackage, supplement, and disseminate existing knowledge and resources laying forth fundamentals of why and what, in a way that reaches non-expert practitioners in the field.
- Second, how to address known gaps (including mainstreaming of energy-gender principles) in standard humanitarian tools.
- Third, how to navigate dissemination channels in the absence of a single centralized cluster or global capacity-building hub that offers country-level (or regional-level) capacity building.

Strong self-organization among humanitarian actors will be required to overcome the current decentralized and overlapping nature of capacity-building efforts. Fortunately, the will of individual champions and institutions, and prioritization of energy-gender issues, is clear and growing. EEMRG will work through the Global Plan of Action’s Technical Expertise and Capacity Building Working Group to receive feedback on technical content and dissemination plans, as well as a smaller advisory group of leading humanitarian agencies. Together, EEMRG and global practitioners will begin to address these humanitarian-energy-gender capacity gaps, with clear opportunities for transformative impact for communities living through emergencies, especially for women and girls.

Annex 1: Methodology

Mercy Corps and WRC completed a literature review to assess the current state of knowledge and practice documentation, engaged 28 global experts in key informant interviews using a standardized questionnaire to assess current practices, and synthesized results of field-level consultation with refugees, host communities, and humanitarian practitioners in Uganda and Jordan (available as separate country-level case studies).
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135 EEMRG Annotated Bibliography of 72 reviewed sources available here.
136 Global expert KII questionnaire available on request.
Literature Search Protocol, Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The EEMRG team reviewed academic and peer-reviewed literature journal articles, non-peer-reviewed academic literature, case studies, frameworks, guidance, manuals, toolkits, handbooks, program reports, and trainings addressing energy, GBV, and gender- and age-responsive programming. All types of emergency contexts (rapid onset, displacement, protracted, etc.) were considered with specific attention to Jordan, Uganda, and Afghanistan as pilot sites for the project. Only documents produced after 2005 and available in English were examined. Development literature and frameworks that were not specific to humanitarian settings and not applicable to emergencies were excluded.

Data Retrieval and Review

A comprehensive set of academic databases, websites, and journals was used to gather data, including: JSTOR, SAGE, Academia, Google Scholar, and the University of Denver’s library search database. Academic and peer-reviewed literature was sourced, including from the Journal of Gender Based Violence. Practitioner websites such as ReliefWeb, ALNAP, UNHCR, WRC, Mercy Corps, IRC, CARE, Oxfam Safe Fuel and Energy Community of Practice, GBV AOR, Relief Web, Humanitarian Response, Call to Action on Protection from GBV, and Moving Energy Initiative were also drawn upon. Literature retrieved was evaluated according to the inclusion criteria and analyzed to identify convergences and gaps in evidence and resources.

Limitations

This literature review has several limitations. First, only documents available in English were reviewed; however, this did not exclude a large quantity of literature. Second, databases and journals that were not accessible through the University of Denver’s search engine were not reviewed. Third, the search string vocabulary used, although intending to be comprehensive, may not have captured all sources. Fourth, few case studies captured during retrieval aligned with inclusion criteria and may not be all encompassing.

Annex 2: Practitioner Insights on Preferred Training Features

Global EEMRG KII Interviewees were asked the following two open-ended questions about training design and audience considerations:

What should we be aware of as we develop knowledge products (tools, guidance, etc.) to make sure they are user-friendly, demand-driven, comprehensive, and widely applicable?

What formats should we consider?

The analysis below synthesises the priorities and themes raised by interviewees in response to these questions and broad conversations about capacity building around energy access, GBV, and gender in emergencies.

Theme 1: Define Our Audience

In considering training audiences, interviewees noted important distinctions within the broad “humanitarian” audience. Important sectors to engage include the protection and GBV, energy, environment, camp
management, and shelter sectors (as well as multisectoral teams, including cash and voucher practitioners). Yet, even within sectors, there are different specialist profiles that may benefit from specific or specialized outreach and tools, or may orient toward different entry points, including program managers, case workers, outreach specialists, cluster leads, etc. Interviewees had different opinions of where to focus geographically within institutions (at HQ or country level). For example, an interviewee based at a UN institution noted the importance of targeting decision-makers at country level (“where decision-making happens”), while interviewees at several NGOs noted the utility of providing quality, customizable tools to HQ advisors who have substantial influence on operations. Others noted the importance of catering to — and ensuring relevance of — materials in the energy and infrastructure context; for example, the less-connected regions of the rural Sahel vs. urban Lebanon. Finally, interviewees noted the importance of ensuring tools are accessible for organizations that prioritize localization and engage in remote management, and that tools are accessible to learners with disabilities.

**Theme 2: Building Enthusiasm and Commitment for the Issue**

Several interviewees gave suggestions to get learners invested in the topic, including making a practical case for energy as a basic need (and thus included in the MEB), and the risks of not addressing energy-gender issues. Others mentioned that demonstrating how energy fits into existing guidance (IASC GBV guidelines, for example) could motivate practitioners, and suggested framing the training to illustrate how addressing energy-gender-GBV supports compliance with existing standards. Several interviewees advised against creating new standards. Many of the comments on this theme highlighted awareness of different humanitarian actors’ sector- or program-specific goals and objectives. Interviewees spoke of the need to demonstrate how accomplishing mainstreaming of energy and GBV can contribute to the goals those actors are already working toward in their existing funding resources.

**Theme 3: Where to Focus**

Interviewees offered many suggestions of what to include in the training content. Many preferred keeping a focus on the basics, including defining energy, explaining the basic theory behind energy access and GBV risks (with concrete recommendations for risk mitigation, including requisite staff and financial resources to do so), and offering support with selecting the right technology. One respondent advocated for framing solutions to energy needs in terms of availability, accessibility, acceptability, and quality (AAAQ).

Many suggested elements that would help program staff get up and running quickly even if they are not familiar with basic theory or energy programs, including predetermined questions and sample indicators related to energy to include in risk assessments. One respondent encouraged framing training in terms of thinking about constant adaptation to implementation rather than just design of programs. Others wanted to ensure that guidance promoted inclusive programming through the use of an AGD lens and collection of SADD, and inclusion of people with disabilities as a central population and not an add-on.

Others had strategic advocacy recommendations to highlight the importance of including energy needs in humanitarian response plans, because, if not included, the likelihood of funding for energy will be limited. Others touched on the importance of addressing some of the sticky issues prevalent in energy programming, including guidance on performing evaluations that confirm or disprove theoretical assumptions around impact, the need to reconcile market-based versus rights-based approaches in different settings (acute versus complex crisis), and providing models for coordination.
Theme 4: Formats

When asked about desirable formats for training, respondents surfaced a few common themes:

Light, adaptable tools with clear directives: One NGO HQ staff interviewee noted that, “while at HQ we often don’t want to be overly prescriptive...the field often wants clear directive and direction. Scripts for focus groups are great.” Many interviewees asked for “anything that is easily adaptable” with specific requests for checklists, cheat sheets, one-page cheat sheets, step-by-step instructions, short FGD guides, and KII guides. One interviewee noted the need for tools to operate without dependence on M&E colleagues.

Several interviewees noted the concept of modularity: a desire for tools to be easily scanned and taken apart and reformulated based on the needs of the context or project, moment in the program cycle, available time, or challenge of the day. For example, a mix of in-person and short online modules; or sections on themes/challenges that could be picked up as needed, or guidance that is stored separately from tools (so either can be easily accessed).

Interviewees repeatedly mentioned stories and examples as a key feature of successful training materials. Suggestions included anecdotal feedback from women and girls on programming, testimonials from practitioners on the community impact of quality energy/GBV programming, case studies with best practices resourcing (staff, budget, time) required to implement those best practices. Others requested comparative stories to demonstrate the comparison of mainstreaming energy and GBV and inclusive programming to one that is not (and differing outcomes).

In operationalizing training resources, respondents emphasized the importance of translating resources widely (three respondents brought this up as a high priority) and ensuring that light/offline resources are high quality for offline and low-bandwidth learners. Others brought up opportunities for assessment and accountability, including self-assessments (pre/post training), as well as coaching and mentoring that can support accountability for implementing learning following the training.

Theme 5: Potential Training Hosts/Venues

Key informants suggested housing EEMRG training materials on the following platforms and repositories, though there was no wide endorsement or clear favorite vehicle among the venues mentioned:

- UNHCR’s Global Learning Center (GLC) benefits UNHCR (accessible to UNHCR staff and partners’ staff upon request), and in particular as a complement to the SGBV ToT, which features a short component on access to fuel and energy developed by WFP; there are required and optional trainings for UNHCR staff on the GLC platform
- UNFPA’s internal platform (accessible to UNFPA staff and partners’ staff upon request)
- UNICEF’s internal Agora
- Kaya, facilitated by the Humanitarian Leadership Academy (CaLP, Habitat for Humanity, NRC)
- Humanity & Inclusion’s internal Learn and GO
- Disaster Ready
Theme 6: Promotion — Opportunities to Link to Other Initiatives

Interviewees mentioned the opportunity to link EEMRG training with the following upcoming/ongoing initiatives:

- IASC GBV guidelines roll-out
- Roll-out of cash and GBV compendium
- MEB tip sheets by CaLP
- Link to IASC disability guidance and standards for livelihoods and cash
- Link to Safe from the Start [UNHCR]
- GPA Capacity Building Working Group
- SAFE/GPA annual training
- Upcoming MEI capacity-building work (in process of being defined/funded)
- NORCAP training for energy roster

Annex 3: Case Studies

Case studies are important for learning and improving practice around energy-gender as they prove (and sometimes disprove) our theories of change and highlight challenges and ways to overcome them. EEMRG identified a number of case studies in its literature review, and will incorporate leading case studies (listed below) into final training materials, using them to illustrate concepts and practices.

Many studies focus on risks of GBV associated with collection of fuel and firewood and insufficient or ill-placed lighting.\textsuperscript{137} Despite this concentration, however, the evidence base between cooking/fuel interventions and reduction of violence has not been clearly established. An evidence review of links between GBV and humanitarian cooking projects was led by GACC in 2016.\textsuperscript{138} It found that:

"Of the 126 humanitarian cooking projects reviewed...15 included reduction of GBV as an objective. Within these 15 projects, only one attempted to measure incidence of GBV (incidents of GBV reported to the protection staff) before and after the project’s implementation. [The one study] found that providing firewood


to refugees resulted in fewer firewood collection trips, which in turn resulted in a reduced number of rapes occurring during firewood collection.”

This gap highlights the need to push for more robust evidence collection around the fuel-GBV issue, while also building the evidence base in the wider field of energy access. However, as a standard, incidence and prevalence of GBV are rarely measured in emergencies due to methodological challenges (including underreporting) and ethics considerations. Quality of M&E methods is an area that can be emphasized in EEMRG training resources.

Case studies focusing on cooking/fuel and GBV risks (or gender-specific needs) include:

- The “Inyenyeri Clean Cooking Pilot in Kigeme Refugee Camp (Rwanda) Social Impact Assessment”\(^{139}\) assesses the social and economic impacts of a pilot cooking intervention in Kigeme Camp, Rwanda. It is one of the few assessments to deeply consider socio-economic impacts of a cooking intervention in a refugee setting, including women’s involvement as employees in the fuel and stove value chain.

- WRC’s “Safe Access to Firewood and Alternative Energy in Kenya”\(^{140}\) includes findings from several WFP energy initiatives in Kakuma and Dadaab refugee camps, and provides recommendations on the production and distribution of energy-efficient stoves, leveraging technology to green the response, supporting livelihoods, and introducing energy-efficient stoves.

- UNHCR’s “Reducing Risks: Sexual and Gender-Based Violence in Emergencies”\(^{141}\) focuses on energy interventions in Nyarugusu and Nduta camps in Tanzania, and the decline of firewood collection among Congolese and Burundian households (and by women and girls in particular), resulting in a reduction in risks related to women and girls’ reduced exposure to GBV.


- FAO’s “Improving Safe Access to Fuel and Energy in northeastern Nigeria: Post-distribution assessment” focuses on FAO’s promotion of fuel-efficient technologies, sustainable forestry management practices, and safe and sustainable livelihoods interventions in Adamawa, Borno, and Yobe States to help address food insecurity and malnutrition, deforestation, and protection and health risks associated with energy access.\(^{142}\)

- The Boiling Point journal\(^{143}\) dedicates a full volume to “Energy in Emergency,” with a number of articles on current practice around cooking in emergencies.


Case studies examining lighting and electricity access and gender/GBV and/or age-specific risks include:

- Oxfam’s “Shining a Light, how lighting in or around sanitation facilities affects the risk of gender-based violence in camps”\textsuperscript{144} reports on findings from Uganda, Nigeria, and Iraq, drawing clear links between GBV and energy.

- UNHCR’s “Participatory Impact Assessment of Electricity Access in Zaatari and Azraq Camps” uses participatory methodology to identify the impacts that electricity has on the protection, health, education, and economic inclusion and livelihood outcomes of refugees in Zaatari and Azraq camps. In addition to the presented impacts on the lives of refugees, the report details positive operational impacts regarding the environmental and financial benefits of renewable infrastructure.\textsuperscript{145}

Case studies examining energy market systems in humanitarian (or difficult operating) settings include:

- A study and business plan examining the possibility of a scaled LPG market within Tanzania’s Nyarugusu refugee camp\textsuperscript{146} provide a strong example of the data and piloting required in moving toward scaled improved cooking fuel systems in camp settings. The study includes an analysis of gendered impacts of switching from fuelwood to LPG cooking fuel.

- Mercy Corps’ “What motivates women to buy? Research brief: Valuing, Understanding and Targeting Women for Improved Cookstove Purchase” focuses on Mercy Corps’ partnership with the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves’ Women’s Empowerment Fund to identify scalable sales, marketing, and financing strategies for increasing improved cookstove purchases among female consumers in East Acholi in Northern Uganda.\textsuperscript{147}

- MEI’s “Prices Products and Priorities”\textsuperscript{148} and “Pioneering market systems for energy access in humanitarian settings — the case of Burkina Faso”\textsuperscript{149} offer strong examples of how energy needs and priorities can be assessed, measured, and presented. The report could serve as a template and model for assessing energy costs and expenditures in future training materials. The Burkina Faso case study presents a concrete example of using a market systems approach to improving energy access in a humanitarian context.

- MEI’s “Adopting a Market-based Approach to Boost Energy Access in Displaced Contexts”\textsuperscript{150} evaluates the market-based approaches adopted in MEI projects in Kenya and Burkina Faso (with those two case studies available as stand-alone studies). It articulates how such commercial strategies can be applied to the delivery of energy in displacement settings, and compares this to real world examples, highlighting areas for improvement for practitioners and donors in future programming.


Annex 4: Uganda
EEMRG: Emergency in Emergencies, Mitigating Risks of Gender-Based Violence
Uganda Case Study

Above: Focus Group Discussions in Bidi Bidi, West Nile, Uganda
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Introduction

Energy is essential to survival, yet is a routinely neglected need in humanitarian response. There is a growing global consensus and body of literature arguing for more attention to and accommodation of energy needs in emergency contexts, including where energy needs and risks of gender-based violence (GBV) overlap. *The Energy in Emergencies, Mitigating Risks of Gender-based Violence (EEMRG)* The EEMRG program aims to improve safety and opportunities for women and girls through access to energy in emergencies. It will do so through the creation of training and technical resources on energy access, GBV, and gender for humanitarian practitioners.

The EEMRG program has produced a draft global learning report and two country case studies to assess the current state of knowledge and practice around energy access in emergencies, and to examine how access to energy impacts the safety and opportunities available to individuals living through emergencies. This Uganda case study explores the lived energy experiences of refugees in Uganda, as well as refugees’ energy access through the lens of humanitarian actors. The report relies on a review of existing assessments and studies, combined with fieldwork carried out between February 26 and March 7, 2019, in Kampala and Uganda’s West Nile region. In the course of this fieldwork, EEMRG consulted 94 refugees and hosts, and 16 market actors via focus group discussions (FGDs). EEMRG FGDs used interviews, participative ranking methodology, and images of energy uses. Fieldwork included consultation with ten humanitarian practitioners.

Findings from this report will inform EEMRG’s training curriculum on energy access and GBV in emergencies. It will ensure that existing resources and knowledge are appropriately leveraged, and that EEMRG training materials and tools respond to the most important gaps in knowledge and practice. The audiences for the report are humanitarian energy and GBV experts, who we hope will confirm and challenge conclusions, ensuring that the report lays an accurate foundation from which we can develop training materials and guidance around energy and GBV in emergencies.

Organization of Uganda’s Humanitarian Energy Access Community of Practice

In Uganda, environmental and energy issues have been a high priority for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the government, with energy and environment listed as one of six priority outcomes within the refugee response plan.¹ Uganda has an Energy and

Environment Technical Working Group, chaired by UNHCR, the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), and UNDP, establishing a platform for these institutions to promote energy as a priority, but without providing a clear mandate or responsibility for provision of energy needs. The working group has a dedicated advisor in place to convene meetings and lead discussions around technical guidelines and harmonization.

Uganda’s refugee response plan includes clear prioritization of energy and environment issues, and includes the following energy and environment objectives and indicators:

- **OBJECTIVE:** Access to sufficient and sustainable basic energy services for lighting, power and cooking increased and climate change drivers mitigated with reduced reliance on wood and fossil fuels
- **INDICATOR:** # of targeted households that self-report using fuel-efficient cook-stove to cook the main meal
- **INDICATOR:** # of households using alternative and/or renewable energy (e.g. solar, biogas, ethanol, briquette, lpg [liquefied petroleum gas])

### Organization of Uganda’s GBV Mitigation Community

The OPM and UNHCR lead coordination of GBV prevention, mitigation, and response. In November 2018, the Uganda humanitarian community held a workshop on Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) guidelines, and devised a national action plan on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) mainstreaming. Each sector has a specific action plan for GBV mitigation, and each sector lead is responsible for reporting on identified GBV risks and how they have been addressed.

CARE described the structure and organization around GBV as “very active and ideal,” with coordination at the village, zone, sub-country, and settlement levels. Within the settlements, CARE, the International Rescue Committee (IRC), the Danish Refugee Council (DRC), and UNHCR have coordinated case management support for GBV survivors and have discrete responsibilities for prevention and response. However, during EEMRG field visits, the GBV referral mechanisms for GBV survivors and those at risk were under review by UNHCR and OPM, and, in the face of funding gaps, there was a reduced presence of GBV actors within the settlements -- a repeated concern shared by settlement residents, refugees, and host community members.

CARE emphasized that energy must be considered as a “key input” for GBV prevention, mitigation, and response programming in order to improve the GBV protection environment in Uganda. However, many organizations, including CARE, feel they lack the knowledge, skills, and expertise to address energy directly and indirectly. CARE reported that gaps in livelihoods

---

programming must be addressed in order to effectively address GBV: “We are trying to reduce GBV cases overall, but with no significant progress on livelihoods or progress on fuel it is limited. We hear people asking us often ‘do you want us to take care of the trees or live?’” CARE sees potential promising interventions in tree-planting, scaling briquette and efficient stove-making, incorporating energy into the minimum expenditure basket (MEB), focusing on longer-term interventions, and better linking food aid and energy access.

**Current Humanitarian Energy Access Initiatives - Uganda**

Given the high number of humanitarian actors undertaking actions in Uganda’s refugee response, tracking activities and interventions is challenging, and no comprehensive summary of energy access initiatives currently exists. However, activity tracking is an identified need and priority of the Energy and Environment working group. Interviews and publicly available documentation identified the following types of programs and activities underway or recently concluded:

**Cooking:** Training of trainers for energy-saving stove construction; distribution/construction of energy-saving stoves; development of alternative briquette production (using fecal sludge and agricultural byproduct); production and distribution of heat-retaining cooking bags; promotion of energy-saving cooking techniques.

**Lighting/Powering:** Solar street light installation for public infrastructure by a number of organizations, and based on safety mapping under UNHCR’s Safe from the Start initiative; personal torches and lantern distributions (often with both lighting and powering capability); energy kiosks promoting market-based approaches to energy access with high-quality solar power and cooking products; a de-risking fund to incentivize entrance of pay-as-you-go solar energy providers to refugee camps (led by USAID’s Power Africa); and small-scale pilots of subsidized pay-as-you-go lighting access.

**General:** Tree planting and recovery, some initiatives to work on improving relationships with host community.

**Current GBV Mitigation Initiatives & Links to Energy**

UNHCR coordinates humanitarian actors to promote wide adoption of a protection lens, and to ensure that GBV is being addressed, including through referrals. UNHCR leads awareness campaigns with refugees and host community members about natural resource management and coexistence to manage competition over resources. As mentioned previously, UNHCR also

---

established an Energy and Environment working group that meets with district focal points to address the linkages between energy and livelihoods, and advocates to humanitarian actors to take on energy-focused projects. Despite these efforts, there is a significant service gap around GBV mitigation and response.

**Humanitarian Practitioner Views of Energy-GBV Programming**

Through interviews with 10 humanitarian practitioners, a number of challenges and suggestions for improving the quality of energy access programming arose. Identified implementation pain points included: the difficulty of coordinating energy activities among a wide range of actors and approaches; the lack of clear methodology on MEB calculation (including energy cost calculations); lack of effective income-generating activities (further constrained by low cash transfer values that cover only basic needs); lack of alternative cooking fuel or provision of wood fuel; and lack of scaling interventions. In addition, some noted that too many years of in-kind donations have made transitions to market-based programming more challenging.

Practitioners shared many ideas for improvements in Uganda’s GBV-energy programming: better, more robust energy programming, including wide distributions of energy solutions where they are deemed necessary/appropriate, as well as more focus on market-based approaches and solutions. One interviewee encouraged considering energy as an input for GBV programming, and energy support to survivors to promote recovery. Others suggested skills building in making briquettes for survivors to create a source of income and to reduce exposure to repeated risks by continuing to gather wood. Still others suggested improved coordination among GBV, energy, livelihoods, health, and shelter practitioners.

Many acknowledged that energy access skills and program design among practitioners is low and hinders the quality of programming. Specific capacity gaps included the lack of awareness of the regulatory environment around mini-grid installation, insufficient focus on market-based solutions, and a lack of acceptable cooking fuel solutions. Many interviewees listed GBV capacity-building resources and platforms, but did not think energy was sufficiently incorporated into those training materials. A multisectoral practitioner with substantial humanitarian experience in a number of contexts noted that, in Uganda, this is the first time she has paid attention to energy beyond charcoal or firewood.
General Energy Context in Response Area (Secondary Research)

Access to sustainable energy for cooking, lighting, and power remain key challenges in the refugee settlements, and throughout Uganda. Across the country, 89% of refugee households have unmet energy needs, and over 75% of refugees lack any renewable source of energy. Cash transfers are widely used, and Uganda is in the process of approving an MEB to establish cash transfer levels. The draft MEB calculations include energy expenditures, figures which were developed with support from the Energy and Environment Working Group and the Cash Technical Working Group.

**Cooking:** 93% of refugee and host community households depend on wood fuel for cooking, with only 45% of refugee and 20% of host community households reporting use of energy-saving stoves. Distributed stoves are often unused, and training is generally not provided to improve adoption. There is low adoption and availability of alternative cooking fuels such as briquettes and biogas; a study in Adjumani district reported only one out of 127 respondents interviewed used alternative cooking fuels. Refugee households use, on average, 22% of their income for energy, with women and children spending 12 to 24 hours a week on firewood collection. A study conducted by DRC in 2015 found that 33% (in Adjumani), 36% (in Arua), and 63% (in Koboko) of females acknowledged having been harassed while collecting wood fuel.

Firewood consumption in northern Uganda averages between 2.5 and 4.5 kg per person per day, with host communities being on the higher end of that range. This means that at least 1.3 million tonnes of firewood are needed every year to meet the firewood consumption needs of over 1.36 million refugees, equating to a yearly demand of nearly 20 five-year-old fast growing trees per individual.

**Light and Power:** On average, refugee households own less than one light source per family. Solar lanterns are inconsistently provided and some are sold to meet other needs. In Rhino and Imvepi, the main fuels used for lighting in households are solar and dry cells, with disposable dry cells being the most common. One survey found that 60% of energy products on the market were counterfeit, and markets contained a high number of donated products from humanitarian agencies.

---

5 2018 Uganda MSNA
6 Source – DRC Environmental baseline assessment report 2015 - including interviews with 611 HHs in 2015
7 Ibid
8 Uganda Refugee Response Plan Jan 2019 - Dec 2020
Findings from Field Research

Field Methodology
From February 26 to March 7, 2019, Mercy Corps and Women’s Refugee Commission (WRC) technical staff conducted a field assessment in West Nile, Uganda, to assess energy access and associated GBV risks for refugee and host communities in Bidibidi and Rhino settlements. Bidibidi (and specifically the villages of Ofua 3 and Ofua 5) and Rhino settlements (Zones 3 and 4) were selected based on Mercy Corps’ previous energy assessments in West Nile, the presence of Mercy Corps operations, and their status as future targeted areas for energy-focused interventions.

Ten FGDs and ten household interviews were conducted over four days with 94 refugees and hosts and 16 market actors. Interviewers used the draft EEMRG Refugee/Host FGD tool using participative ranking methodology, the Refugee/Host KII, Community KII, and Markets KII tools. These tools did not ask about incidents of GBV, but addressed the linkages between energy access and GBV risks as well as community-based risk mitigation mechanisms. Facilitation discouraged participants from sharing personal experiences of GBV. Consultations focused on energy needs and priorities and GBV risks. In accordance with the IASC Guidelines for Integrating Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action, consultations took place separately with women, men, adolescent girls, and boys. Mercy Corps and WRC technical staff facilitated conversations, with the support of Mercy Corps Uganda staff and community mobilizers who served as translators. Daily debrief sessions were undertaken with the data collection team to capture adaptations of the tool to improve utility, usability, and comprehension by respondents. Based on these recommended adaptations, an updated version of the tool was used in the following day’s consultations.

Convenience sampling was completed by Mercy Corps staff, community mobilizers, community leaders, and a primary/secondary school principal, with ninety-four individuals participating. Disability inclusion was targeted at 20%, aiming for representation of both persons living with disabilities and their caregivers. The demographic breakdown of respondents is represented visually in the following graphic.

Individuals & Communities Consulted
As part of this research, Mercy Corps and WRC consulted with 94 individuals in Uganda’s West Nile region through ten FGDs and ten household discussions, as outlined below. A full count of individuals consulted is available in Annex 1.

---

12 Mercy Corps and WRC staff had previously received training on gender, GBV, cash and markets, ethical data collection, focus group and interview facilitation, as well as note taking. Mercy Corps Uganda staff and community mobilizers were familiar with gender, GBV and focus group and interview facilitation.
Findings: Energy Priorities
Findings are presented as ranked priorities (1st, 2nd, and 3rd), unless noted. In cases where findings are not ranked, this was either due to unsuccessful facilitation, or because participants could not identify and rank unavailable (hypothetical) alternatives; for example, in many discussions, ranking energy-dependent livelihoods was difficult because few such activities were available.

Charts presented below are composite findings across populations (refugee and host) and sub-populations (women, men, adolescent girls, and adolescent boys). To analyze and visualize energy priorities and threat rankings, the top three priorities from each focus group discussion were listed, grouped, and counted into a maximum of eight broader categories per focus group question.

Refugee and host community members consulted in this research struggled with unreliable, expensive, and polluting energy sources across all energy spheres (home, productive, and public). Consequences of this energy poverty affect nearly all aspects of daily life. As a male refugee in Rhino camp stated: “Energy drives life – where you limit energy, you limit life.”

Energy needs in the home
All groups ranked lighting and cooking as top energy priorities, with slight variations in prioritization and associated risks among groups.

*Elderly participants counted as men/women, and separately.
Research participants nearly universally shared their struggle with the **unaffordability of lighting products** (refugee respondents noted that they did not receive distributions of solar lanterns). While host communities reported greater access to battery-powered torches compared to refugees, the lack of electric lighting at home forces many households to light small, short fires, or to rely on candles to complete basic tasks such as preparing beds and caring for children at night. The lack of light also increases risks of assault while performing tasks outside of the home (including collecting water and visiting latrines), and limits opportunities for studying and socializing after dark. Refugees reported that boys and men were more likely to purchase torches and batteries from casual labor earnings, while women and girls were more likely to sell rations to purchase candles, torches, and batteries (due to the lack of access to casual labor). Solar energy and lighting solutions (especially lamps, which were distributed to a small portion of households in consulted areas) were widely requested of humanitarian actors.

Women and girls are primarily responsible for **firewood collection**, which poses a time burden and is linked to risks of conflict and physical and sexual assault. The length of journeys to collect fuelwood varied by location, with the longest reported time spent being up to eight hours, three times per week (in Rhino Camp, Arua 6). In areas where firewood was difficult to access, refugees reported selling rations to purchase charcoal at a rate of 30 scoops of maize per bag of charcoal, and 12 scoops for a bundle of firewood. Refugee women and girls reported fears and incidents of assault and tension with the host community. However, despite these fears, some women and girls also discussed firewood as a **valuable asset**, one of the few resources they could freely access for both household use and occasional reselling. Access to fuel-efficient stoves and fuel sources were reported as widely needed.

**Phones and radios** were also reported to be unaffordable and scarcely available within the camp. In rare cases where women in the community were reported to have access to phones or radios, they were acquired in Arua by soliciting a trader to procure them. Households with phones generally reported owning one phone to share among members, and reported tension and competition within the household for use of phones for lighting and communication purposes, with male household members generally having primary ownership. Charging phones was repeatedly mentioned as a priority and a challenge due to cost (around 500 UGX ($US .14) per charge at solar-powered
While access and consequences of the lack of access across groups were similar, a number of notable differences between populations exist. Refugees face greater difficulties and risks accessing firewood than host community members (who have more claim to land, and whose access is less often challenged). Men, women, boy, and girl refugees were aware of and concerned about the risks of firewood collection (even when not directly engaged in its collection). By contrast, male host community members characterized fuelwood access as “easy.” Specific priorities per population and subpopulation are outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugee girls</td>
<td>Bidibidi</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>Light for studying</td>
<td>Portable light (water collection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee girls</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Light for studying</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>Charging phones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host women</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Light for studying</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>Charging phones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host men</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Lighting for outdoor HH tasks</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>Lighting inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee boys</td>
<td>Bidibidi</td>
<td>Lighting via lamps</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee men</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Lighting at home</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee women</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee women</td>
<td>Bidibidi</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>Light for studying</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee male</td>
<td>Bidibidi</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>Light for studying</td>
<td>Radio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Energy access, income generation, and productive space opportunities
Energy access was one among many challenges inhibiting income generation in Bidibidi and Rhino settlements. Access to capital and transportation to markets and jobs were additional constraints. As one male refugee stated, “There isn’t enough info about market and info about quality products.” Another stated, “People also need business skills and to be able to afford transport.” Energy was seen as both an enabler for a wide variety of livelihoods (from agriculture to shopkeeping and baking) and also a potential source of employment (through income generation opportunities of
charging phones and selling energy products such as fuel). One refugee man stated, “It would be great if people can learn how to produce energy products like candles, briquettes, and stoves.” Another said, “If we had enough capital, we would have started energy businesses already.”

The lack of existing opportunities in energy-based income generation made it difficult for women and girls in particular to rank or envision energy priorities in the productive realm. Some respondents did mention tailoring and hair salons as examples of small businesses enabled through energy access. Detailed results of priority rankings per population and subpopulation are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>PRODUCTIVE REALM ENERGY PRIORITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugee girls</td>
<td>Bidibidi</td>
<td>Powered schools (for teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>NONE REPORTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host women</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Light for shops at night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host men</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Power for irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee boys</td>
<td>Bidibidi</td>
<td>Cooking fuel (to sell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee men</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Charging phones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee women</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Power for small biz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee women</td>
<td>Bidibidi</td>
<td>NONE REPORTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee male</td>
<td>Bidibidi</td>
<td>Power for small businesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Refugee and Host Productive Energy Priorities**

- **P1**
  - Powered schools (for teaching)
  - Light for shops at night
  - Charging phones

- **P2**
  - Firewood for bakery
  - Life for businesses
  - Fuel for boda drivers

- **P3**
  - NONE REPORTED
  - NONE
  - Support for agriculture

**Graph**: Refugee and Host Productive Energy Priorities

**Legend**:
- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd
**Public Energy Needs**

Across locations and populations, lighting was overwhelmingly highlighted as the top energy priority in the public space. Consequences of a lack of public lighting are widespread. As water is often delivered late, collecting water in the dark is necessary but risky for women and girls, who take primary responsibility for the task. Unlit pathways and roads were reported as unsafe for travel to waterpoints, hospitals, and schools. Markets do not operate (or are not considered to be safe) after daylight hours. Children have less opportunity to study. Unpowered schools, hospitals, and churches limit opportunities for quality service delivery. Public energy priorities identified by location and group are listed below.

![Refugee and Host Public Energy Priorities](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>PUBLIC ENERGY PRIORITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugee girls</td>
<td>Bidibidi</td>
<td>Power at hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee girls</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Lighting at water points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host women</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Lighting at markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host men</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Lighting of roads/paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee boys</td>
<td>Bidibidi</td>
<td>Lighting for all public infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee men</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Lighting at water points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee women</td>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>Lighting public spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee women</td>
<td>Bidibidi</td>
<td>Lighting of water points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee male</td>
<td>Bidibidi</td>
<td>Lighting roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P1: Power at hospital, Lighting at water points, Lighting at markets, Lighting of roads/paths, Lighting for all public infrastructure, Lighting at water points, Lighting public spaces, Lighting of water points, Lighting roads.

P2: Lighting paths, Lighting at water points, Lighting at church, Lighting at water points, Lighting at water points, Lighting / public, Lighting paths, Lighting water points.

P3: Lighting water points, Hospitals (generator), Lighting at schools, Lighting of latrines, Lighting, Lighting streets/paths, Torches to use while walking, Lighting latrines, Lighting schools.
Findings: Energy Access and GBV Risks

Consultations on risks and fears in all spaces and activities revealed high degrees of fear and reported incidents of violence related to energy collection and use both in public spaces and in the household. Scarcity of energy resources (and economic pressure around how to prioritize energy use) fores households into awful decision-making scenarios affecting women and girls — risk assault or rape, or go without water or cooked food.

Fear of violence and attacks while traveling in darkness was the most frequently ranked threat, and was closely associated with the lack of public and portable lighting. Refugees and host community members across sub-populations reported linkages between insufficient access to lighting and GBV in public places. Water kiosks, latrines, markets, schools, and pathways were all used or traveled to in darkness, and reported incidents and fears of GBV were common.

Collecting firewood was the third highest ranked risk due to the remote location and tension with host communities. The risk is increasing as woodfuel sources are depleted. A female community leader in Rhino camp said, “In the last year people have been finding it [firewood collection] more difficult. Areas that were OK before are now not OK. Landlords are upset.” Focus group participants frequently mentioned the risk of “getting chased” while collecting firewood and performing other tasks in remote and dark areas, which implied the risk of physical or sexual assault.

The risk of “getting chased” was raised in the context of both boys and girls traveling long distances to school in the dark (the fourth highest ranked specific risk). Rape and groping in the marketplace after dark and attacks at latrines were mentioned as additional risks; however, many consulted populations had latrines close to home that were shared with a small number of neighbors, so this risk was lower than it may have been in other settings. Robbery was also mentioned as a risk factor while traveling in the dark. In general, unlit public spaces and roads/walkways were perceived as high risk and frightening areas for all groups.
**Water collection at night** was the next most frequently cited specific risk factor. Women and girls often have no choice but to collect water in dark and tense settings, where they experience increased risk to rape and sexual assault. A refugee girl from Rhino camp reported: “Someone might force you to have sex at the waterpoint.” In addition, competition for the limited water resource is high, and respondents report conflicts breaking out at collection points.

Within the household, **tension, GBV risks, and incidents of physical and verbal violence were reported in part linked to household energy resources**. Refugee women reported domestic violence resulting from “the state of affairs” (meaning low ability to meet the basic needs of the household, including cooking). They reported tensions in negotiating with men around household expenditures and how to trade rations to meet basic needs. One refugee woman reported having to “ask the man for funds to purchase a torch or a candle, and this is a big problem.”

Many households have only one cell phone, which is controlled by a male in the house, with use highly rationed due to the cost of charging phones at solar kiosks. Informants reported household conflicts and risks of violence over this limited **phone access and use**. Women and girls have the least access to communication and light-dependent activities enabled by phones. Some women reported facing scrutiny about their use of phones. One refugee woman stated: “There can be misunderstandings and the husband can think that the wife is calling someone else when she is getting in touch with her relatives.” In addition, the lack of access to communication tools to report emergencies (for example, women going into labor, or severe illness) was a reported risk factor.

**Refugee Coping Mechanisms and Attitudes around GBV - Energy Access**

Refugees report they feel frustrated with and resigned to the energy deficits they face in the settlements. Women and girls, and the men and boys in their lives, expressed wishes that the time burden and GBV risks were not built into necessary daily responsibilities, such as gathering water and fuel. Proposed solutions by refugee communities include increasing the refugee community’s knowledge of renewable energy and financing options to facilitate access and affordability (in particular, for women and girls, of products such as solar-powered personal torches); ensuring that each person in the household has her own light; increasing access to solar lamps and solar panels; training women and older adolescent girls on efficient stove production and preparation and sale of fuel alternatives; supporting refugee livelihoods and leveraging the relatively strong enabling legal environment; installing lights proportional to the number of existing water points and latrines; ensuring continuity of GBV services within the settlement; and increasing food rations if refugees must continue to sell a portion to afford fuel so that their food security is not jeopardized.

Refugees and host community members are using a wide range of risk mitigation strategies to reduce exposure to risks of GBV associated with energy access. Listed strategies include:

- Use personal torches whenever possible
- Travel in groups
● Avoid traveling at night and, where possible, limit distances traveled (nearly impossible for women and girls
● Communicate with the host population through community leaders to discuss deforestation permission of refugees to collect firewood, and mutual advocacy with humanitarian actors
● Directly request permission from host community to gather firewood
● Report risks to community leaders and to IRC (current GBV focal point)
● Demonstrate an aggressive attitude to deter potential attackers
● Respect firewood collection boundaries
● Leave the market early and stay alert to threats
● Have refugee men sell rations to buy firewood instead of having women travel to collect it
● Purchase torches for their children
● Whenever possible, collect water in the morning, and
● Meet with community leaders to discuss energy and GBV issues and sensitize the community about issues

Market Availability
Market visits and interviews with 16 market actors revealed that within refugee settlements, energy products are limited to basic hand-held torches for lighting and charcoal for cooking. The only exception was in the international donor-supported “energy kiosks” in Rhino and Impevi camps, where fuel-efficient stoves, a variety of solar systems and products, and rechargeable batteries are available for sale. However, many interviewees within the settlement noted that energy products could be procured by either visiting markets in neighboring towns or by asking a merchant within the settlement to purchase something on behalf of the settlement resident (for an upcharge).

In town markets of neighboring settlements, including Yumbe and Arua, a wide array of lighting, power, and cooking fuels were available for purchase. In addition, these towns are home to a number of national and international branded solar energy providers offering product warranties, including Village Power, Solar Now, Fenix (ReadyPay), and Green Light Planet (SunKing).

Gaps in Support Provided by the Humanitarian Community
Across the settlements in West Nile where this research was undertaken, lighting and fuel needs are inadequately considered or addressed by the humanitarian community. Refugee communities are resorting to risky coping strategies. Firewood collection heightens women and girls’ risks of GBV. Refugees report selling food rations in exchange for fuel and lighting, which worsens food insecurity for an already food insecure population. Inequitable distributions of non-food items (NFIs) such as solar lamps and personal torches have given earlier arrivals an advantage over later arrivals. For example, refugees who arrived at the beginning of 2016 compared to later in the year have more access to energy, as later arrivals came with fewer assets and then received fewer NFIs, resulting in energy deficits and related protection issues, including GBV. This trend is presumably linked to decreased funding levels of humanitarian operations and programming since 2016.
Similarly, settlement water points and latrines installed in later-established zones had either a lower ratio of, or no, lighting installations. The few refugees who are able to afford torches buy them locally. However, a majority of refugees cannot afford the few torches available in marketplaces. Research finds a lack of support for livelihood activities, including energy inputs. This is in part due to the absence of market linkages between settlements and host communities, and often forces refugees to remain dependent on humanitarian assistance.

**Recommendations from Refugee and Host Communities for Humanitarian Agencies**

All groups consulted recommended increasing access to or provision of personal or public lighting. No substantial differences in recommendations were documented between host and refugee sub-populations. Priority recommendations beyond lighting, however, varied somewhat between women, men, boys, and girls. Specific recommendations include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Ensure access to light at home and in public; provide alternative cooking fuels; improve cell phone charging options; increase income-generating activities (training, skills, and market assessment); educate community about solar products and systems (host community women).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Move the health center closer to the villages and have daily operating hours; move the schools closer to the villages; support livelihoods to improve purchasing power for charcoal from the host community; install solar lights at water points; implement efficient stove products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Improve access to better stoves and fuel sources; provide access to personal lights for every individual to navigate roads and pathways; install additional lamp posts proportional to the number of water points and latrines; build schools closer to the villages (in particular secondary schools for which attendance is already an obstacle for girls and requires traveling long distances).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Install lamps at school; improve relations with the host community so that they stop chasing refugees who are collecting firewood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Impact of Improved Energy-GBV Interventions

Refugee and host communities alike agree that resolving energy-related GBV risks would impact their lives in a variety of ways.

In Rhino, refugee girls shared that improving access to energy would improve their school attendance and retention rates -- girls would not be taken out of school regularly by their families to collect firewood and perform other care work. Improved attendance would enable them to gain a better education and better jobs in the future, they said. In Bidibidi, refugee girls said that access to energy, and in particular lighting in the form of personal torches, would increase their freedom of movement, their physical safety from accident or injury, and increase their ability to study more (into the evening hours). They drew direct linkages between improving their performance in school and an increase in opportunities critical to their improved future chances at success. They also saw increased access to energy and lighting as increasing their freedom from risks and violence.

Host women in Rhino reported that if they had better knowledge about energy products (i.e. types of products and associated costs) and the market (i.e. where energy products may be purchased in the settlements or towns and cities of West Nile), they would be better equipped to improve their safety. Host men in Rhino shared that if there were more than one personal torch per family, intra-household conflict between women and girls would be reduced. Girls would be able to study more, and women would be able to fetch water safely at night (when water arrives late at the water kiosks). In addition, host men reported that personal lights would also mean safer access to the market and better outcomes for everyone in the household, because they would be less susceptible to insect bites.

In Rhino, host men articulated the connection between poverty and conflict/violence within the household, and recommended improving access to food. A male refugee community leader highlighted that, while food is being addressed by humanitarian actors through food distributions, refugees routinely sell a portion of their food rations. From these sales, they purchase primarily firewood, and secondarily, charcoal in order to cook their food, as well as to reduce the time taken, distance traveled, and protection risks faced by women and girls associated with firewood collection. He also recommended that the responsibility to collect firewood should be shared by men and women, or, given current realities, that men accompany women and girls during collection to decrease the risks they faced. Lastly, he shared that lighting within the home would improve comfort and reduce routine injuries from wild animals.
Capacity Needs: Humanitarian Teams

Interviews with ten humanitarian practitioners working in West Nile and Kampala revealed the following capacity gaps that contribute to the challenge of designing and implementing successful energy-GBV activities:

- **General lack of awareness of GBV/gender concepts.** As one practitioner stated, “Many times I have to work with colleagues who are totally unprepared on gender-sensitive concepts and approaches. The first thing I would do is train all staff on gender-sensitive programming.” Interviewees also noted that due to a lack of basic awareness among some staff, any training on energy-specific needs should begin with an introduction to fundamental gender and GBV concepts.

- **A lack of resources on “durable solutions” that engage local markets.** Some interviewees reported tapping into the private sector, as well as closer partnerships with development organizations and actors, to fill that capacity gap.

- **A need for clear standards for energy programs and service delivery.** Some interviewees felt that clear standards would facilitate improved cooperation between the host government and a range of humanitarian actors, to address energy access and GBV risk mitigation.

- **Capacity-building support and materials.** Several practitioners noted that some of their most productive learning moments included visits from regional/global technical advisors and regional learning exchanges, but acknowledged that advisors are often overstretched, and these types of events can be expensive and difficult to maintain. Modular training materials that could be rolled out by field-level staff are crucial to address capacity needs and to promote collaboration among stakeholders.

**Conclusion**

Consultations with affected populations across West Nile revealed critical deficits in humanitarian funding and response to adequately address energy access and GBV risk mitigation. EEMRG hopes that this case study can be leveraged by stakeholders to garner support for enhanced programming to bridge gaps.

Consultations with humanitarian practitioners in Uganda revealed that most practitioners were unsure about where to look for energy-gender capacity-building resources and programming tools, and unclear about best practices. Nearly all struggled to implement systemic, scaleable responses. At a global level, many leading standard humanitarian assessment and design tools insufficiently address energy-gender issues.
EEMRG is currently working through the Global Plan of Action’s Technical Expertise and Capacity Building Working Group, as well as a smaller advisory group of leading humanitarian agencies, to begin to address these humanitarian-energy-gender capacity gaps. We see clear opportunities for transformative impact for communities living through emergencies, especially for women and girls. The findings and conclusions from the Uganda and Jordan Case Studies, together with global practitioner input, will complement research from the broader EEMRG Global Learning Report. Together, summary findings and feedback from sector specialists will define a foundation for a universal humanitarian-energy-GBV curriculum, training program, and ultimately, uniform standards for assessment, interventions, and monitoring.
## Annex 1: Individuals Consulted

### Rhino:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Elderly (55+ included in men and women)</th>
<th>Persons with disabilities, included in men, women, girls, and boys</th>
<th>Family member with disability, including in men, women, girls, and boys</th>
<th>Total individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10% persons w/ disabilities & 42% persons w/ disabilities & caretakers

### Bidibidi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>IDP</th>
<th>Returnee</th>
<th>Refugee</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25% persons w/ disabilities & 31% persons w/ disabilities & caretakers
Annex 5: Jordan
EEMRG: E.. rgy in Emergencies, Mitigating Risks of Gender-Based Violence Jordan Case Study

Above: Shahed, 13, takes a computer class at a youth center run by Mercy Corps in a refugee camp for Syrian refugees.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Introducon** 3  
Jordan’s Naonal Energy Context 3  
Organizaon of Jordan’s Humanitarian Energy Response 4  
Current Humanitarian Energy Access Inia v es - Jordan 5  
Current GBV Mig aon Inia v es and Links to Energy 6  
Findings from Field Research 7  
Field Methodology & Individuals Consulted 7  
Research Context 8  
Findings: Energy Priories 9  
Findings: Energy Access and GBV Risks 10  
Refugee Coping Mechanisms and Atudes around GBV - Energy Access 11  
Recommendations for Humanitarian Agencies from Refugee and Host Communities 12  
Capacity Needs: Humanitarian Teams 13  
Conclusion 13  
Annex: Individuals Consulted 14
Introduction

Energy is essential to survival, yet is a routinely neglected need in humanitarian response. There is a growing global consensus and body of literature arguing for more attention to and accommodation of energy needs in emergency contexts, including where energy needs and risks of gender-based violence (GBV) overlap. The Emergencies, Mitigating Risks of Gender-based Violence (EEMRG) program aims to improve safety and opportunities for women and girls through access to energy in emergencies. It will do so through the creation of training and technical resources on energy access, GBV, and gender for humanitarian practitioners.

The EEMRG program is producing a global learning report and two country case studies to assess the current state of knowledge and practice around energy access in emergencies, and how access to energy impacts the safety and opportunities available to individuals living through emergencies. This case study examines energy access for refugees and host community members in Jordan and relies on fieldwork carried out between April 16 and 26, 2019, in Amman, Azraq Camp (Village 5) and Mafraq, as well as interviews with humanitarian and energy stakeholders in Amman. Given the brief research scope, the report aims to highlight bright spots and trends around gender and energy in Jordan’s humanitarian response, and does not present a full picture of initiatives underway nor issues faced by host and refugee communities.

Findings from this report will inform EEMRG’s curriculum on energy access and GBV in emergencies. It will ensure that existing resources and knowledge are appropriately leveraged, and that EEMRG training materials and tools respond to the most important gaps in knowledge and practice. The audiences for the report are humanitarian energy and GBV experts, who we hope will confirm and challenge conclusions, ensuring that the report lays an accurate foundation from which we can develop training materials and guidance around energy and GBV in emergencies.

Jordan’s National Energy Context

Energy use in Jordan is widely subsidized by the government, with costs to government increasing with use. The Syrian crisis and resulting population growth have increased pressure on domestic energy resources and infrastructure, and sparked action by the government of Jordan and international partners to respond to this challenge. Jordan has instituted a legal framework for the “promotion of energy efficiency and renewable energy” and a progressive tariff regime, while also benefiting from an active national private sector and substantial solar PV [photovoltaic] expertise.1 By 2017, Jordan was ranked third globally in renewable power production and fuels investment and has a range of renewable energy mega-projects in solar and wind. Jordan is now on track to exceed

its target for 10% renewable energy coverage by 2020, and is seen as a strong example of responding to humanitarian crises in a way that meets immediate needs while also strengthening renewable energy systems and infrastructure.²

As a result of this improved electricity grid and Jordan’s expansive Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) networks, energy access for refugees generally hinges on affordability rather than accessibility. The 2019 Vulnerability Assessment Framework (a leading study of refugee vulnerability) produced by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), measured the mean and median monthly electricity refugee expenditure per capita at five and three Jordanian dinars respectively.³ For Jordanians and Syrians, debt is most often related to rent and utilities, and places a great strain on household budgets. As one humanitarian stakeholder stated, “Energy is three times as expensive in the winter as compared to summer, even for Jordanians. If you are rich or poor, energy is a large expenditure.”

Energy metering also influences housing stability for refugees in rental markets. In Jordan, it is common for two or more houses to share an electricity meter, which can cause tension around cost sharing, and sometimes lead to evictions. A number of humanitarian programs supporting the rehabilitation of rental units have required landlords to install additional meters to ensure that there are no more than two houses sharing the same meter.

Organization of Jordan’s Humanitarian Energy Response

The Jordan Response Platform was established in 2013 as the strategic partnership mechanism between the Government of Jordan, donors, UN agencies, and NGOs for the development of an integrated refugee, resilience-strengthening, and development response to the impact of the Syria crisis on Jordan. It creates a regularly updated “Jordan Response Plan (JRP)” which outlines priorities and resourcing needs. Since 2014, the JRP has clearly underscored energy priorities, including: offsetting incremental energy demand; promoting energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies; and providing safe sustainable energy for refugees and Jordanians.

The current JRP includes the following energy objectives for 2019:

1. Introduce and promote renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies and solutions to support the increased energy needs.


2. Enable refugees and host communities to access adequate, affordable, and secure energy supplies.4

The consistent and clear prioritization of energy in the JRP, combined with Jordan’s existing capacities and enabling regulatory environment, has yielded positive results at both household and community levels. Public schools have benefitted from the installation of 35 PV solar systems as well as the installation of over 3,500 solar water heating systems which reduced rent payments by an estimated 28%. Larger-scale projects have included completion of a 13-megawatt solar power plant in Zaatari camp. The installation of a 40-megawatt solar power plant in southern Amman is underway to serve refugees in the camps (Zaatari and Azraq) and to provide energy to public entities (e.g., health facilities) in the host communities.

An energy and water working group was convened by the Moving Energy Initiative to bring together stakeholders working on energy access for refugees, but is no longer active. The Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) is beginning to organize an energy-specific stakeholder group.

**Current Humanitarian Energy Access Initiatives - Jordan**

Jordan’s humanitarian energy access initiatives can be grouped into three categories: expanding energy access, improving energy management/efficiency, and building the capacity of local energy stakeholders.

**Energy access** initiatives expand access to and use of reliable energy sources. Initiatives include NRC’s work to install PV solar systems in schools and other public buildings to strengthen public infrastructure facing pressure from the influx of refugees.

**Energy efficiency** initiatives increase efficiency and reduce costs associated with energy access and use. In this category, the Jordan Green Building Council’s Green Affordable Homes project built energy-efficient homes and retrofitted existing homes for increased energy efficiency, as well as conducted awareness-raising campaigns on energy-efficient practices. They worked in communities affected by the Syrian crisis and found great receptivity to educational activities that helped households adopt energy-saving practices and save money.

At a national level, the Jordan Renewable Energy and Efficiency Fund, supported by a mix of international donors, has implemented JOD50 million worth of renewable energy projects over the past four years. Their work has included retrofitting 128 schools with energy-efficient solutions and selling 22,000 subsidized household solar water heaters.

An example of a shelter-focused energy efficiency program includes NRC’s work to negotiate reduced cost of rent for refugees with Jordanian landlords in exchange for installation of solar water systems which become an asset for the landlord.

4 [http://www.jrpsc.org/jrp-publications](http://www.jrpsc.org/jrp-publications)
Building energy capacity initiatives strengthen the ability of local stakeholders to provide and manage energy - often with a focus on renewables or energy efficiency. This includes NRC’s work to build the capacity of engineers employed by the Ministry of Education, raising awareness about renewable energy. NRC has also trained 70 refugee technicians in Azraq and Zaatari camps to clean, install, and maintain solar PV power plants.

Jordan Green Building Council’s Green Affordable Homes project also had an energy capacity building component, training 20 local and refugee builders on green construction techniques, and instructing craftswomen in techniques to create shading devices from reused window frames and local straw. Identifying and engaging women in this initiative required persistence and household-to-household outreach, as many families in targeted communities were reluctant to allow women to engage in the workforce.

Current GBV Mitigation Initiatives and Links to Energy

A number of GBV mitigation initiatives are underway in Jordan that illustrate connections between GBV and energy access. Practitioners note that domestic violence is likely to increase during winter, with increased costs for heating (GBV caseloads increase in winter). Thus, the International Rescue Committee (IRC) is implementing cash for protection projects in Jordan to mitigate the potential for intra-household violence by reducing household expenditure stress. Practitioners also note that improvements in energy affordability, especially in winter, could lead to a reduction in negative coping strategies (such as early marriage, begging children, exploitation, etc.).

An app (Amaali⁵) developed by the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) gives service providers and beneficiaries access to up-to-date GBV referral pathways. It is updated as partnerships change (e.g., new service providers, implementers wind down operations, funding shifts). The app will be used to monitor “dangerous areas” and to follow up in those areas to identify risk factors such as a lack of lighting.

UNFPA also conducts safety audits. In Azraq and Zaatari camps, safety mapping is conducted as a collective effort with UNHCR and other actors to avoid duplication. In urban areas, UNFPA supports partners to identify risks for women, making recommendations and presenting findings to stakeholders. Identified risks are often Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) related – including requests for lighting at water collection points to reduce risks and fears of GBV.

The sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) working group, co-led by UNHCR and UNFPA, piloted and continues to promote risk assessments in various locations, with partners selecting from a bank of questions to apply in specific contexts. Assessments identified issues such as sexual

harassment of girls en route to school and concerns about women and girls accessing WASH facilities at night in Azraq camp due to lack of lighting and perceptions about security risks.

Findings from Field Research

Field Methodology & Individuals Consulted
From April 17 to 25, 2019, Mercy Corps and Women’s Refugee Commission (WRC) conducted a field assessment in Azraq Camp and Mafraq, Jordan, to assess energy access and associated GBV risks for refugee and host communities. Azraq Village 5 (a section within Azraq refugee camp) and Mafraq were selected based on convenience sampling and the presence of Mercy Corps operations and identified areas for future energy interventions. Eight focus group discussions were conducted over two days with 66 Syrian refugees and 22 Jordanian host community members. Researchers used the draft Refugee/Host FGD tool employing a participative ranking methodology. These tools did not ask about incidents of GBV, but addressed the linkages between energy access and GBV risks as well as community-based risk mitigation mechanisms. Facilitation discouraged participants from sharing personal experiences of GBV. In accordance with the IASC Guidelines for Integrating Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action, consultations took place separately with women, men, adolescent girls, and boys. Mercy Corps and WRC technical staff facilitated all FGDs with support from Mercy Corps Jordan staff and hired translators. Daily debrief sessions were undertaken with the data collection team to capture adaptations of the tool to improve utility, usability, and comprehension by respondents. Based on these recommended adaptations, an updated version of the tool was used in the following day’s consultations. A full count of individuals consulted is available above, and in detail in Annex 1.

In addition to consultations with refugees and host communities, Mercy Corps carried out interviews with 9 key informants from the following institutions:

---

6 Mercy Corps and WRC staff had previously received training on gender, GBV, cash and markets, ethical data collection, focus group and interview facilitation, as well as note taking. Mercy Corps Jordan staff were familiar with gender, GBV and focus group and interview facilitation.
Research Context
Primary research was carried out in two very distinct contexts: a fenced refugee camp with movement restrictions (Azraq village 5), as well as an urban center that is home to both Jordanians and Syrian refugees (Mafraq). Energy needs and associated GBV risks varied substantially in these different contexts.

Azraq refugee camp stretches for about 15 km in an otherwise unpopulated desert setting near Azraq town and is home to approximately 40,000 refugees, mainly from Syria. Families reside in metal shelters called “caravans” and are organized into smaller villages that each contain sanitation, market, health, and other basic facilities. Azraq is the first refugee camp in the world fully powered by renewable energy. A nearby solar plant occupies a space of 50,000 square meters and uses 7,788 solar PV panels to generate an energy supply of 3.5 MW.

In Azraq village 5, refugees reside in a fenced camp with tight restrictions on movement due to security concerns. Village 5 residents are generally not allowed to leave the camp, and are therefore heavily dependent on aid and humanitarian agencies to meet basic, psychosocial, and other needs. Electricity in village 5 is controlled and rationed differently than in other villages within the camp. Certain appliances are banned from use within the camp (such as space heaters) due to the stress they place on the electric system. In response to unsanctioned use of these types of appliances within village 5, UNHCR rations and restricts hours of electricity access. As of April, electricity in village 5 was available roughly between noon and 6:00 in the evening, with substantial repercussions on household activities. By contrast, other villages in Azraq were reported to have electricity access 16 hours per day.

Mafraq, by contrast, is a governorate close to the Syrian border and the main border crossing point for Syrian refugees entering Jordan. Currently, over 85,000 Syrians live in Mafraq governorate, outside of refugee camps. UNHCR estimates that close to half of all non-camp refugees in Jordan reside in substandard housing, which may have inadequate structural, WASH, and/or energy access issues. This EEMRG research consulted refugee and host community members living in the city of Mafraq, which has experienced significant pressure on infrastructure and services since the onset of the Syrian crisis. In Mafraq, rent increased from 70-150 JOD a month prior to the crisis to approximately 200-300 JOD in 2018. Most refugees face an income-expenditure gap and resort to a wide range of dangerous coping mechanisms, from illegal or exploitative work, exploitation from

landlords, and child labor, including street begging. Early marriage of young girls is also on the rise, often as a result of poverty and household resource constraints.8

Findings: Energy Priorities

Azraq. The limited hours of electricity surfaced as the main energy deficit, impacting opportunities at home and in the community, and, to a lesser degree, livelihoods. As a male community member stated, “Electricity shortage is the community's biggest challenge – kids play outside too much and at night there is no studying without light.”

Mafraq. Access to critical sources of energy – electricity, cooking gas, etc. – is not a constraint. The cost of that energy and control within the household were issues brought up by refugees and host community members. Several women reported putting off other bills to pay for electricity, as it was considered a priority. Community leaders confirmed that the cost of utility bills was a primary source of financial stress and indebtedness. In addition, many consultations revealed tensions and challenges around shared metering (where multiple households share a single electricity meter).

Energy Needs in the Home

Azraq. Lighting and power were the most frequently mentioned needs by FGD participants. Women stressed the importance of powered appliances to reduce the burden of household work (citing the substantial number of hours required for washing clothing by hand versus with machines). Phone charging was also highlighted as a priority to stay connected with the outside world and for entertainment. Gas for cooking was listed as a priority, though most respondents said this need was being met through an LPG cash distribution (refugees receive a regular cash distribution intended to cover costs of LPG purchase).

Mafraq. Consultations revealed that energy access is widespread, but affordability is a key barrier and can put pressure on households to reduce their use of electricity and gas. Some women were aware of energy-saving appliances, but noted their high upfront cost posed barriers to purchase. Another key issue involved meters shared between households, and thus difficulty establishing responsibility for energy consumption and bills. As one woman stated, “Shared meter is imposing so much injustice, especially when one family has so many more appliances (hairdryers, etc.). I believe that each household should have an independent meter.”

Productive Energy Needs

Azraq. For refugees in Azraq village 5, restrictions on movement and the inability to access labor markets were identified as the most critical barriers to livelihoods. Energy was, however, identified as a barrier to some of the limited livelihood opportunities available within the camp. Refugees felt that more access to energy could increase income generation opportunities for small business activities, including barbering/hairdressing, increased access to gas for bakery or restaurant operations, and

8 Mercy Corps internal assessment.
opportunities to open new businesses that do not currently exist, such as video gaming studios or welding shops.

**Mafraq.** Income generation activities available to women in Mafraq include tailoring, food and beverage services, teaching, construction, and acting as guards. The cost of energy was seen as a barrier to profitability for self-run business activities, and inconsistent access to power and lighting was identified as a barrier to jobs that rely on public energy, including schools and construction.

**Public Energy Needs**

**Azraq.** Public lighting and powered public facilities were priorities raised by all groups of refugees consulted. Hospitals, schools, markets, sanitation facilities, and streets/walkways were identified as sites with insufficient light and/or power. Women and girls prioritized lighting at sanitation facilities higher than male participants. As one woman said, “We need lighting in the toilets so badly.” However, some consulted individuals said that lighting needs were adequately met. A male community leader stated, “Lighting is okay in public places.”

**Mafraq.** Public lighting and power for hospitals, markets, and schools were raised as priorities. In some cases, the lack of lighting in public was seen as a safety hazard for women and girls, but many interviewees also stated that light alone would not solve the threats. A lack of public transportation options was also raised as a priority. As one girl stated, “Mobility and transportation is a constraint – you’re always late for work or school and you get in trouble.”

**Findings: Energy Access and GBV Risks**

**Azraq.** Fears of violence and GBV in Azraq revolved around specific threats of violence in public and in the household. In public spaces, verbal and physical harassment and violence towards women and girls were mentioned as threats. Girls ranked the threat of violence while collecting water and while charging phones as the highest threats to their safety. While darkness was perceived to exacerbate these risks in some cases, respondents said lighting did not always remove the threat of violence against women and girls in particular. A female community leader stated:

“I won’t let my daughter go out alone at night to the toilet. Young girls are not safe. At night I am scared of everything. There are many young men. We as parents must be vigilant and girls must be accompanied. There are lights at some toilets, but girls should still be accompanied.”

Many consulted refugees felt that village 5 had previously been safer, as most initial residents had arrived from the same community in Syria and there was a level of trust between residents. The more recent arrival of single men (referred to as “bachelors”) presented a perceived threat to male
and female refugees, especially when those newly arrived males were placed in caravans near residences of families with women and girls. A refugee man stated, “Bachelor men in the neighborhood are dangerous.”

At a household level, the lack of employment and activities, especially for boys and men, was identified as a source of household tension that could escalate to violence. A female community leader described the risks:

“Six people are in one caravan – it is small, confined space and there is pressure between husbands and wives...Due to lack of jobs people are under pressure at home; for example, fathers take it out on moms and kids. Some wives ask their husbands for money and this can turn into conflict.”

Beyond threats faced in public spaces and within the household, refugees said they felt that their confinement, without expectation or hope for a change in circumstances, was another experience of violence. As a refugee girl stated, “It’s a jail in here…our existence in village 5 is violence.”

Mafraq. Consultations in Mafraq revealed fears of violence and physical/verbal harassment in public spaces, and risks of disempowerment and lack of independence at the household level. In public spaces, women expressed fears of allowing daughters to travel alone. One woman said, “Sometimes I go out in the street and they want to flirt with her [my daughter].” Others noted that, particularly in crowded spaces, unwanted touching can occur. As a result, it was generally understood that girls, and in some cases, women, should be accompanied by a male family member outside the home. Energy was not seen to be a primary constraint or cause of these risks, though darkness could exacerbate risks. In addition, girl respondents noted that violence was not only a problem for women and girls. They had heard of boys being taken by men and raped.

Within the household, discussions revealed tension around costs of energy, as well as the risk that male family members would take control over any income earned by women. Phones were also mentioned as a cause of tension when male family members would either want to use phones more or control content or communication of female household members.

Refugee Coping Mechanisms and Attitudes around GBV - Energy Access

Azraq. Coping mechanisms in response to public threats included women and girls traveling together or with a trusted male to services or locations deemed risky. Flashlights were also used by women and girls to reduce risks of harassment and attack in public spaces. For risks of intra-household violence, refugee women reported working to maintain a “nice” household environment with good food and dressing nicely, to reduce tensions. When intra-household conflicts do arise, neighbors are often called on as mediators. As a female community leader stated, “Some people are natural conflict resolution people.”
In Mafraq, females noted accompaniment by male family members and avoiding crowds in public spaces as primary coping mechanisms to reduce harassment and violence. Other coping mechanisms in public included using flashlights when walking in dark spaces, speaking on the phone while walking in threatening areas, and carrying a knife as a protection mechanism. One girl said, “I always carry a knife in my bag when I go out at night and I feel safe, just in case something happens.” Within the household, women and girls reported using a passcode on phones and discreetly using phones to reduce tension over phone use. Some women avoided working due to fear or the threat of men taking their earnings. While some girls reported that it was better to not go outside at night even if lighting were available (noting that it could attract people to you), another stated, “Sometimes we HAVE to go outside at night in desolate and crowded places. If there are lights, the chances of attack will be much less.”

Consulted humanitarian staff and GBV experts identified a number of risky coping mechanisms. One humanitarian worker stated, “In a protracted crisis like this one people are exhausting every coping mechanism. At the end if I have married out all my girls, what else do I have? Sexual exploitation and abuse is on the rise and we have an indication that, especially for female-headed households, they are at increased risk [of adopting negative coping strategies for] paying their rent and utilities.” Others noted a potential connection between energy access and coping mechanisms, but a lack of attention to that potential link. One aid worker stated, “Here refugee women have an opportunity to do home businesses, for example, food processing or tailoring. Who is paying attention to the energy implications for the success of home-based businesses?” Others noted that in the Jordan context, leveraging energy access for GBV and gender equality objectives was less about access and more about methods — for example, focusing on energy conservation and enabling women to participate in the installation of renewable energy equipment.

**Recommendations for Humanitarian Agencies from Refugee and Host Communities**

In Azraq, consulted refugees highlighted the need for extended hours of power, lighting, and water delivery. Many felt that increased access to incomes, work, and entertainment would reduce household tension and incidents of intrafamilial violence. One community leader highlighted the need for more anonymous forms of reporting when violence does occur.

In Mafraq, refugees and host community members highlighted the need for fully powered and climate-controlled schools, as well as support in powering homes for people with disabilities. Support for pumping and cooling drinking water was also requested. Beyond these needs, many saw opportunities and needs around energy efficiency. As one girl stated, “Instead of new projects, why don’t we sustain what we have – for example, turn off lights when nobody is in the room. Conservation – teaching about conservation is important – like turning on the water heater just for a few hours.” Others noted that energy saving would reduce economic pressure, and requested information about methods for energy saving.
Capacity Needs: Humanitarian Teams

Interviews with nine humanitarian practitioners working in Jordan revealed highly sophisticated energy access programming, as well as GBV mitigation initiatives. Many capacity gaps identified related to ensuring basic principles and risks from each field (GBV and energy) are integrated into holistic programming. Opportunities for capacity building include:

- **General lack of awareness of GBV/gender concepts among energy practitioners.** Some projects in Jordan working in the energy efficiency space struggled to effectively engage women and girls or identify risks faced by those groups. Other projects worked through these barriers with innovative solutions that can serve as models for other humanitarian response contexts.
- **A need for clear standards for energy programs and service delivery** that address shelter and WASH programs. Many interviewed practitioners felt that colleagues in WASH and shelter could benefit most from training and resources addressing the energy-GBV nexus.
- **Resources that clearly address energy-GBV at all stages of the program cycle for both camp and urban environments in high energy access environments.** Many interviewed practitioners noted the clear lack of resources around energy-GBV for contexts with wide grid and cooking fuel availability.

Conclusion

Consultations with affected populations in Azraq and Mafraq revealed a number of areas where energy access and GBV concerns can be better addressed and monitored by the humanitarian community. EEMRG hopes that this case study can be leveraged by stakeholders to garner support to execute enhanced programming to bridge gaps for refugees and host communities both in Jordan and across the globe.

Consultations with humanitarian practitioners in Jordan revealed that most practitioners were unsure about where to look for energy-gender capacity-building resources and programming tools, and unclear about best practices. Nearly all struggled to implement systemic, scaleable responses. At a global level, many leading standard humanitarian assessment and design tools insufficiently address energy-gender and energy-GBV issues.

EEMRG is currently working through the Global Plan of Action’s Technical Expertise and Capacity Building Working Group and a smaller advisory group of leading humanitarian agencies to begin to address these humanitarian-energy-gender capacity gaps. EEMRG is identifying clear opportunities for transformative impact for communities living through emergencies, especially for women and
girls. Global practitioner technical input into this report, the Uganda Case Study, and the global learning report will further identify opportunities, laying the groundwork for a humanitarian-energy-gender training curriculum, and standardized tools and best practices for serving communities, particularly women and girls, with effective design, monitoring, and programming interventions.

Annex: Individuals Consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Azraq Village 5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Elderly (55+ included in men and women)</td>
<td>LGBTI Persons with disabilities, included in men, women, girls, and boys</td>
<td>Family member with disability, including in men, women, girls, and boys</td>
<td>Total Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic data not captured on disability/if those consulted were caregivers of persons with disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mafraq</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0% persons w/ disabilities &amp; caretakers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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