



# **ENGENDERING G-RAP**

## **Processes, Activities and the Way Forward**

**Esther Ofei-Aboagye (PhD)**

**January 2008**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
1. Introduction	2
1.1 Background	2
1.2 The Process	2
	4
2. Extent of Achievement of Activities and Results	
2.1 Development and Use of Gender Policy	4
2.2 Amendment of PMT Toolbox and Procedures	5
2.3 Awareness Enhancement Trajectory	6
2.4 Policy Appraisal Capacity Development	8
2.5 Review of G-RAP Policies and Practices	8
3. Results of the Engendering Effort	9
4. The Unfinished Business on the Engendering Agenda	11
5. Key Issues and Dilemmas	12
6. The Way Forward	13
References	15

## APPENDICES

1. Summary of the activities, expected results and achievements	16
2. Members of Gender Steering Committee and List of Gender Link Persons	18
3. Terms of Reference for the gender Specialist	19
4. Proposals for amending EOI and application format	20
5. Highlights from encounters with Funders and inputs for the process	22

## BOXES

Box 1: Opportunities for Updating Stakeholders on Engendering Process	7
Box 2: The ISODEC Experience	9
Box 3: The CDD Experience	10
Box 4: The Experience of the Ark Foundation	10
Box 5: Unfinished Business on the Engendering Agenda	11

# **ENGENDERING THE GHANA RESEARCH AND ADVOCACY PROGRAM G-RAP**

## **Report on the Processes, Activities and the Way Forward**

### **1. Introduction**

#### **1.2 Background**

The Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme (G-RAP) seeks to enhance pro-poor accountability on the part of the government of Ghana as well as development partners. It was established in 2003 to provide an alternative avenue for supporting research and advocacy work in Ghana by building the capacity of organizations engaged in these activities to acquire relevant evidence on economic, social, political and security issues and disseminate the same through advocacy and coalitions (G-RAP, 2005).

Amongst others, the programme seeks to provide a counter-balance to Multi-Donor Budgetary Support (MDBS) through the work of research and advocacy organizations (RAOs) and monitor the impacts of development interventions as well as progress against national commitments and obligations. This has been pursued mainly through G-RAP funding grants.

Against these intentions, ensuring responsiveness to the needs of all sections of the population and the need for disaggregated and differentiated assessment and analysis is critical. There is considerable evidence now that pursuing gender equity, towards achieving gender equality is critical for achieving pro-poor sustainable development. Without gender-sensitivity and dis-aggregation of the impacts of poverty-related interventions, the work of RAOs could not be considered complete.

It is in this regard that G-RAP initiated a process to promote gender sensitivity in the programme generally and ensure that the studies, other outputs and advocacy of RAOs were more gender-sensitive.

#### **1.2 The Process**

At the start-up of the programme, when the first set of grants were awarded, it became evident that gender concerns, though a critical part of development and poverty reduction, had not been adequately catered for. To examine the requirements for gender equality and women's rights in the programme, a gender audit and programme review was commissioned and undertaken by Dr. Agnes Apusigah. The study was intended to review the design, structures, systems and practices of G-RAP and derive lessons and recommendations that would inform an action plan for engendering the programme (Apusigah, 2006).

The study report indicated that strong policy-related efforts were required to articulate institutional commitment to gender equality, women's rights and social equity. It indicated that the design of G-RAP revealed acceptability of pro-poor programming but lacked gender considerations and there was a general absence of gender

requirements. Successful RAOs showed minimal gender components. It concluded that the existing initiatives needed to be explored and expanded towards eventual integration of gender issues in overall programme. The study indicated that avenues existed for building, utilizing gender skills and knowledge for enriching research and enhancing advocacy (Apusigah, 2006).

Dr. Apusigah's recommendations included improving the design of the programme to include affirmative action and targeting more organizations working on gender equality and women's rights for support. The report also advocated strengthening the gender-sensitivity capacities of contracted RAOs. RAOs gave their mandate for the programme to initiate efforts to engender G-RAP. To this end, a number of mechanisms were put in place as follows.

A gender steering committee (GSC) was established and allocated an operational budget of \$20,000. Arising from the Apusigah (2006) study, the GSC identified various activities, products and processes to facilitate engendering including

- The development and use of a gender policy
- Amendment of PMT toolbox and procedures
- Gender awareness enhancement with executive directors, gender link persons from RAOs; the gender link persons would be the focal persons in RAOs and the drivers of change and use action learning sessions to build their capacities, track their work and share insights
- Policy appraisal and capacity development in relation to gender
- Review of performance on gender in RAOs' policies and practices.
- Monitoring indicators and gender best practices.

A summary of the activities, expected results, achievements and outstanding actions of the engendering process has been presented in Appendix One below.

A gender specialist, Dr. Esther Ofei-Aboagye, was contracted to work with the Gender Steering Committee towards achieving the products (Minutes of Gender Steering Committee Meeting of 10<sup>th</sup> May, 2007). The terms of reference for the position have been presented in Appendix Two. The key duties and responsibilities included the following:

- Coordinate and manage the engendering activities of G-RAP
- Develop and implement training modules on gender awareness and gender skills building training modules/seminars on gender awareness
- Organize training activities for key stakeholders
- Review funding structures, processes and instruments
- Liaise, collaborate and consult with the Gender Steering Committee (GSC), Programme Management Team (PMT) and the RAOs as well as other gender consultants, with a view to facilitating the engendering process
- Arrange and attend meetings, producing reports of meetings as necessary
- Develop instruments for systematically collecting and sharing information with the GSC.

A major strategy for engendering was to encourage the RAOs to identify gender link persons around whom the engendering process could take place within the respective organizations. These persons were expected to support the engendering process in three ways (a) providing critical information required to track the engendering process

(b) participating in capacity-building events such as the action learning sets and workshops (c) initiate action on engendering processes within their organizations (See Appendix Three for list of gender link persons).

During the year, some exploratory exercises were undertaken. These included

- what resources were in the G-RAP community that can be shared in relation to gender learning
- The perspectives various RAOs have on gender and its place in the whole enterprise
- What structures the RAOs have for mainstreaming gender (focal persons, requirements, target-setting, performance standards, capacity-building provisions and linkages they maintain for gender learning and mainstreaming);
- The existing political will to mainstream gender (recognition of national commitments, provision of resources, actual commitments of spending, achievements and efforts to deal with resistance to change).

To facilitate these studies,

- Interviews were conducted with representatives of funders as stakeholders to gain some insights into their perspectives;
- Self-assessment undertaken by RAOs in the periodic reports to G-RAP were analyzed; and
- An in-depth survey instrument was administered to the gender link persons of eleven (11) RAOs.

## **2. Extent of Achievement of Identified Activities and Results**

As evident in Appendix One, there were important achievements in each of the five activity areas. The highlights are presented below.

### **2.6 Development and Use of Gender Policy**

A gender policy was developed for use by the RAOs and other stake-holding organizations interested in G-RAP in October, 2007. It consisted of

- A Definition of Terms
- Background, Rationale and Principles
- Goal, Aim and Objectives
- A Position Statement
- Priority Areas including Organizational Culture, Staff Development, Sexual Harassment, Governance Structures, Resources, Capacity Building, Monitoring and Evaluation
- An Implementation Strategy composed of the following: support for Gender Work, Scheduled Programmes, Collaboration, Decision-Making, Capacity Building, Enforcement Mechanisms, Resource Allocation, Monitoring and Evaluation, Change Management

(Ghana Research and Advocacy and Research Programme, Draft Gender Policy, October, 2007).

While the Activity Plan provided for generation of feedback, revision, validation workshop and finalization of the Gender Policy, this is yet to be done fully. Gender

link persons have provided important feedback on the draft gender policy and how it could be used. They saw it primarily as a framework or guideline for promoting change. It could be used

- As a model or guide of what a gender policy looks like; it still an unknown concept in many (mainstream) RAOs; gender link persons can use it to show what a gender policy is;
- As an input for RAOs own documents; RAOs may adapt parts, elaborating sections of it as may be required; the content could be used to enrich the gender policies being developed/reviewed by RAOs;
- As resources for orientation processes for RAOs joining the GRAP Programme; the gender policy and responsiveness checklists would be particularly useful in this regard;
- As a call to RAOs to re-examine trends and processes in their own systems.

However, they suggested that the gender policy document should be seen more as a good practice guide than a binding requirement. To make it more user-friendly, a guidebook or handbook to demonstrate how each section can be developed further by RAOs would be required.

Members of the GSC also commented on proposals under the Implementation Strategy Section which stated that G-RAP will be guided by a 40:60 gender equity commitments in pursuit of the various components. It was indicated that this ratio could not be applicable across board especially with respect to RAOs.

## **2.7 Amendment of PMT Toolbox and Procedures**

Programme tools and instruments were reviewed and proposals were made for revising the contract package, assessment and narrative. It was proposed that a paragraph would be included in the notes accompanying the expression of interest. In the template that prospective RAOs would be required to use to express their interest, two questions are posed for the organizations to indicate how they demonstrate commitment to gender equity and to describe their intentions for promoting gender equity in their organization or in programme activities.

Amendments to the application format that would be sent to short-listed applicants include a more detailed series of questions to encourage the RAOs to explore their experiences in organizational and programme engendering, their capacity and preparedness to undergo a gender self-assessment.

Proposals were also made that at the negotiation stage, RAOs would be encouraged to develop a gender action plan for the grant period with the support of gender backstopping consultants. The proposed format for the gender action plan has been presented in Appendix Four below.

Checklists for engendering the PMT and grant applications were also developed. Issues and standards for the PMT related to establishment and programming activities. Establishment-related issues included ensuring gender equality in the mandate, representation in governance structures, resource allocation and decision-making. The checklist also provided pointers for ensuring gender-sensitive organizational cultures. Programming standards consisted of ensuring that

- Programme support furthers gender equality and women rights
- Gender equality and women's rights organizations benefit
- Gender analysis is employed in assessments.

The proposed checklist for grant applications was aimed at assessing the following:

- Grant applicants demonstrate efforts towards gender equality and/or rights
- Gender equity indicators are applied in the evaluation process
- Decisions are informed by gender considerations
- Equitable distribution of grants for mainstream and gender equality/women's rights organizations.

The gender-responsiveness checklists also offer an additional resource for RAOs to undertake self-assessment related to the extent and progress of gender-sensitivity in their organizations as well as provide insights into the possibilities and standards they could aspire to (G-RAP Gender Responsiveness Checklists: Research and Advocacy Organizations, Programme Management Team and Grant Applications, 2007).

In July 2007, the Programme also introduced five (5) self-assessment questions in annual reporting format. These were:

- Do you have a gender policy?
- How do you assess your organization's gender policy/practice in relation to (a) recruitment (b) promotion (c) development/training (d) harassment (e) programming?
- How is the policy/practice monitored?
- How could you improve upon your policy/practice?
- Any other issues in relation to gender?

The answers provided indications of what RAOs had done to acknowledge and take account of gender in their operations and programming, even in the absence of organizational gender policies. However, there were indications that there was need to build consensus on the place and use of gender policies and encourage self-monitoring on engendering process and gender practice. RAOs generally recognized and provided for improving gender practice including documenting their gender practices or developing policy guidelines; developing additional instruments such as strategic plans and strategic guidelines and learning from the experience of other organizations policies and practices. The third major area was in giving their staff further training and exposure on gender issues.

The retention of these questions in RAOs' narrative reporting requirements will allow an additional facility for keeping their attention on engendering processes (See "Engendering G-RAP: Inputs for Available for the Gender Policy Development" July 19, 2007 Working Session and Minutes of Gender Steering Committee Meeting held on July 31, 2007).

## **2.8 Awareness Enhancement Trajectory**

In relation to training and skills-building, a number of activities were undertaken, including two (2) main working events involving gender link persons and members of the Gender Steering Committee (GSC).

The first working session was held on 19th July 2007. It introduced the gender specialist and provided opportunity for all parties to be updated on gender-related activities and inputs from the RAOs in relation to engendering G-RAP. It also provided an opportunity to set the agenda with gender link persons and the discuss requirements for the gender policy. Activities included a review of the recommendations by the gender analysis report (Apusigah 2006) and the results of the various surveys; and a discussion on gender policies, their structuring and purposes.

The second workshop was organized on 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> August, 2007. It involved seven (7) Gender Link Persons and four (4) members of the GSC. The session was intended to establish a common understanding of gender policies and undertake an analysis of the gender circumstances of RAOs. Activities included a review of the principles of action learning; establishing an understanding of gender and gender relations and how it plays out in organizational and personal lives; and a discussion on key gender issues and definitions; and what constituted good gender policies. Activities included plenary and group discussions.

Some of the discussions related to whether a gender policy was a pre-requisite for gender-effectiveness in G-RAP and whether good practice would suffice. It was agreed that a written down document, pulling together and amending directives in organizational handbooks was useful. The workshop proposed that the key elements of a gender policy included a statement of the problem; clear objectives; missions; targets and implementation guidelines.

Some of the discussions there included the fact that equity was the process of reaching the goal of equality or equal treatment. Affirmative action was required to provide corrective action. The culture of organizations greatly influenced effective implementation of gender equality efforts and leadership was an important issue.

Between June 2007 and February 2008, a series of action learning sets were conducted largely with gender link persons. While these action learning sets were intended to provide an environment in which mutual learning could take place amongst the gender link persons, these events were intended to monitoring what was happening in the organizations and equip link persons with strategies to sustain the momentum of organizational engendering.

At various periods, presentations were made to update various stakeholders on the engendering process, including the following indicated in Box One below:

**Box 1: Opportunities for Updating Stakeholders on Engendering Process**

- Get-together with the Chief Executives of RAOs, Gender Link Persons, PMT and GSC Members on 12<sup>th</sup> September, 2007 to update them on progress and provide a context for processes their Link Persons may be initiating and to solicit their commitment for ensuring the process.
- The G-RAP Annual RAOs Convention in November, 2007. The purpose of this presentation was to update participants on the process and to solicit their commitment for its continuation. It outlined the activities that had been embarked on during the year and presented the views of the gender link persons as well as the priorities for the way forward.

- Meeting of representatives of RAOs on February 21, 2008 in the context of changing programme management and governance arrangements
- Collaboration with the Ghanaian print media to put in articles on Engendering G-RAP in national newspapers in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Weeks of March, 2008.

## 2.9 Policy Appraisal Capacity Development

A review of the reports submitted by RAOs to the G-RAP Programme between 2005 and 2007 raises various considerations for enhancing gender advocacy in policy making:

- Recognizing the gender dimensions of their research interests and priorities (economic development including public resource accountability, security and peace building, government and civil society collaboration and citizen's participation in deepening governance)
- Getting the relevant data to support advocacy including orienting existing research efforts to collect and provide data for differential analysis; this includes locating existing secondary information as well as research undertaken by women's rights-oriented organizations
- Developing the advocacy strategy including knowing what change is required;
- [For the women's rights oriented organizations] knowing where to take evidence of gender discrimination and proposals for change
- Appreciating the stakeholder environment: the gender dimensions of differential participation, levels and location of power and influence in policy making
- Advocacy strategy planning: including message formulation, targeting, effective networking and formation of alliances and coalitions
- Putting relevant information across to the parties that can use it including making effective use of the media.

## 2.10 Review of G-RAP Policies and Practices

The engendering plan made provision for the compilation of gender monitoring data based on a quick monitoring scan. A specific monitoring scan has not yet been undertaken nor the compilation of quantitative monitoring data.

However, a number of activities were undertaken at the start of the assignment to assess the environment and resources for engendering within the Programme and with the different stake-holding institutions. These included a survey to

- establish the mechanisms various RAOs had for mainstreaming gender (including focal persons, organizational standards and requirements; target setting; and capacity building arrangements);
- the existing political will to mainstream gender in RAOs including such as the extent to which RAOs recognized national commitments, provided resources for gender work and efforts in place to deal with resistance to change;
- existing gender resources in the G-RAP community (including policy guidelines, strategies and tools) that could be drawn upon.

These activities were in recognition of the different levels of gender awareness amongst RAOs and the fact that some organizations did more work related to gender, equity and women's rights than others. It was important to gain a baseline view of

what was going to be changed. It was also important to establish the resources in the G-RAP community that could be shared for gender learning.

Interviews were also conducted with representatives of funders as stakeholders to gain some insights into their perspectives as stakeholders and generate inputs for the process. The interviews assessed the (a) the Rationale and Nature of Funding Agencies' Support for G-RAP; (b) Expected Outputs and Impacts of the Initiative from the Funders' Perspective (c) Funding Agencies' Position on Gender Mainstreaming and Practicalization in Assistance to Ghana (d) Agencies' Actual Support for Gender-Related Interventions and Potential Linkage with G-RAP (e) Ideal Visions of Gender-Mainstreaming (f) Possible Actions to Mainstream Gender into G-RAP (g) Other Resources to Support Engendering Process Beyond Financial and Technical Assistance. These consultations were undertaken in May and June of 2007 and the highlights presented in Appendix Five.

### **3. Results of the Engendering Effort**

The gender-related interventions have succeeded to some extent. Through the action learning sets, it is evident that different RAOS have initiated efforts to engender their work. Gender link persons have briefed their organizations' professional and management staff on gender, their learning at the workshops, as well as the availability of products RAOs can use such as the gender checklist, and the gender policy. RAOs have taken steps to organizing gender training for their staff as well as implementing gender recommendations that have been made.

The action learning sets have provided invaluable opportunities for sharing knowledge and strategizing for action in a non-threatening and mutually supporting way. Interesting reports have been received on the gender-related discussions and "spaces" that have been created for these discussions in the Institute for Economic Affairs (IEA), the Integrated Social Development Centre (ISODEC) and the Ghana Centre for Democratic Development (CDD). Basics of "what gender is" have been shared amongst staff in these organizations and relevant training events proposed. CEOs have demonstrated considerable commitment and support of their gender link persons. Processes in RAOs have been presented in Boxes 2, 3 and 4 below.

#### **Box 2: The ISODEC Experience**

The gender-related objectives that the **Integrated Social Development Centre (ISODEC)** has identified include ensuring that the organization is an equal opportunities employer by creating a work environment that is free from gender discrimination and abuse; and employing best practices for affirming gender equity in the organizational framework and relations. To this end, it seeks to develop and sustain programmes for gender mainstreaming in all organizational and programming processes. ISODEC has implemented a gender audit it commissioned in 2007 and has conducted a gender learning workshop for its staff. It is developing a gender policy document and intends to identify any gaps and adverse practices that may exist in ISODEC's processes, systems and work. It envisages that capacity-enhancement of staff for gender mainstreaming will continue as required.

Courtesy: Gabriel Sosu and Chris Dadzie, Gender Link Persons, ISODEC

### **Box 3: The CDD Experience**

**The Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD)** has worked hard to strengthen its gender focus. It currently has a gender desk, sexual harassment policy and has conducted a gender sensitization workshop to educate its staff including the executive director. In 2007, the Center collaborated with the Parliamentary Select Committee on Constitutional, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs on a monitoring tour of communities in the three northern regions to learn about Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) and the implications of the proposed Criminal Code (Amendment) Bill, 2006. Their findings influenced the final law that was passed, emphasizing the criminality of the practice of FGM. The Center also organized a roundtable discussion on human trafficking, highlighting the situation of young girls trafficked to Europe for prostitution purposes. In January, 2008, the Center engaged with women-oriented organizations such as WILDAF, ABANTU and Ark Foundation to solicit inputs for affirmative action on women in parliament to be incorporated in the round four of the Afro-barometer Survey (AB R4). The Center has initiated an organizational gender policy document to take account of gender issues and provide a guide for the way forward.

Courtesy: Regina Tetteh-Amanfo, Gender Link Person, CDD-Ghana

The action learning sets have built a system of mutual support amongst members, sharing strategies and experiences that have fostered confidence amongst them to attempt tried and tested methods and know that they are not alone in their efforts. There is a sense of a network amongst members beyond the meetings.

### **Box 4: The Experience of the Ark Foundation**

**The Ark Foundation** is a women's human right organization with a gender equality vision. It works from a women-centered approach in its internal processes as well as in the delivery of its programmes and services. Its' Organizational Manual of Policies and Procedures (OMPP) captures its stated approach to leadership and service delivery, and this informs policy direction on issues such as sexual harassment, work place violence, HIV/AIDs and staff development among others.

Participation in the engendering process has been both beneficial and challenging. Through discussion and learning, the Ark has decided to review its OMPP in order to strengthen sections that would reinforce its vision and approach. It has also decided to ensure consistent training of staff to enhance their capacity to articulate women's rights, empowerment and gender equality principles and strengthen gender analysis across programme and internal processes. On the other hand, the challenge arises as The Ark seems to be a lone voice advocating recognition of the differential needs of organizations in the engendering process. For instance, the Ark's insistence, that it does not need a specific gender policy to articulate its gender equality and women's empowerment goals has been an uphill task in the learning process. But all in all, it has been a worthwhile process!

Courtesy: Blessing Agboada, Gender Link Person, The Ark Foundation

Apart from sharing progress and gaining peer inputs, action learning sessions provided opportunities to review proposed instruments and programme toolkit amendments including the draft gender policy (for instance, the session of 20<sup>th</sup> November, 2007).

Apart from the training materials developed for the two working sessions conducted in July 2007 and August, 2007, other instruments were formulated at the request of specific RAOs. For instance, products were developed for the Centre for Democratic Development (CDD) for a workshop conducted on 26<sup>th</sup> November, 2007 (Handout on Gender, Gender-Sensitivity and Development).

#### **4. The Unfinished Business on the Engendering Agenda**

In spite of the achievements indicated above, some of the envisaged activities and targets could not be achieved. They are still relevant and are presented in the Box Five below.

#### **Box 5: The Unfinished Business on the Engendering Agenda**

##### **1. Development and Use of Gender Policy**

- Further discussion required on the gender policy
- Conduct of stakeholder workshop on the policy
- Finalization and wide dissemination of the gender policy
- Further discussion on RAOs requirements on Gender and HRM

##### **2. Amendment of PMT Toolbox and Procedures**

- Testing of the proposed amendments
- Generation and incorporation of comments from stakeholders

##### **3. Awareness Enhancement Trajectory**

- Identification of and agreement on monitoring indicators
- Collection of monitoring data vis-a-vis survey data
- Continuation of Action Learning Sets with Links
- Review of role of GSC and agreeing on a coordinating mechanism for engendering

##### **4. Policy Appraisal and Development**

- Consultation on policy capacity appraisal and priorities for capacity development RAOs
- Drafting of policy appraisal module
- Conduct of workshop using module
- Monitoring and coaching on the job

##### **5. Review of G-RAP Policies and Practices**

- Collection of monitoring data from surveyed RAOs
- Conduct of monitoring scan
- Identification of gender monitoring indicators

## **5. Key Issues and Dilemmas**

While the process provided several important lessons and gains, it was not without its challenges. The course of initiating action, establishing how to proceed with RAOs, finding mutually acceptable objectives and harmonizing expectations were more involving than expected.

While the key message of the importance of engendering the products as well as the operations of RAOs has been reinforced through the processes, there are certain dilemmas that need to be resolved. These have emerged from the reflections of Gender Link Persons and interactions with different stakeholders (Funders, RAOs Chief Executives and Gender Link Persons). They include the following.

While, RAOs owe it to the people of Ghana to demonstrate some gender-sensitivity in their work, the engendering process must involve moral suasion rather than compulsion. From an interaction with RAOs, there were indications that it would be appreciated that engendering did not introduce new conditionalities for accessing funding. The perception of “conditionalities” defeats some of the essential tenets underlying the operation of G-RAP. This spirit was reflected in the Mid-Term Review. Rather, an incentive mechanism is required to invite beneficiary organizations to benefit from the capacity building processes and to access knowledge and tools for engendering their work. For the time being, RAOs should self-commit to some actions.

On the other hand, given the importance of gender to achieving pro-poor development, how can we ensure that gender remains on the agenda? Perhaps, it would be useful for the programme and community of RAOs (ensured in the new governance structure) to have some basic expectations of RAOs in relation to gender.

Gender-sensitivity is desired not only the work of the RAOs but within their work environments. While various RAOs have focused on ensuring parity in key positions, they should endeavour to go beyond recruiting females for key positions. While that is useful for their visibility and harnessing their perspectives, this move does not necessarily achieve gender-sensitivity in the work of RAOs. RAOs should examine how their organizational gender-sensitivity influences the quality of work they turn out.

Unfortunately, the commitment self-regulation requires cannot be assumed. In spite of the on-going process, some RAOs have not participated in the action learning sets in spite of several invitations. Out of a possible 22 participants, the learning sets have attracted an average attendance of 12. It is not clear which engendering processes there are in their organizations, the practices and lessons they have, the tools that are available to them and what they have gained by way of methodology (in research and advocacy) that could have been shared.

If self-regulation is to be effective in the engendering process, RAOs must agree on some benchmarks/basic criteria. There have to be clear mechanisms for measuring progress, clear indicators against which progress will be measured and which will

allow for consistent assessment, attribution, derivation of general lessons as well as the identification of influencing factors, amongst others.

Another dilemma is related to the extent of involvement of the Funders in the engendering process. Given that G-RAP arrangements are supposed to be demand or RAO-driven, it is difficult to establish a clear role for the Funders. To date, development partners have been represented on the Steering Committee by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). A representative of Department for International Development (DfID) has been in attendance at some GSC meetings. During the year's work, the consultant visited various representatives of Funders to elicit their views on their involvement.

The functional changes in the G-RAP programme management arrangements, as well as having a new firm performing them have implications for the continuation of engendering G-RAP. The new responsibilities of the programme manager places more emphasis on fund-management rather than facilitation, requiring innovative measures for coordinating the engendering process. The new programme manager's track record, interest and capacity for gender issues could influence (though indirectly) it could play in following up on the process.

There has been some resistance where some stakeholders perceived the engendering process as having being hijacked by the gender "lobby". Some participants noted that there were so many social relations issues (class, religion, ethnicity, disability and others) that a strong case can be made for ensuring inclusion of these in the work of RAOs as well as in their internal operations.

The fundamental question therefore, is to determine what it means to engender G-RAP in the light of the changing arrangements for managing the Programme and roles of the various interest groups (the fund-governance structures, Funders, beneficiary RAOs, other non-beneficiary RAOs). Should the vision of engendering remain the same? How do we apply the lessons learned from the one year's work of engendering?

## **6. The Way Forward**

The programme encourages RAOs to demonstrate gender-sensitivity in their work and to "walk their talk", in their organizational development. It makes various provisions to support gender-related capacity-building. The programme now has a draft gender policy. The now active network of Gender Link Persons meets regularly in Action Learning Sets for purposes of experience-sharing, peer review, problem-solving and capacity-building. Periodically, RAOs may organize a gender dialogue and specific skills building sessions related to gender.

Indeed, it is in the interest of RAOs to demonstrate that they are doing gender-sensitive work or have something to show as their commitment to being responsive to the concerns of different sections of the population.

Apart from addressing the unfinished activities in the original engendering work-plan, there are other priorities that need to be addressed. They include the following.

- a) There is the need to forge a common understanding of gender in the programme. In other words, in the light of the purpose and experience of the stakeholders in G-RAP, what does engendering the programme mean to RAOs, PMT and Funders?
- b) Fostering continuing commitment from the CEOs of RAOs as champions of pro-poor development and to seek some commitments to gender equity.
- c) Identification of gender indicators to measure and monitor progress in the work of RAOs;
- d) Conduct of learning events around engendering and advocacy in such areas as social development; economic issues including public resource accountability, multi-donor budget support; security and peace; government-civil society collaboration, citizens' participation and good governance; poverty related research and advocacy for pro-poor policy making.
- e) Periodic events including retreats for continuing capacity development in gender for gender focal persons and staff of RAOs.
- f) Capacity development for RAOs to undertake gender-related policy advocacy based on gaps identified from the performance reports.
- g) Identifying and agreeing on the process by which there would be induction of the new RAOs into G-RAP in relation to the gender requirements and agreements.
- h) Reviewing how the role the Gender Steering Committee (GSC) has been playing will be played. Based on the experiences of the past year and the GSC's efforts to oversee the implementation of an engendering agenda, how is this going to be continued and future processes monitored?
- i) Continuation of action learning sets to monitor and share the lessons, challenges and best practices in processes of engendering within RAOs.
- j) Identifying an entity (entities) that would take on the hosting, convening, administering and facilitating role for the Action Learning Sets and related activities for building gender capacity for RAOs.
- k) Exploring the extent to which the Action Learning Sets as a facility could benefit the larger RAO community (beyond those benefiting from G-RAP resources).

## References

- Apusigah, Agnes Atia (2006) Gender Analysis of the Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme (G-RAP). G-RAP Accra, March 2006
- Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme (2007) Engendering Gender: Gender Responsiveness Checklists for the Programme Management Team and Grant Applications. Accra
- Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme (2007) Gender Steering Committee: “Progress Report on Engendering G-RAP-Period: 11<sup>th</sup> May To 14<sup>th</sup> June, 2007”. Accra
- Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme (2007) “Engendering G-RAP: Inputs Available for the Gender Policy Development”. Accra
- Ghana Research and Advocacy and Research Programme, Draft Gender Policy, October, 2007

**APPENDIX 1:  
SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES, EXPECTED RESULTS AND  
ACHIEVEMENTS FOR THE ENGENDERING PROCESS**

Activity	Expected Results	Achievements	Outstanding
<b>1. Development and Use of Gender Policy</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Stakeholder survey on gender policy for G-RAP</li> <li>▪ Draft Policy Statement</li> <li>▪ Draft G-RAP Gender Policy</li> <li>▪ Stakeholder Feedback on Policy</li> <li>▪ Stakeholder Workshop on Policy</li> <li>▪ Finalization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gender policy inputs collected</li> <li>▪ Policy Statement drafted</li> <li>▪ Engendered HRM Policy drafted</li> <li>▪ Stakeholders receive feedback format</li> <li>▪ Both policies discussed and amended</li> <li>▪ Final documents available and disseminated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Stakeholder survey undertaken and policy inputs generated</li> <li>▪ Gender policy drafted and circulated</li> <li>▪ Some feedback generated from Gender Link Persons</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Further discussion required on the gender policy</li> <li>▪ Conduct of stakeholder workshop on the policy</li> <li>▪ Finalization and wide dissemination of the gender policy</li> <li>▪ Further discussion on RAOs requirements on Gender and HRM</li> </ul>
<b>2. Amendment of PMT Toolbox and Procedures</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Application and contract package review</li> <li>▪ Assessment and narrative reporting package review</li> <li>▪ Grant-making gender checklist</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Amended grant access toolkit</li> <li>▪ Amended grant management toolkit</li> <li>▪ Checklist for governance structures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Key questions introduced in the annual reporting format</li> <li>▪ Questions proposed for the expression of interest and application formats</li> <li>▪ Checklists developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Testing of the proposed amendments (see appendix four)</li> <li>▪ Comments from stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>3. Awareness Enhancement Trajectory</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ First communication to RAO Executive Directors</li> <li>▪ Second communication to Executive Directors, Donors, PMT</li> <li>▪ RAOs Gender Link Persons network established</li> <li>▪ Gender and Action Learning Workshop designed</li> <li>▪ Links meet with GS, GSC and PMT (briefing and sharing)</li> <li>▪ Gender Action Learning, 3-Day</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ RAOs aware of the engendering start</li> <li>▪ Stakeholders informed of the process and needs</li> <li>▪ RAOs have appointed dedicated person</li> <li>▪ Links receive information prior to workshop</li> <li>▪ Coherent workshop programme</li> <li>▪ Links discussed process and accept role</li> <li>▪ Approach shared and adopted at workshop</li> <li>▪ Monitoring data and best practices examples</li> <li>▪ Minutes of GSC-GS-PMT meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ RAO executive directors communicated with on the engendering process</li> <li>▪ Stakeholders updated periodically on the progress of the engendering process (Encounters with RAOs CEOs, RAO Conventions, GSC Meetings)</li> <li>▪ Gender Link Persons identified and network established</li> <li>▪ Action learning sets initiated and monthly meetings conducted</li> <li>▪ Two (2) workshops conducted</li> <li>▪ Regular GSC-GS-PMT meetings organized</li> <li>▪ RAO Case studies on experiences with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identification of and agreement on monitoring indicators</li> <li>▪ Collection of monitoring data vis a vis survey data</li> <li>▪ Continuation of Action Learning Sets with Links</li> <li>▪ Review of role of GSC and agreeing on a coordinating mechanism for engendering</li> </ul>

<p>Introductory Workshop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Monthly Action Learning sessions with Links</li> <li>▪ Monthly GSC-GS-PMT Meetings</li> </ul>		engendering generated	
<b>4. Policy Appraisal and Development</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identification of RAO knowledge gaps and competencies</li> <li>▪ Development of Policy Appraisal Module</li> <li>▪ Implementation of Module in Workshop RAO report</li> <li>▪ Monitoring and coaching-on-the-job.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Survey of report and publicity material</li> <li>▪ Module draft available for comments</li> <li>▪ Workshop held and reported</li> <li>▪ Ongoing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Initial survey of RAO reports and publicity material undertaken</li> </ul>	<p>Drafting of policy appraisal module</p> <p>Conduct of workshop using module</p> <p>Monitoring and coaching on the job</p>
<b>5. Review of G-RAP Policies and Practices</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Compilation of collected gender monitoring data</li> <li>▪ Quick monitoring scan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Body of monitoring data compiled</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agreement with RAOs on the need to collect gender monitoring data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Collection of monitoring data from surveyed RAOs</li> <li>▪ Conduct of monitoring scan</li> <li>▪ Identification of gender monitoring indicators</li> </ul>
<b>6. Final Report on Gender Exercise</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Report with findings and recommendations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Report produced</li> </ul>	

## **APPENDIX 2: MEMBERS OF GENDER STEERING COMMITTEE AND LIST OF GENDER LINK PERSONS**

### MEMBERS OF THE GENDER STEERING COMMITTEE

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>
1. Rose Mensah-Kutin	ABANTU for Development
2. Cherub Antwi-Nsiah	Netherlands Development Organization (SNV)
3. Agnes Apusigah	Consultant (University of Development Studies)
4. Nadia Ibrahimah	Ghana Trades Union Congress (GTUC)
5. Mariama Adama Issah	Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
6. Peter Owusu-Donkor	Ghana Centre for Democratic Development (CDD)
7. Victoria Adongo	Integrated Social Development Centre (ISODEC)
8. Elvis Otoo	G-RAP PMT
9. Peter Evans	G-RAP PMT
10. Hans Determeyer	G-RAP PMT

### G-RAP RAO GENDER LINK PERSONS

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>
1. Hamida Harrison	ABANTU for Development
2. Diana Kpodo	The Ark Foundation
3. Kathleen Boohene	Third World Network (TWN)-Africa
4. Marinna Nyamekye	Ghana Trades Union Congress (GTUC)
5. Gabriel Sosu/Chris Dadzie	Integrated Social Development Centre (ISODEC)
6. Regina Tetteh-Amanfo	Ghana Centre for Democratic Development (CDD)
7. Esther Gordon Mensah	West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP)
8. Ruby Ajiagoh	Association of African Women Lawyers (AWLA)
9. Susan Aryeetey	International Federation of Women Lawyers (FIDA)
10. Charity Osei-Amponsah	Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA)
11. Frank Bodza	Women in Law and Development in Africa (WILDAF)
12. Genevieve Eba Polley	Centre for Policy Analysis (CEPA)
13. Esther Ofei-Aboagye	Consultant (Institute of Local Government Studies)

## **APPENDIX 3: TERMS OF REFERENCE OF GENDER SPECIALIST**

### **Background**

The Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme (G-RAP) is a pooled funding mechanism to support the institutional development of research and advocacy organizations in Ghana. The purpose of G-RAP is to enhance the capacity of Research and Advocacy Organizations (RAOs) to carry out evidence-based research on economic, social, political and security issues and to make an autonomous contribution to the policy process through dissemination of research, advocacy and coalition-building. Its objectives are to cement the autonomy of research and advocacy organizations; strengthen their institutional capacity; and create more political space for them to engage in the political process. G-RAP is committed to promoting gender equality in policy advocacy work in Ghana.

In recognition that a gender perspective has not been fully mainstreamed in the G-RAP Programme, a gender audit was commissioned by the Advisory Board/Funders' Committee. The audit acknowledged the existing gaps and challenges in relation to gender and recommended a process of engendering for G-RAP.

G-RAP aims to achieve greater equality between women and men through a process of engendering. To engender G-RAP is to bring into existence and ensure that a gender perspective is mainstreamed into all aspects of G-RAP – programme, activities, G-RAP as an organization (PMT): Funding (processes, instruments and structures); and in Research and Advocacy Organizations (RAOs). Engendering in this context does not replace the need for targeted women-specific policies and programmes, where required. It covers mainstream, gender-focused and women's rights organizations.

The Gender Specialist (GS) will work closely with an inter-stakeholder Gender Steering Committee (GSC) to deliver a plan of action. The Gender Specialist will lead in the delivery of gender training and in implementing gender mainstreaming in the G-RAP programme; funding structures, processes and instruments; the organization and into activities of the research and advocacy organizations.

### **Key duties and responsibilities:**

- Coordinate and manage the engendering activities of G-RAP
- Develop and implement training modules on gender awareness and gender skills-building training modules/seminars on gender awareness
- Organize training activities for key stakeholders
- Review funding structures, processes and instruments
- Liaise, collaborate and consult with the Gender Steering Committee (GSC), Programme Management Team (PMT) and the RAOs, as well as other gender consultants, with a view to facilitate the engendering process
- Arrange and attend meetings, producing relevant reports as necessary
- Develop instruments for systematically collecting and sharing information with the GSC.

**Duty Station:** Accra with minimum travel to other regions.

## **APPENDIX 4 PROPOSALS FOR AMENDING EOI, APPLICATION FORMATS**

### **For Inclusion in the Notes Accompanying the Expression of Interest (EOI)**

The G-RAP recognizes the importance of ensuring gender equity for achieving pro-poor, sustainable development. Therefore, the programme encourages RAOs to demonstrate gender-sensitivity in its work and organizational development and makes various provisions to support gender-related capacity-building. G-RAP is guided by an over-arching gender policy. Mechanisms include an active network of Gender Link Persons who meet regularly in Action Learning Sets for purposes of experience-sharing, peer review, problem-solving and capacity-building. Periodically, RAOs may organize a gender dialogue and specific skills building sessions related to gender. It is therefore important that you respond to the questions relating to gender as frankly as possible. (Before or after eligibility, there is a gender section).

### **EXPRESSION OF INTEREST**

1. How does your organization demonstrate commitment to gender equity?
2. Brief description of intentions for promoting gender equity in the organization and programmes

### **APPLICATION**

1. What have been your experiences in engendering your organization, your programmes and activities since 2005?
2. What systems does your organization have in place to ensure that gender is understood by everybody within it?
3. What gender capacity does your organization have? (focal persons in the organization; resource persons; peer review mechanisms, other).
4. What is your own assessment of your organization's capacity gaps in relation to promoting gender equity?
5. Would you be prepared to undergo a gender self-assessment?
6. What are your intentions/plans for enhancing gender-sensitivity in your organization, programmes and activities?

### **Explanatory Notes to Application**

Experiences in engendering organizations could include

- (a) Development of organizational guide documents, policies, systems, conditions of service (b) Capacity building programmes for various categories of staff (c) Other

Engendering programme activities could include

- (a) Setting gender targets and commitments (b) Inclusion of gender-sensitive objectives, analysis and reporting in research activities (c) Attention to gender dimensions of issues in advocacy efforts (d) Other

## THE GENDER ACTION PLAN

### Notes

The gender action plan is intended to assist participating organizations to articulate their “paths” to enhancing gender-sensitivity in their institutions and programmes over the grant period.

On successful consideration for funding, organizations will have an opportunity to develop and review a gender action plan with a gender-support team. This dialogue will enable organizations gain feedback into strengthening and finalizing the plan.

The plan will be circulated to Gender Link Persons and other stakeholders within the RAO community to share information on what the various organizations are doing in relation to gender.

The plan will form part of the basis for assessment over the grant period. Performance against the targets will be reported; the reasons for gaps and deviations, analysed; skills- and capacity-building needs identified; adjustments to the plan considered; and generally, recommendations for the way forward made.

ASPECT	Activities	Deadlines	Indicators	Assumptions
Organizational development				
Programme-related activities				
Ensuring gender-sensitive resource allocation				
Knowledge-sharing on gender within the organization				
Knowledge generation on gender by the organization				
Institutional collaboration and networking on gender				
Other				

## **APPENDIX 5: HIGHLIGHTS FROM ENCOUNTERS WITH FUNDERS AND INPUTS FOR THE PROCESS**

The consultant met with representatives of the funding agencies as follows:

Karina Johansen	DANIDA	17 <sup>th</sup> May, 2007
Mariama Adama-Issah	CIDA	28 <sup>th</sup> May, 2007
Sonya Sultan	DFID	30 <sup>th</sup> May, 2007
Raymond Danso	RNE	4 <sup>th</sup> June, 2007
Monique Muller		

Discussions focused on updating them on activities so far towards engendering G-RAP and to soliciting their views in relation to the above objectives. Their inputs are presented below.

### **Rationale and Nature of Funding Agencies' Support for G-RAP**

Donors were consistent in their rationale for supporting G-RAP. G-RAP is intended to create a counter-balance to government's interventions with the support of MDBS. It is also intended to create a critical mass for more effective poverty reduction. It is to inform research and advocacy efforts in ways that provide evidence. G-RAP seeks to enhance accountability of MDBS mechanisms through CS. The rationale is very much about core funding conditions: flexibility and the recipients setting the agenda.

In view of the move towards multi-budget donor support (MBDS), G-RAP is ultimately intended to strengthen civil society oversight over the allocation of resources to ensure that pro-poor perspectives are retained. A way to do this was to move away from project-based perspectives to focusing more attention on the core ways of doing things. The essence of G-RAP is to strengthen CS capacity. Donors want to see more civil society ownership of the processes.

### **Expected Outputs and Impacts of the G-RAP Initiative from Funders' Perspective**

That a stronger voice, more co-operation and increased networking amongst RAOs would be created. However, the impacts will be more visible over a longer-term and possibly not, before three (3 years). G-RAP is intended to enhance the ability of CS to influence government policy and hold government accountable to its pro-poor commitments and to generally encourage pro-poor implementation processes and dealings with other stakeholders in development. To ensure that development is pro-poor, governance must be shared. G-RAP is expected to work around GPRS and achieve the desired general outcome. G-RAP should result in clearer insights into what impact there is on the ground of MDBS and extent of pro-poverty; clearer indications of the linkages between MDBS and poverty reduction.

### **Funding Agency's Position on Gender Mainstreaming and How This Has Been Practicalized In Assistance In Ghana**

DANIDA: Gender has been pursued on a cross-cutting basis in Ghana. When programmes are designed, an internal gender specialist (as well as with support from Copenhagen) assists in its formulation to assure its gender-sensitivity (See gender policy)

CIDA has a gender policy and has pursued gender as a cross-cutting issue in its development assistance in Ghana. The Ghana Programme itself has a gender strategy advancing from the position that gender-sensitivity is core to tackling poverty.

DFID has a gender policy but not specifically for Ghana; since a country-led approach is adopted in assistance.

RNE Gender is perceived as a cross-cutting issue like HIV AIDs and Environment. There is a gender policy for Netherlands Assistance.

### **Agency's Support for Gender-Related Interventions in the Country and Potential for Linkage with G-RAP**

CIDA has supported women in elections as well as various aspects of MOWAC's work (essentially expert meetings for policy inputs). There are key gender-related information resources from various CIDA-supported projects in Ghana including DISCAP, NORWAPS and CIFS. Their tools, research findings and data would be interesting for the RAOs as they research into related issues and could provide inputs for advocacy.

DFID has pursued gender-related concerns, while working within the selected sector groups. For instance, it has supported girls' education within education; addressing domestic violence; maternal mortality. It has advocated better gender-disaggregation in structures to ensure CEDAW and other international, gender commitments. For instance, it has worked with MOWAC to develop monitoring and evaluation capacities. Its approach has been that in all the work that is done, every sector should work pay attention to gender inequalities.

Within the various sectors, DFID has been opportunistic and looked for entry points, rather than forcing their way in. DFID is also supporting RAVI, which may provide considerable, valuable information. RNE supports various interventions that prioritize gender sensitivity.

### **Ideal Visions of Gender Mainstreaming in G-RAP**

It is not clear that gender has been sufficiently embodied in MDBS. Here the RAOs could play the devil's advocate to ensure that sufficient attention is paid to it. Part of the process could be to track the deficits. In the MDBS dialogue, it is a challenge to get gender taken seriously. There is the need for (a) more commitment and pressure from the centre (b) more clarity in an approach for donors.

Ideally, since the work of RAOs is to inform the processes of the MDBS, engendered perspectives from the RAOs should feed into a national pro-poor agenda supported with disaggregated data. The statements that RAOs make must be informed with both quantitative and qualitative data. It is envisaged that this could be achieved in another two (2) years.

CS is expected to use G-RAP to project itself as a worthy partner in development. Gender should be part of that projection. Gender-based organizations may do it as part of their regular business but the mainstream, more traditional RAOs do not. While several RAOs have recognized this, the challenge has been in the operationalization.

The engendering process must be linked to the recommendations from the Apusigah report as well as the insights from the mid-term review. While the gender policy is important, measures to ensure its implementation must clearly be in place. The policy must be able to hold the participating organizations accountable and to hold them to a common position. Systems and structures within the RAOs must facilitate this.

Beyond formulating the policy issues, there must be interventions to develop the structures for implementation as well as provisions to facilitate the growth of expertise to fulfil the strategy. It is important to focus on what is do-able first (hence the need for a situation analysis) to practicalize what they are doing; acknowledge skill limitations; and develop a common understanding of gender.

The gaps between the ideal and the existing situation must be identified and filled in.

An ideal vision is that there will be many more strong women's advocacy organizations that would support strong women's voice in the MDDBS and poverty reduction discussions and ensure more effectiveness in influencing government policy debates. If it is the stronger CS entities (ISODEC, CDD) that get to talk to government/have access to government, then to get them to make clearer interventions and lobby on gender issues too. Also, to get more women's organizations talking more to government. At present, they present a rather disjointed voice. It is not that all should work solely on gender issues but to have them engender their discussions.

If RAOs are indeed engaged in poverty-related interventions, then gender is a matter of course. They should be able to demonstrate disaggregated impacts and participation, including those related to gender. Therefore, the standard should be that RAOs consider gender routinely but not that all RAOs are gender organizations.

Organisations funded by G-RAP are aware of the importance of gender and deal with the arising issues in poverty reduction. Through the research of RAOs, stakeholders in development should see how gender affects issues and at least how gender-sensitivity can be taken into account. If RAOs can do this, then they would have made the effort.

### **Possible Actions to Mainstream Gender into G-RAP**

It is possible to jointly establish gender targets to be achieved by RAOs in their work or include a gender trigger/standard to be met for all potential recipients. However, the key question is the extent to which RAOs can be compelled to meet this. A basic step would be to commit to gender dis-aggregated data in the research conducted by RAOs.

The move to focus on core funding could be linked to gender mainstreaming. But how that is integrated must be jointly arrived at. G-RAP must aim for a longer-term process perhaps over a two (2) year period. A couple of years from now, gender performance could be a criterion for selection (as with other characteristics): (a) Do they know enough? (b) Have they considered gender sufficiently (c) yearly gender evaluations.

It is useful to have a facility to "backstop" engendering by the RAOs, very much in the manner that PMT is servicing the entire G-RAP process. However, the Mid-Term Review (MTR) was not in support of this approach. While RAOs indicate that they will ensure gender mainstreaming, it is always helpful to have external support.

There is a broad articulation of the statement for engendering G-RAP (see Dr. Apusigah's report). However, more mid-level objectives are required. The "understanding gender" workshop will be useful for distilling these objectives and generating the monitoring indicators.

We need to acknowledge that the process of gender mainstreaming will differ from RAO to RAO especially in relation to (a) what people know; and (b) what they want to achieve.

The assignment has the following imperatives:

- (a) clarity on the engendering process and what it entails – which will then ensure more commitment to the Action Learning Sets;
- (b) getting buy-in from the RAOs; establishing what RAOs will commit to.

### **The Roles Funders May Play in Facilitating Engendering G-RAP**

While funders may require gender targets and performance standards, it may not be (a) realistic – in terms of timing and RAOs’ ability to gender mainstream (b) appropriate to spirit of partnership and the discussions with RAOs to pursue that line.

It may be possible, along the line, to introduce a minimum basket of requirements for RAOs to fulfill for continued support. Achieving this will require some discussion amongst all parties and particularly amongst funders. Since this is a pooled fund, and the funders have different stances and emphases on gender (even though all of them have it as a cross-cutting issue), these requirements have to be negotiated and agreed upon.

Some donors have been more insistent and visible in relation to gender than others. This could be reflection of their priorities, capacities/expertise and extent of decentralization of operations. The latter helps to develop more focused interventions.

Funders could devote funds to gender or earmark resources if they perceive “absence of gender-sensitivity” as a gap.

Getting buy-in from RAOs is not about conditionalities and may not be useful to link it to core funding. It is also not enough for funders to insist that engendering is important or good. They must have a part to play and play it.

Do we then (a) jointly come up with a G-RAP gender policy that funders commit to as well?

Whenever gender has been made a conditionality, it has not worked much beyond window-dressing. It is evident that whatever change in organizational working culture and results that there is (in favour of gender), it must come from within the organization. There is solid evidence to that effect.

There is no point in imposing gender on the RAOs, which may have the opposite effect of fostering ownership. It is important that RAOs generate the evidence in various sectors that adopting poverty approaches that pay attention to gender has better effects in order to convince government.

While conditionalities could have an adverse effect, it is not clear how incentives would work.

### **Other Resources Available From Funders That Could Go To Support Engendering (Beyond Money and Technical Assistance)**

DANIDA There are fellowship seminar courses in mainstreaming that RAOs could benefit from. As part of the Good Governance Portfolio, the mainstreaming courses could be organized over a three-week period and attract two (2) participants from each RAO.

CIDA: The provision of technical assistance that is available to funders to RAOs is a key resource. CIDA has contributed the services of MAI to the Gender Steering Committee, supported the review undertaken by Dr. Apusigah and advocated the recruitment of the Gender Specialist. Tools and frameworks developed within CIDA such as the gender equality performance assessment framework and tool kit for developing the gender strategy could be very useful. However, RAOs must define areas of technical assistance or support that they could find useful.

DFID envisages sharing best practice from around the world about how gender can be mainstreamed. The Gender Equality Sector Group could offer a brokering role for government and Civil Society – to create spaces for dialogue and advocate on behalf of certain organizations. It can also facilitate linkages within Forums they are part of. Because donors have access to certain information; and because they are linked to CSOs who see what is on the ground; and to the government’s position, they have some advantage to

facilitate discussion. However, RAOs should feel free to ask for that support since donors cannot impose it.

RNE Examples of short cases from interventions in-country and world wide as well as gender-disaggregated data from the interventions that the Funder supports could be made available.

### **Other Interesting Insights**

The need for evidence-based research, research-based policy formulation and policy evaporation are critical issues to be addressed if MDBS is to be effective.

Funders would like to see more information flow from RAOs on how and when they can participate in G-RAP; in relation to gender, they would like to know when and how to engage in the process and to demonstrate their support for ensuring gender-sensitivity in policy changes. Is there any forum where Funders and RAOs could meet beyond the Conference? It does not appear so.

The focus has been to engender the structures however, who is doing research to see the gender impacts of events, policies, decisions and negotiations on a timely basis? Who is work to provide engendered information to inform policy positions? Funding structures: how does money get disbursed to raise issues about who gets what?

In the short term, some funds could be found to fund specific, thematic, topical research.

Country-led approaches may allow for non-action especially when the government has not got a policy. The dynamics of the relationships within G-RAP would bear studying. The implications of adopting the principles of core funding must be explored further. If the Funders' Committee plays fewer and fewer roles, there has to be other mechanisms to periodically check that the right thing is done. The key question is "is more hands-off a good thing?" In contrast, the funder has been quite "hands-off" in relation to G-RAP. Money is still put in and left to others to sort out.

We must also acknowledge the differing gender requirements for research and advocacy. For instance, advocacy work may be more time and staff intensive.

A lot of the research that RAOs are doing is good but the impacts on policy could be greater. While it is recognized that impacts on poverty are hard to measure, CS could be stronger in bringing this about.

That raises the essential question of what constitutes CS in this regard and the entities with the resources to hold government to account in addition to the traditional NGOs. This would include think-tanks, trades unions, faith-based organizations. From the G-RAP experience, this could be anything that is not part of the executive arm of government (could CHRAJ in this regard be CS?) **It is important to have a common definition of CS in the G-RAP Community.**

The exercise should offer a key opportunity to review key G-RAP documents to examine the extent to which they take gender into account. It should also provide the opportunity to see how PMT can be strengthened to facilitate gender delivery there. Could G-RAP Websites be used to share information on gender?

How can we facilitate more sharing of core objectives and key achievements, best-practices on gender within the G-RAP Family? More than anybody, the Gender RAOs have the

legitimacy, capacity and clout to facilitate engendering. We could ask particular RAOs to undertake functions in areas where they have a comparative advantage.

Mainstreaming gender in a programme as diverse as G-RAP will not be easy; having different perspectives and the challenge of aligning these (having effective gender spectacles). The challenge of moving from separate women's projects to gender mainstreaming has various lessons. How do we integrate these into the learning processes for the G-RAP Family?

Government can do more to elicit that evidence to support its proposals on selected interventions. The RAOs could do more to get the attention of government with their findings. The RAOs have improved in generating evidence-based advocacy. The government's response and the political environment for listening to this advocacy have also improved but what government does with all this information is not too clear.