



Building Capacity of Research & Advocacy Organisations
towards Pro-Poor Policies and Action

GENDER ANALYSIS BRIEF

March 2006

Dr. Agnes Atia Apusigah

1. INTRODUCTION

The Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme (G-rap) was established in 2003 to provide an alternative avenue for supporting research and advocacy work in Ghana. It is a multi-donor funded initiative aimed at "building capacity of Research and Advocacy Organizations [RAOs] towards pro-poor policies and action" (G-rap brochure: 1). G-rap funding grants are intended to support RAOs in their efforts to conduct independent research and advocacy on pro-poor initiatives within the framework of the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The G-rap seeks 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. The scope of the activities supported by G-rap includes evidence-based research, public awareness and information and dialogue and coalition building (G-rap, 2005).

Shortly after its operationalization, it became evident that the programme conceptualization did not adequately address gender equality (GE) and women's rights (WR) concerns. Its policy and programmes were criticized for lacking gender sensitivity (CIDA, 2005; NETRIGHT, 2004; Cusack, 2004). Alerted to and recognizing the critical place of gender equity in Ghana's poverty reduction efforts, a study was initiated to investigate the criticisms.

The gender study was aimed at analyzing G-rap; its design, structures, systems and practices as well as best practices elsewhere for lessons that would guide recommendations and development of an action plan for engendering the programme. The study was intended to "ensure that G-rap encompasses best practices and approaches for engendering its design, operations and monitoring as applied by its decision-making bodies" (G-rap, 2005).

2. METHODOLOGY

A participatory methodology was proposed for involving all stakeholders and interest groups during the investigations. In defining the terms of the study, it became necessary to adopt a multi-site design entailing the use of mixed methods. This design made it possible for reaching the many actual and potential grantees spread across the nation and for involving participants in varying ways in the analysis of the programme.

Participants

Varied and differently located potential participants were identified for the study. These included governing structures, beneficiaries and independent experts. Hence, it became necessary to select from among them participants that were representative of the entire group. Using random sampling techniques participants were identified and invited for participation from the governing structures; namely Programme Management Team (PMT), Advisory Board (AB) and Finders Committee (FC); and RAOs including beneficiaries namely awardees, rejectees and withdrawees as well as potential applicants. Steps were also taken to ensure that participating RAOs included both mainstream and GE/WR RAOs. In addition, independent GE/WR experts was identified and invited for participation.

Techniques

The research techniques adopted were expected to enable critical analysis and participatory approaches. Hence mixed methods were adopted entailing conceptual analysis and participatory research approaches with the view to generate qualitative and quantitative data from both primary and secondary data sources. The main conceptual techniques adopted included concept analysis, content analysis, situational assessments and documentary analysis. Participatory research tools

used included mailed questionnaire, informal discussions, focused group discussions, in depth interviews and direct observation.

Area of Study

As a nationally competitive programme, G-rap has a nationwide coverage. Hence, the multi-site design adopted was to enable nationwide investigations specifically in areas where there were beneficiaries those award recipients (awardees), those whose applications were rejected (rejectees), those who withdrew their applications (withdrawees) and those who had expressed interest in the programme. In the end the fieldwork was carried out in Accra, Tamale, Bolgatanga and Zebilla. Efforts to involve a participating RAO in Kumasi proved futile.

3 KEY FINDINGS

The study entailed the analyses of G-rap with the view to unearth its strengths and weaknesses; analysis of various gender programmes with the view to learning from gender best practices and; seeking expert views on the engendering of funding programmes. The lessons from the various processes became the basis for drawing conclusions, making recommendations and drawing up plans for engendering G-rap.

Analysis of Gender Best Practices

In order to offer recommendations that were practicable, it became necessary to examine ongoing efforts at programme engendering efforts, especially funding programmes. The investigations revealed the existence of various examples of programme engendering in Ghana and elsewhere. Their best practices are presented in this section in the form of generic and specific practices.

Generic Best Practices

The generic best practices comprise broad experiences that lend themselves to wider application. These generic models are subject to various adaptations as practitioners assess the cultural environment, reflect on local circumstances and/or respond to emerging challenges. Some of the lessons offered are in the areas of:

- **Policy**

Evidence points to a need for a strong policy and/or legislation that articulates institutional commitment to gender equality, women's rights and social equity vividly (MOWAC, n.d.; World Bank, n.d.; CIDA, 1995). This should be implicit and explicit in institutional vision, mission, goals and objectives. The establishment of clear policies is important for legitimizing and committing institutional actors to initiate action. Policy provides the framework and guidance for action.

- **Governance**

Governance is an important area for institutionalizing gender commitments in organizations. The governance systems and structures provide grounds for initiating and negotiating actions toward change. Studies show that engendered governance structures and systems are essential for realizing the goals of gender equality and women's rights, poverty reduction and national development (Chigudu, 1997; Opare, n.d; Ketekewu, n.d.; Tsikata & Kerr, 2000).

Some of the important structures identified include management/administrative structures such as Boards, Committees and Management Teams/Fora. Also, systems such as staff recruitment/development, financial management, monitoring and evaluation and, data management systems should be oriented toward gender equality goals.

The lessons indicate that gender sensitive governance structures and systems secure overall institutionalization of gender as such structures and systems bear and nurture the seeds (policy, programmes and projects) that institutions champion. Above

all, the direct implications of governance for resources allocation are highlighted (Opare, n.d.; CIDA, 1995; Moser, 1993; World Bank, 2001).

● **Resources**

Resources allocation is another important area of gender equality and women's rights concern (SCGA, 2002; World Bank, 2001; Moser 1993). Contestations regarding gender-blind and/or gender-neutral institutions stem from the inequalities that arise in the distribution of resources.

The development of gender sensitive indicators and gender responsive budgets is becoming a popular route for ensuring that resources reach all those who need to access them. Affirmative action has become a strategic targeting tool for compensating for histories of discrimination. Rural development organizations and even banks are also adopting alternate strategies that enable women and their organizations to access resources. In addition, advocacy is growing around putting monetary value on women's unpaid work and especially reproductive roles (Sharp 2002, 2003; Elson, 2002, 1997; Goetz, 1995; Beneria, 1992). Institutions are also setting quotas for women. It is becoming the norm among Ghanaian institutions to set aside percentages of overall resources for targeting gender equality initiatives.

● **Targeted Programming.**

Lessons from practice show that mainstreaming efforts are resulting in new forms of inequalities that stem from gender-neutral programming. Hence, efforts are being made to target women for specialized programmes. Efforts to target women in Ghana include the NCWD now subsumed under MOWAC as the Department of Women. Although not very effective, the provision to ensure that 30% of government appointees to local government authorities and other decision-making structures is an important step for targeting women.

The success of targeted programming, however, depends on the allocation of resources for such initiatives. For instance in India, Budget Plans provided for the construction of hostel facilities with day care centers for children of up to 18years for working women (Sharp, 2003). In the Third World Network, the Gender and Economic Reforms in Africa programme has a budgetary allocation that enables it to run its targeted and mainstreaming programmes.

● **Technical Capacity**

To facilitate the implementation of gender equality and women's rights commitments, institutions need to possess the capacity for steering the tide (Chao, 1999, Ofei-Aboagye, 1999; Manuh, 1999). Chao (1999: 6) states that "[c]apacity building appropriate training programs for women and government leaders, renovation of government structures and procedures to foster change can help accelerate the process" of institutionalizing gender issues."

Research and advocacy institutions that are pro-poor in their programming and recognize the place of gender in the process, seek to collect data in ways that ensure the disaggregation of data by sex, include women as research participants and analyze data according to sex categories for comparison across differences. Capacities in policy understanding and formulation, significant concepts, monitoring and evaluating as well as disseminating information are critical. UN Info Data and the World Bank support databases that disaggregate data by sex and as such enable gender analysis. Here in Ghana, the Ghana Statistical Service is yet to provide comprehensive and compelling data for gender analysis. Although the national data collector and holder, the Ghana Statistical Service hardly disaggregates its data by sex. Hence, national databases in local and global sites continually provide incomplete data.

● **Monitoring and Evaluation**

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) has become an important component of efforts that track development initiatives for their sensitivity to gender equality commitments (Khan, n.d.; World Bank, n.d.). Studies show that the integration of a gender dimension in M&E helps in the identification of the differential effects of policies, projects and programmes. This allows for

correcting and generating credible results as design, implementation and monitoring decisions are guided by gender sensitive indicators.

CIDA and the World Bank provide guidelines for stakeholders to engender entire project/programme cycles. They advocate mainstreaming from identification/preparation through design/appraisal and implementation/supervision to implementation/completion.

Organization-specific Models

The organizations modeled in this section were chosen for their commitments to promoting gender equality and women rights. This was especially so because the organizations are mainstream organizations. It was expected that G-rap as a mainstream institution and the many mainstream RAOs with works with would benefit from examples from like organizations.

● SEND Foundation of West Africa

SEND Foundation of West Africa is a relatively new mainstream NGO that has shown, in the past few years, a strong commitment to mainstreaming gender issues in its policy, programmes and projects. They have done this by making major and novel commitments in terms of policy, leadership, resources and processes that compel all stakeholders to work toward gender equality. These include developing and disseminating policy, providing organizational leadership, re-packaging programmes with women's needs in view, designing and implementing practical monitoring systems and building staff capacities.

● Institute of Local Government Studies

The Institute of Local Government is a Ghana Government establishment that in recent time has demonstrated a commitment to transforming its male-dominated character into a gender sensitive one. This is being done through institutional leadership, roping in men, planning and executing periodic major gender events, drawing from external support and networks, effectively utilizing pedagogical moments and building capacity of staff and partners.

Analysis of G-rap

The analysis of G-rap focused on design, structures, implementation and monitoring.

Design

The analysis of the design of G-rap revealed a general acceptability of support for pro-poor programming although concerns were raised regarding the lack of gender considerations in the design process. There were concerns regarding the adoption of the GPRS framework for its inadequacies regarding the meeting of gender equality commitments as well as emphasis on economic growth.

An import area of analysis was client targeting. The G-rap grant facility targets established RAOs. Questions were raised regarding the criteria for defining an "established" RAO. GE/WR organizations and smaller RAOs, largely those that did not receive core or any grants at all during the first call, found the clause discriminatory. For them, it was discriminatory to the extent that it favored mainstream organizations with huge running budgets while not taking into consideration the successes and achievements of modest RAOs with established reputation in research and/or advocacy. There was, however, a general agreement among the RAOs and other respondents that the selective targeting mechanism created room for supporting large organizations, while nurturing emerging ones.

Also, respondents were generally satisfied with the three funding windows availed through G-rap. The Core window was seen as a welcome opportunity for enabling successful RAOs to obtain substantial, reliable and independent funding for embarking

on targeted activities within the five-year grant period. The capacity building and technical assistance grants were seen as generally offering opportunities for growth. However, questions were raised regarding the criteria for placing RAOs in the three grant categories. No defined criteria for ICB and TA were available in documentation provided.

There was also a general agreement that some of the criteria were discriminatory. Both mainstream and GE/WR RAOs agreed that the emphasis on established RAOs and the criteria for selecting such RAOs, naturally excluded non-established ones. It was pointed out by some participants of the PMT, AB and FC that RAVI catered to the needs of the "other" (i.e., non-established) RAOs. Although agreeing to and supportive of the presence of the RAVI alternative, other participants such as participating GE/WR RAOs, Gender Experts and unsuccessful RAOs, thought the categorization was vague and open to diverse interpretations. This group of study respondents did not think that the criteria defining the category were adequate.

Major concerns were also raised regarding the use of over USD 400,000.00 per annum turnover/threshold as qualification for selection for multi-annual core funding. Faith-based, local NGOs, GE/WR RAOs and gender experts argued that it discriminated against their unique principles of voluntarism and self-sacrifice and as well the use of limited term or part time services. The analysis revealed that even the biggest GE/WR and faith-based RAOs could not meet the annual turnover requirement.

Another major concern for GE/WR and even some mainstream RAOs with gender interests was the absence of gender requirements. Indeed, the application package for the first call and the criteria specified in the Joint Memorandum (G-rap, 2004) did not include any gender statements. However, the G-rap brochure makes gender awareness and pro-poor programming a joint criterion. This seems to be an attempt to respond to emerging criticisms but also that the broadsheet (G-rap, 2004) requires almost all successful RAOs to develop strategies and plans for gender and pro-poor programming. The revised LFA includes a few gender statements.

Yet, another major concern regarded the "lumping" of advocacy and research as one criterion. Although there was agreement among respondents that the two were related, some RAOs raised the issue of differences in organizational strengths and weaknesses resulting in the carving of niches in advocacy or research or both. Hence, the lumping of the two discriminated against those who had specialized in one or the other and in favor of those with expertise in both. Available documentation does not say how much weight was put on RAOs possessing both during selection, however, it makes sense to say that selection criteria might change if advocacy and research are considered as alternatives rather than tied.

Furthermore, concerns were raised about the interpretation of collaboration. Women's networks such as NETRIGHT, NOGNET and RESIGNET argued that beyond collaborating with CBOs and other RAOs, women's networks were establishments in their own right and should be treated as such. Responding network members argued that their unique identity of maintaining flexible and independent arrangements allowed for the harnessing of unique strengths for collective actions while supporting individualisms. Responding network members argued that G-rap discriminated against them by failing to appreciate their uniqueness. This was justified as GE/WR organizations which applied as independents were lumped under an "additional funding support category" with a proposal for collaboration. While this move might be explained differently, the picture conveyed is one of a lack of appreciation of the dynamics of networking and especially of its significance as an age-old strategy used by GE/WR RAOs to project visibility and magnify voice.

Governance Structures

The three main governing structures of G-RAP are the Project Management Team (PMT), Advisory Board (AB) and Funders Committee (FC). A gender analysis of each of the three structures reveals minimal and varying levels of gender sensitivity regarding representation and persuasion but not expertise.

Although not a balanced representation of women, the membership of the governance structures was found to be representative of women. Women form 25% of PMT, 33% of AB and 40% of FC. The main concern was to improve participation at the PMT while working to improve expertise in PMT and FC for effective gender analysis.

Implementation

Issues covered grant targeting, grant applicants including access to funds and volume of funds, communication and evidence of gender work among beneficiaries.

● Target Group

True to its policy of targeting established RAOs, the first round grants were accessible largely to mainstream organizations. These successful RAOs operate in the required areas of social, economic, political and security issues. An examination of their institutional profiles revealed well “established” operational structures typical of any bureaucracy. With such advantages, application requirements were of little challenge. However, the near absence of GE/WR RAOs justifies claims of the underpinning gender bias in the definition of “established” institutions. Only one GE/WR, out of nine (9) RAOs, received core funding, the main window for established RAOs.

● Grant Applicants

On grant applicants, the analysis revealed that the first call attracted 63 RAOs, out of which 27 were short-listed for consideration. An analysis of short listed applicants showed a high success rate for GE/WR RAOs. Of the 27 (100%) short listed applicants, 17 (63%) received grant awards. Of those that received awards, GE/WR (6 forming 35%) received the highest number of awards. Counting NETRIGHT, which was awarded but declined, and except for WISE, which withdrew early in the competition, all applicants in the GE/WR category were successful.

However, a by-spatial category analysis reveals that applicants in GE/WR fared poorly compared to mainstream RAOs. From the list of awardees, seventeen (17 forming 100%) RAOs, counting NETRIGHT, received or were expected to receive various forms of grants from the G-RAP facility during the first call. The list of awardees comprised eleven (11 forming 65%) mainstream and six (6 forming 35%) GE/WR RAOs. Hence, RAOs specializing in GE/WR form about a third of total successful applicants.

In addition, an examination of access to the funding windows depicts a skewness in favor of mainstream RAOs. As already noted while eight (8 forming 89%) of mainstream RAOs received core funds, only one (1 forming 9%) of GE/WR RAO was able to obtain funds through the core window. GE/WR RAOs were more successful in obtaining ICB funds. All successful GE/WR RAOs received funds from the ICB window. Note that the sole GE/WR RAO that received core funds also received ICB funds.

As well, a by-spatial analysis of funding allocations reveals even a more skewed picture in favor of mainstream RAOs. Out of a total of USD 1,965,000.00 (100%) allocated during the first round, GE/WR RAOs received USD145,000.00 (7%) while mainstream RAOs received USD 1,820,000.00 (93%). The broadsheet detailing the various categories shows that GE/WR RAOs were more successful in receiving funds from the additional ICB support (USD 125,000.00) compared to mainstream RAOs which received funds from main support (USD1,840,000.00).

● Communication

The study reveals that the PMT, working with various stakeholders, maintains various forms of communication. The main media used were email, post mail, newspaper advertisement, brochure and website. As well, information about G-rap is circulated through various stakeholders at vantage points for sharing with interested RAOs and by word of mouth. The G-rap uses these varied media to announce calls, facilitate various forms of correspondence and provide feedback.

Participating RAOs, mainstream and GE/WR, were satisfied with correspondence with G-rap. Both groups agreed that communication channels were open and effective. The use of multiple media, especially phones and electronic media eased correspondence and feedback.

● Evidence of Gender Work among Beneficiary RAOs

A desk study of the work plans of beneficiary RAOs reveals G-rap support for a wide range of activities under the first round facility. Key areas identified were infrastructural, structural and programming activities. Consistent with the G-rap intent of supporting RAOs to build capacities, budget estimates reflect assignment of substantial amounts to infrastructural and structural development. Both mainstream and GE/WR targeted their funds at capacity building with little on actual programming and related activities. A few however focused on programming activities solely.

Also, the analysis revealed that many of the successful mainstream RAOs had programmes with minimal gender components. Programmes varied from girls' education; gender, poverty and economic growth; conflict and women's businesses; women in peace building; to gender and economic reforms, among others. That many of the mainstream RAOs had gender components in their programmes is suggestive of an appreciation of the significance of and interest in gender concerns. With negotiations and technical support, such avenues can be explored fully and expanded toward the eventual integration of gender issues in overall programming.

In addition, avenues exist for building and utilizing the gender skills and knowledges of participating GE/WR RAOs for enriching research and enhancing advocacy. Capacity building in gender research skills, use of participatory techniques and gender analysis tools would be very useful especially in the generation of data and production of knowledges.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The study revealed that the G-rap uses a number of strategies to monitor and evaluate its grant facility. These comprise a multi-tiered reporting system, a logical framework analysis and an organization assessment tool.

● Reporting systems

Analysis of reporting systems reveals that there are two levels of reporting requirements of stakeholders; grantees and PMT. Grantees are required to provide periodic reports for tracking progress. These include the maintenance of full and complete records and books of accounts, submission of quarterly financial statements, arrangement for annual audit by legally certified person (s) or entity for each grant year and ensuring that appropriate corrective actions are taken on audit reports. Participating grantees in the study pointed out that the initial requirement of quarterly reporting was too frequent. However, through negotiations the frequency of reporting has been reduced to two per annum. The PMT, on its part, submits quarterly progress and financial reports, detailed annual performance and financial report, annual audit reports and bank statements to donors.

● Logical framework

The April June 2005 Quarterly Progress Report includes an annex of the revised G-rap Logical Framework. Regarding gender concerns, the revised LFA is an improvement on the older version captured in the **Joint Programme Memorandum** of January 2004. However, it persists in rooting poverty reduction support within the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy Framework (GPRS). Both the old and revised LFA are also consistent to the extent of marching goals, purposes and activities. The goals, purpose and activities remain broad and closed to equity/gender concerns. Inherent gaps can be explored for including gender and other equity concerns.

A significant and noticeable change in the revised LFA is the attempt to include gender statements in the objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs). While the effort is commendable, it also exposes the limitations in expertise as indicators remain too broad and subject to various interpretations. More work is required for sharpening the gender indicators and inserting them in appropriate places. As well, narrative summaries could be redefined to include equity/gender concerns. By so doing, it will be easy to develop suitable OVIs and even MOVs.

● **Organizational Assessment**

Generally, both participating mainstream and GE/WR RAOs of the study saw relevance in organizational assessment. They pointed out that for organizations that seek accountability on the part of government and claim to speak with the deprived and vulnerable, periodic OA was necessary for ensuring internal accountability.

The study revealed, also, that G-rap provided support to organizations during the self-assessment process. This support helped clarify questions and enables applicants to complete the forms appropriately. However, there were complaints regarding the drudgery of completing the forms. This was proven through verbal complaints, non-response, incomplete and lack of detail in participant responses to an exercise involving an assessment of the OA tool.

A recurring question, arising largely from participating GE/WR RAOs, regarding the assessment tool was the emphasis on technical capacity to the detriment of outputs and deliverables. They were said to lack an appreciation of the functions of complex systems and advocacy in particular. GE/WR RAOs said the assessment tool was suited better for research and not advocacy organizations.

The 50 elements comprising the 12 key components of the OA focus largely on structural issues with preference for organizational functions over impact. Although some impact areas exist, these are minimal. Again, the OA tool tends to stress a technical notion of efficiency with an emphasis on existing structures. Questions on effectiveness seem to escape analysis or are assumed at best under the problematic notion of efficiency.

The elaborate structural requirements of the OA tool are indeed necessary for ensuring organizational discipline and measuring trust especially where donor funds are at issue. However, it is also the case that such elaborate structures are often trapped in bureaucratic red tapers that drain already inadequate resources. Staff salaries and institutional management costs divert needed resources for delivering services into servicing personnel and structures. Hence, measurement of organizational efficiency must be marched with a commensurate measure of effectiveness. This may take the form of assessing expenditure trends as well as the marching of inputs and outputs.

CONCLUSIONS

The main conclusions reached from the analyses of gender best practices and of G-rap were as follows:

The Need for Gender Equality in Poverty Reduction

There is sufficient evidence that gender is an essential part of ongoing efforts to reduce poverty in Ghana. Provisions in G-rap documentation suggest and/or point to a need to include gender considerations in the G-rap process. However, the initial gloss over gender issues marred the entire design. Although efforts are ongoing to correct the initial lapses, there is still need for ensuring that such efforts actually respond to real gender needs and meet national/global gender commitments.

Lessons from Gender Best Practices

The analysis of Gender Best Practices reveals many areas of learning. Experiences from within and out of Ghana, of small and big organizations and, of GE/WR and mainstream organizations offer lessons for strengthening the G-rap to deliver its goal and objectives. The lessons are useful for improving design (e.g., policy, criteria, packaging), structures (e.g., representation, capacity), implementation (e.g., responsiveness, analysis) and M&E (e.g., systems, indicators).

Gender and the G-rap

The study reveals that the G-rap offers several opportunities for improving gender work. However, its design, structure, implementation and monitoring systems have not served gender equality (GE) and women's rights (WR) concerns adequately. The laudable G-rap goal of supporting RAOs to build their capacities for pro-poor programming has been marred by the absence of strong gender sensitivity in initial design. Initial documentation was silent on gender issues. However, later/recent

documentation reflects efforts to insert gender statements. While such positive efforts are commendable, they ought to be guided by informed knowledge and technical skills in order to serve GE needs better. Some amount of work is needed in the rationalization, framework, targeting, funding windows and eligibility criteria to improve their response to gender equality commitments

Also, the governing structures of G-rap provide for the participation of various stakeholders. There is women's representation on all three decision-making structures: PMT, AB and FC. However, the capacity to affect decisions toward gender equality remains doubtful. The PMT, in particular, requires expertise in gender analysis since major decisions regarding pre-qualification and short listing are made at that level.

In addition, the implementation process presents the most gender challenge. The challenge presents largely in the form of imbalances in benefits from grants. Although GE/WR were more successful compared to mainstream organizations, their access to funds was very poor. GE/WR received only 7% of the total volume of funds during the first call. The analysis revealed that the particular emphasis of selection procedures on technicalities without a commensurate emphasis on outputs contributed to the limited success of GE/WR RAOs. Even the biggest names in GE/WR in Ghana did not meet the criteria for qualifying for the main funding window; the multi-annual core funding window. The analysis also revealed that many of the mainstream RAOs had projects on gender and could use some support in strengthening them while working toward more gender sensitive programming in their establishments.

Furthermore, the analyses revealed that the M&E system was generally acceptable to both mainstream and GE/WR RAOs. The demands on both the PMT and RAOs were commended by both. However, both mainstream and GE/WR RAOs expressed concerns regarding practicability, which was attributed to over detailing and frequency of reporting. Fortunately, efforts are being made to improve the instruments to make them more practicable. Reporting frequency has been cut down from four to two times a year. While these changes are ongoing, it is important to re-examine and improve the LFA and OA toward making them more gender sensitive and responsive.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Drawing from the analyses of best practices and of G-rap, a number of recommendations are being made for engendering the programme. It is expected that the recommendations will help strengthen G-rap to deliver on its pro-poor support more equitably.

Improve Design

The design of G-rap should be enriched through the inclusion of gender requirements in policy and framework. It is recommended that policy be reframed to reflect gender statements and presented as a cross cutting issue. Also, there is the need to review the GPRS framework adopted to capture ongoing criticisms and make room for more social equity programming. The eligibility criteria need to be reworked to include a criterion on gender equality and a second look taken of the "over USD400, 000.00" requirement for qualifying for core funding. A de-linking of research and advocacy is proposed in a way that presents them as alternatives. As well, it is recommended that the criteria for ICB and TA be clarified while affirmative action is taken to target GE/WR RAOs for core funding.

Strengthen Capacities

It also became evident that expertise on gender equality was limited. Hence, it is recommended that trainings for members of governing structures and mainstream RAOs be conducted. Also, GE/WR RAOs should be supported through TA grants to build technical capacities. The use of gender expertise on permanent or temporary basis for critical programming initiatives is highly recommended.

Modify Monitoring Indicators

The analyses also revealed gaps in monitoring and evaluation systems and structures. Hence, it is recommended that steps be taken to develop inclusive indicators that incorporate process, output, input and impact indicators. There is the need to develop gender indicators (GIs) for use with EC, OA and LFA while a quick checklist is developed for use by decision-makers at all levels.

Facilitate Inclusive Structures

There is also the need to make the governance structures of the G-rap more inclusive of gender interests. Hence, it is being proposed that measures be taken to strengthen capacities through the use of gender experts in the PMT and AB. Also, the G-rap should make provisions for building capacities within its governing structures and participating RAOs.