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| 1 | The IASC Gender with Age Marker helps to ensure gender equality is a priority in humanitarian action.  The GAM was developed in response to requests from humanitarians for a tool that would *help them to do better gender equality programming.* The GAM is a capacity-building tool for teams, but it also gives valuable data on humanitarian program quality. The questionnaire is based on the premise that discussing and deciding how gender, age, and disability differences will be addressed in key program elements leads to more responsive and accountable humanitarian action. Users report that the GAM’s reflective discussion process helps them to do this.  Points:   * The GAM is project-specific: a separate questionnaire must be completed for each project. * The questionnaire automatically determines from the answers if the program mainstreams gender or is a targeted action specifically to address discrimination. * The GAM is simply a questionnaire -- people do not need “training” to fill in a questionnaire! |
| 2 | After its first two years, the GAM was revised to improve the quality of data, and to shorten it.  The questionnaire now asks about **10** key program areas where differences in gender, age, and for people with disabilities, need to be considered. It works at project level, but is also applied to cluster response plans, HNOs, HRPs and strategies --- the same issues are always relevant. 4 elements are reviewed in the project design phase, and all ten indicators are reviewed 3-6 months later in project monitoring. |
| 3 | This is what the GAM actually looks like to users. For each programming step (“GEM” or indicator), the Kobo questionnaire asks for details of the proposed action, followed by which gender groups are included… (next slide)  (The definition of LGBTI used in the GAM is “People of diversesexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sex characteristics”) |
| 4 | … which age groups, and inclusion of people with disabilities. The same format is repeated for each question.  Mention how to change the language of the GAM form (at the top right of the questionnaire) and website (on the homepage) |
| 5 | The most important element of gender responsive programming is the analysis. We must start by identifying who is disadvantaged and why, if we are going to respond to their different needs. We must then USE this analysis as the foundation to design our program.  The GAM asks people to briefly describe their gender analysis: what are some of the different issues affecting women and men, those with disabilities, or particular age groups? Users are asked to simply describe, “Who is disadvantaged and why?”  Proposals should clearly demonstrate that understand the differences and concerns of different groups; that they know who is at risk and why. If they don’t, it is unlikely they will be able to *respond* to these different groups. |
| 6 | (Chart) Many people still don’t understand what gender analysis means, or why it’s useful. In this sample, only ~30% of projects had a good gender analysis. More than half of the projects did not explain the different problems faced by men and women, or boys and girls |
| 7 | It is clear that this organization understands the implications of mines for men and women, boys and girls. It is very likely they will tailor their program to meet the needs of these different groups. |
| 8 | These projects also recognize key gender and/or age differences, so will likely address them when designing their activities. Gender analysis does not have to be long or complicated! |
| 9 | Instead of describing gender differences, many people just make promises about what they intend to do, or summarize their organizational gender policy. Some even explain what gender analysis is.  They are trying to make a good impression because there is still a misunderstanding that they need to get a “good score” for their project to be selected.  This is not correct: the *purpose* of the GAM is for teams to consider and agree the important gender differences – as well as concerns different age groups, as well as issues facing women, men, girls and boys with disabilities -- and how these will be addressed.  When reading a gender analysis, ask yourselves if they understand the situation for women and men (or boys and girls) or if they are just making promises.  Helping project teams to identify key gender differences, the likely challenges and barriers faced by different groups, and to understand their implications for program delivery is an area where cluster leads and gender focal points can have a real impact. |
| 10 | The GAM asks people to think about how they will adapt and tailor their project activities, based on the gender analysis and issues facing other identified groups. Questionnaire responses shows us where people may be missing out. |
| 11 | In this country example, we see that more than half DO tailor activities based on the different needs, issues and barriers faced by different group. Many still only consider the “needs” when designing or tailoring activities. A few projects are tailored solely to address gender-based discrimination.  The majority of projects aim to adapt their activities for all gender groups, all age groups, and almost half also plan to tailor activities for females, males and LGBTI with disabilities. A smaller number of projects focus on specific groups.  Does this GAM data suggests there may be some groups possibly being left out? A: Fewer projects seem to be intentionally adapted to the needs of adolescents and older adults. |
| 12 | Projects are asked to describe how different gender, age and ability groups will not only participate, but actually influence the management and decision-making in the project. |
| 13 | Results from the GAM can be compiled to give us an overall picture of gender programming. For example, we see that affected people participate least in reviewing and evaluating projects. Results for each element can be broken down by gender, age groups, and females/males with disabilities  Keep in mind that in the design phase, the GAM only reports on what project are PLANNING to do! |
| 14 | The monitoring phase asks users to consider – and enables us to report on - important things like how projects are actually addressing GBV; the functioning of complaints mechanisms, communication with communities, or the impact of unexpected problems. |
| 15 | Half of projects report actual numbers of people accessing assistance; almost all are disaggregated by sex and over 70% by age. Few report on access by people with disabilities.  The majority of programs still estimate aid recipients based on population figures. While this is necessary in very large programs, it makes it difficult to identify which specific groups may be missing out. |
| 16 | GBV – Less than 75% of projects say they are working to prevent risk of GBV – this is an important discussion during project design. It will be good when ALL projects are identifying what they can do to reduce GBV. |
| 17 | 75% of projects have a way for people to give feedback or complain which is great, but a smaller proportion are confident that these are safe and confidential or actually result in changes; fewer are accessible to people with disabilities. GAM results also show us areas for improvement like this. |
| 18 | Another example of GAM results: we see that 50% of projects are adapting their communication to reach different gender or age groups -- for example women compared to men, people with disabilities, or elderly compared to adolescents, literate and non-literate people. Many still provide one standard message or approach for everyone. |
| 19 | Project problems / unanticipated negative effects are important because they often affect one group more than another. Many projects do identify unexpected problems and make changes to fix them. Most projects take a serious look at problems, including how they affect people with disabilities, different gender and age groups. |
| 20 | Conclusions - At the end of the GAM you receive a code, 0-4 – this is NOT a reflection of project quality! It is simply an indication of how consistently the project has selected gender or age groups throughout. A code 1 or 2 suggests you might want to go back and think a bit more about which groups will be involved in each stage. |
| 21 | (Re-iterate) For the GAM is to have its intended impact on project quality, it must be clear that the code is in no way tied to project acceptance or funding.  It was developed in response to the need for a capacity-building tool, and it is the process of completing the GAM that improves project quality.  Users should have no incentive to alter the codes that are intended for their benefit only. OCHA and donors only require evidence that the GAM process has been completed.  PLEASE GET PEOPLE TO USE THE GAM FOR MONITORING!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! |