Gender Mini-Workshop, October 12, 2016

Mini-Workshop objective – to dialogue on the gender analysis process. This workshop will focus on "What do you know/not know about the gender context that can impede or facilitate progress along the project Theory of Change?" We will focus on the "gender context" piece of this question and focus more on TOC in another session.

Mini-Workshop output – TOPS to pull together a short documents on key points

How are we defining "gender context?" Multi-layered: National policies, cultural norms in program area (participants, partners, and stakeholders), organizational policies and norms, program tone (supportive, neutral via activities as well as staff). Are there other pieces to take into consideration in defining the gender context?

- The context involves the points mentioned above, but it depends what we are focusing on for the program. We need to be aware of policies, but we may not focus on policy work.
- Theory of Change could help with narrowing this and build off of this by looking at context in general.
- The tone of donor initiatives and mission in-country may not be consistent with local "climate" or aligned as closely with HQ.
- Example from Rwanda: A woman was appointed as head of the Ministry of Agriculture and a gender analysis was completed. This was her initiative not a requirement.
- Social and cultural norms are not static, they change. What are the current and past contexts? What about generational differences? Religion also plays a role even in the same program area.
- In Kyrgystan, if someone asks the question "Are men and women equal?" The answer is "yes." "Discreet norms" are present. Traditional gender roles exist. Staff and beneficiaries play a role in help defining these "discreet norms".
- The definition itself of gender could be different. I.e. Zambia - sex versus gender. Women can do something, but is it something they do on a regular basis (the answer is no)? Gender - it's something that somebody does.
- Language plays a role too.

When do we need to know this info? (1) Depending on organizational experience, at least some of this should be known at the program design stage, (2) adapt and learn over the course of the project.

- FEWSNet is a tool to know the ongoing IPC. We don't have one for gender. We don't know the current gender status within a country, region, or context.
- Gender Development Index (GDI): rating system. Same group that developed the Human Development Index (HDI), but it is limited at this time (nothing before 2010).
- Gender Inequality Index (GII)
- Take HDI and GII to see the lag between them. HDI does not have a disaggregation function.

Who is responsible for knowing/understanding this piece? A team: HQ gender advisor, program gender staff, COP, tech leads, all staff. . .

- Key technical advisors who lead tech areas in TOC should be aware of it. They should be responsible for passing along. It's everybody's job.

- Ex: It is understood that people should implement it, but everyone turns to the gender specialist. It is not really understood. How do we go from theory to practice?
- Each team needs to have targets. Until they are held responsible (on paper), it is not going to be a reality that it needs to get done.
- Leadership is crucial in leading the gender focus. It can involve training, other activities.
- In trainings, demonstrating impact and showing that gender integration can make impacts on other parts of the program is the key to helping people realize the important of including gender (rather than thinking "Oh it's a gender thing.").
- The right targets need to be set and the right activities need to be measured. It's a tricky balance.
- Gender needs to be tailored to the TOC so it is put on everyone's agenda.
- One can't lose sight of technical objectives while trying to integrate gender. It is a marriage. Hard to communicate that piece as well.

What resources are we using to define the gender context?

National policies: in-country staff, World Bank data (http://wbl.worldbank.org/), inquiries to ministries

Cultural norms in the program area: staff and partner interviews, lit review, past experience

Organizational policies and norms: Review of HR docs, understanding of standard operating procedures. (i.e. Do all staff receive training? Do family friendly policies exist?)

Program tone: usually gained by personal interaction, review of proposal, participation in start-up workshops

- Laws are really based on social norms which can help us understand why laws are created.
- There may be business practices - i.e. banking regulations which can prevent people from accessing services. Informal businesses - are women "allowed" to buy/sell in the market. Intermediaries are an example. If they are use to dealing with men, they may not want to deal with women. Traditional leadership may "enforce" practices. Land ownership is another example. It is good to look at the nexus of informal and formal.
- The gender advisor is responsible. M&E staff may be involved.
- A holistic understanding comes from layered assessments and analyses processes. If sector leads can participate even better.
- One organization has some standardized onboarding.
- How much should there be an expectation that there is some specialized staff and training? If someone doesn't think something is a problem, then they will not put efforts in reaching a goal. However, reading an onboarding session or reading a policy becomes a checklist activity. There is value in letting people know what the organization expects. If someone sees something (can see change with beneficiaries), they may come on board with the action. TOC - this can help with demonstrating the TOC. Gender audits are really useful in seeing what a project can see what has happened so far.

Rhetorical question: Why do we need to understand the gender context as it relates to the program? So that we know what may "impede or facilitate progress along the project TOC." Our hope is that gender is integrated in the TOC. Ongoing programs may not have a TOC. TOCs from a year or two ago may have gender as a cross-cutting theme.

- TOC development is fuzzy. How will we work and revisit within the programs? People have very different beliefs about them. TOC is really a strategy to obtain activities. How can you make your pathways within your strategies or eliminate things that will impede it? (while setting realistic expectations); based on context, what can be expected around changing GBV.
- One option - if it isn't written into an agreement, it won't get done. It is dependent on the donor and the type of project (learning, development, emergency).
- FFP requirement of review is annual.
- Is the review of the TOC in workplans? Maybe in the future.
- MYAPs didn't have to include TOC and then it was needed (simple graphic - house of building blocks). Now it is very extensive. Internal TOCs exist. We are following FFP's lead.
- Revisiting the TOC is really donor-driven.

How will having info on the gender context help in the gender analysis process?

- Past and existing projects have that information, but we don't have outputs associated. Follow-on projects help, but institutional knowledge is lost.
- We have indicators and data and nothing is done with the data. And it takes time to understand what happens with gender. There is a disconnect. The short duration can be an issue as well.
- Organizations don't necessarily have capacity statements.

Additional resources:

- http://www.womanstats.org/
- http://datatopics.worldbank.org/gender/
- https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/23436/9781464805561.pdf
- http://www.fao.org/gender-landrights-database/en/
- http://landwise.resourceequity.org/
- https://gender.cgiar.org/
- https://data.humdata.org/
- https://www.dhsprogram.com/
- http://www.ifpri.org/topic/weai-resource-center