EVALUATION OF GENDER MAINSTREAMING IN UNDP:

INDIA COUNTRY STUDY

April 25–30, 2005

FINAL REPORT

Marcia E. Greenberg, Member of UNDP Gender Mainstreaming Evaluation Team
Nafis Sadik, Team Leader, UNDP Gender Mainstreaming Evaluation Team
Incorporating input from Darshini Mahadevia
June 27, 2005

INTRODUCTION

At the request of UNDP's Executive Board, UNDP's Evaluation Office (UNDP/EO) has undertaken a global evaluation of UNDP's gender mainstreaming (the "Evaluation"). The objective of the Evaluation is to make forward-looking recommendations for improving gender mainstreaming and UNDP's contributions toward achieving sustainable human development that includes gender equality based on an assessment of the extent to which UNDP has been mainstreaming gender throughout its policies, programmes, and institutional practices. To this end, UNDP/EO recruited a team of seven independent consultants (the "Evaluation Team"). The Evaluation is based on country studies in fourteen countries selected by UNDP/EO; in-depth interviews with key stakeholders throughout UNDP headquarters in New York, Regional Service Centers, representatives of other UN agencies, particularly UNIFEM, and Executive Board members; and a survey sent to all senior managers in 166 UNDP country offices interviews.

This report reflects the country study undertaken in India during a one-week mission in April 2005. It is important that the staff of UNDP/India and any others who may read this report understand that the study was undertaken in only 5 days, never purporting to be an evaluation. Rather, the primary focus of the investigation was to inform the Gender Mainstreaming Evaluation. The focus of this report is both to share information with the Evaluation Team and to offer some discrete, independent observations for the UNDP/India Country Office – in a spirit of humility given the great deal of effort invested by UNDP/India staff in promoting gender equality and the limited opportunity to understand fully the context, all that has been attempted, and all that has been achieved

COUNTRY CONTEXT

General

With an estimated population in 2004 of 1.08 billion, India is the second most populous nation in the world. Moreover, India is extraordinarily diverse in terms of religion, culture and language – with 15 official languages, and religious breakdowns of 82% Hindi, 12.1% Muslim, 2.3% Christian, 1.9% Sikh, 0.8% Buddhist and 0.4% Jain (Economist Country Profile 2004, reflecting 1991 (update with 2001census). India's 28 States include some geographically and demographically large and distinct enough to present the challenges of many countries elsewhere in the world, and vary enormously in terms of wealth, resources and politics.

As a result of such variations, it is possible to find great development improvements in India along side millions of people still suffering from extreme deprivation. In 2002, India had a Human Development Index value of 0.595, 127th of 177 countries. [1] Per capita GDP is US$558 (or US$2,690 in US purchasing power parity). Life expectancy at birth (LEB) is 63 yrs.for men and 64 yrs for women, up from 32 years for both in 1951. Yet national indicators fail to depict the true story, as they combine success in certain geographic areas and in the upper and middle classes, with abject poverty among so many others. With a total fertility rate of 2.9 birth per woman, Uttar Pradesh's rate is 4.7 while Kerala's is 1.8. Similarly, mortality rates for children under five have fallen from 127 in 1,000 in 1970 to 67 per 1,000 in 2001 – but there are great variations. Regarding the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), in 2004 just 28 per cent of the population had access to improved sanitation and 84 per cent had access to improved water supply. The percentage of undernourished people in 1999/00 was 21 per cent; percentage children under weight for age was 47 per cent in 1995-2002 period; 30 per cent children were underweight at birth (1998-2002 period) and 46 per cent children were under height for age in 1995-2002 period. [2] It must also not be forgotten that beyond gender differences, there are significant differences of caste that affect access to education and employment.

---

[1] United Nations Development Programme. 2004. Human Development Report, 2004.

[2] Id.

Re Women and Gender Equality in India

In many ways, the situation of women and the state of gender equality in India is consistent with the overall picture. On the positive side, India is enriched by a concentration of very well-educated women who are often found in higher-end, skilled jobs in both the private and public sectors. Women have been entitled to vote since establishment of the Republic of India in 1950, and India has one of the most progressive constitutions, with guaranteed equal rights for all citizens, irrespective of gender, caste, religion or ethnic group.

Regarding international commitments to gender equality, India ratified CEDAW in 1993, and is a signatory to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and to the Beijing Declaration. Through the 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendments, one-third of elected representatives' seats in the "Panchayats" (elected representatives for rural governance) and Urban Local Bodies (elected representative body for urban governance) have been reserved for women – with one-third reservation for posts of chairperson in those bodies as well. In some states, the number of elected women now exceeds the reserved quota.

In terms of government policies and practices, there have been some noteworthy steps in recent years – all due to ongoing pressure by women's rights advocates, and often involving support by UNIFEM and/or UNDP. In 2001, India framed a "National Policy for the Empowerment of Women" –which is under implementation. India's most recent Tenth Five-Year Plan (2002-07) includes gender equality and women's empowerment, and spells outs a three-pronged strategy of social empowerment, economic empowerment and gender justice. Further, the Tenth Five Year Plan has aslo set monitorable targets , some of which pertain to gender equality! There was gender sensitisation for census "operators" (data collectors) for both the 1991 and 2001 censuses. The National Annual Economic Surveys (NAES) of 2001-02 and 2002-03 included gender as a category for the first time. This is noteworthy because the NAES are published by the Finance Ministry, a Ministry that deals only with hard fiscal issues and financial allocations. With UN System support to efforts to engender the survey, it became possible to bring the perceived "soft" gender issues to the forefront. The Economic Survey, 2000-2001, carried a section on women and gender, entitled Gender Inequality, that recognised the economic value of the work that women do – paving the way for more in-depth government attention to this issue. In the year 2000 a Task Force on Women, headed by the Deputy Chair of the Planning Commission, launched a project to review laws and legislation. There have been gender training courses in the areas of gender and police, gender and administration, and gender and the judiciary.

The Department of Women and Child Development introduced the concept of a Women's Component Plan and of gender budgeting initiatives to assess the Ninth Five-Year plan. The WCP tracks funds earmarked for programs targeting women and girls (women-specific), or with significant womens' component (pro-women). Budget analyses have been completed for the central government budget (Union Budget 2001-02 and 2002-03) and for state government budgets. "The Tenth Plan reaffirms the major strategy of mainstreaming gender perspectives in all sectoral policies, programmes and plans of action. Women specific interventions will be undertaken to bridge existing gaps. It mentions that it will "continue the process of dissecting the Government budget to establish its gender differentiated impact and to translate gender commitments into budgetary commitments… (That it) will initiate immediate action in tying up these two effective concepts of Women's Component Plan and Gender Budgeting to play a complementary role to each other, and thus ensure both preventive and post facto action in enabling women to receive their rightful share." (Quoting Darshini Mahadevia's Background paper, p. 12) While initial gender budgeting efforts were limited to education, health, nutrition, access to resources and public services, etc, the DWCD has recently (2004) prepared checklists to assist all departments in gender budget exercises and in using these to develop a gender perspective in planning. These check lists are not only for the conventional social sector Ministries and Departments but also seek to involve so called gender neutral Departments like transport, power, home," (Quoting Darshini Mahadevia's Background paper, p. 12). As recently as Feb. 2005, India's Finance Minister committed that "in course of time, all Departments will be required to present gender budgets as well as make benefit-incidence analyses."

Strengths may also be found in civil society. India's women's movements have been very strong. There are many women's NGOs, with a self-funded National Conference of Autonomous Women's Groups held every four years. In an India of lively political debate, women's groups utilize the media and engage in democratic debate on a vast range of topics. Each of the political parties has a women's wing – and they have been pushing for reservation of 33% seats in the Parliament and in the State Legislative Assemblies. The

women's movement has long taken up issues such as dowry harassment and dowry deaths – a great deal of focus on violence against women in India that is so pervasive.

There are many different women's groups related to economic rights, such as SEWA (the Self-Employed Women's Association), Women Construction Workers, the Organization of Women Working in Bars, the Union of Women Sex Workers, and Lawyers' Collectives. Among rural and less educated women, and particularly in South India, there is an ever-growing community of Self Help Groups (SHGs) focused primarily on livelihoods, but also on health and education. Microfinance has been promoted for many years in India, starting many years back with Women's World Banking.

Finally, to push the thinking, to analyze the data, to support both government and advocacy groups, there are Women's Study Centers in nearly every university, some of which have been given the task of gender budgeting and advocating for their State governments to do it. The Association of Women's Studies (including academics, women's movement and Other People's Movements) meets every two years. In Delhi there is a premier research onWomen's Studies (along with other institutes that also take up gender issues).

Yet at the same time, women in India suffer both economic and social disadvantages – many of which span all classes. Despite the Constitutional guarantee of equality, Article 14 of the Fundamental Rights section also states a "Fundamental Rights to Religion" which allows for the "personal laws" to apply in case of family matters – much of which is of the greatest importance to girls and women in their daily lives, and with regard to personal and financial security. Only 54% of Indian women are literate, as compared to 76% of men. There are far fewer women in the paid, formal workforce (27%) than men (58%), and women earn far lower wages than men doing the same work. The sex ratios in India continue to reflect preference for boys, with startling data indicating a decrease in the juvenile sex ratio from 945/1000 in 1991 to 927/1000 in 2001. (Darshini Mahadevia's Background paper, p. 6). Further selection for boys apparently takes place in all classes, since modern technology enables such selection, and at the time of this study, one newspaper reported that the sex ratio in clinics utilized by middle and upper class couples is evidence of selection irrespective of educational levels. Dowry practices continue, including reports of *increases* in Kerala where progressive politics and education levels also lead to expectations that such practices would be eliminated. Conservative right wing politics and religious trends are resulting in increased inequities, decreased opportunities for girls and women, and losses in efforts to establish gender equitable relations within families and communities.

UNDP/INDIA: History and Gender Mainstreaming

UNDP in India Generally

To understand UNDP/India's contributions to gender equality, it is important to recognize that with its CCF-2 of $250 million over 5 years (in the context of the national budget[3]), UNDP is a very small player in India.[4] From a funding perspective, therefore, UNDP has limited leverage as a donor.

In addition, India is a nation that truly claims ownership regarding the use of donor inputs. Hence, UNDP does not exercise unilateral control over how its assistance is used. UNDP works in partnership with the Government of India – meaning that all funding passes through relevant ministries. There is always a ministry as an Executing Agency, such as the Ministry of Rural Development or the Department for Women and Children Development. Further, program funding is fixed by the NEX, the National Execution Guidelines.

Another aspect of UNDP partnerships is that in the context of India's decentralization, UNDP frequently works with State government entities or personnel. While some may be strong, others lack human or financial resources that limit their capacity to take gender mainstreaming approaches. In addition, India has set its own development goals through it Tenth Five-Year Plan (going beyond, and not confined only to the MDGs) – and all of UNDP's work must be in consonance with the Plan. The challenge for UNDP has

---

[3] According to the 1999 Human Development Report, net official development assistance received by India was 0.4% of GDP. Total external assistance was 6.4% of the revised budget estimates of 2004-05. [Darshini Mahavedia]

[4] Though admittedly the budget may be *huge* relative to other UNDP offices.

therefore been "to identify spaces where its resources can be deployed in a manner that yields optimal dividends in terms of positive impacts on the overall course of develompent" (Darshini Mahadevia, p. 16)

Nevertheless, it is reported that UNDP exercises influence as a partner. Many, including informants with government offices, suggested that as a multilateral donor, UNDP is an external agency with independence and credibility. A common opinion was that if UNDP advises its partners to take a certain approach, people listen. This is significant in terms of how UNDP incorporates gender into its policy dialogues.

Moreover, this presents a strategic opportunity for bilateral donors concerned about gender equality. While the Government of India (GOI) has limited bilateral donors to perhaps only a half-dozen, excluded donors may still support development (or gender and development) in India through multilateral agencies like the UNDP. Further, what may appear driven by self-interest or a particular political or cultural characteristic by a bilateral donor, is often viewed as more acceptable when put forward by the UNDP.

UNDP/India has sought to utillize its partnerships and limited resources in strategic ways. One example is the national and State Human Development Reports – ways to build capacity for gathering and analyzing data, as well as focusing policy-makers on "human development" that contrasts with neoliberal approaches and that raises issues of gender equality. Another way to have broader impacts than limited resources would allow, is for UNDP to support pilot programs to inform future government policies and programs.

UNDP's partnerships with the Government of India have included the following:

- The Human Development Resource Centre's earlier work with the National Planning Commission has led to work with State governments to prepare and disseminate State Human Development Reports.

- UNDP's SEED/CCNRM unit[5] partners with the Ministry of Rural Development on sustainable livelihoods, including interventions to increase the access of the poor to privately owned economic assets, common property resources, and public goods and services.

- SEED/CCNRM also works with the Ministry of Environment and Forests, and with the Ministry of Agriculture.

- UNDP works with the Department of Women and Child Development (DWCD) to support gender budgeting and policy outcomes.

- The PPLG/DPP[6] works with several ministries, including the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology, the Ministry of Urban Develpoment and Poverty Alleviation and the Ministry of Tourism and Culture.

- For disaster mitigation and vulnerability reduction, UNDP has worked with the Ministry of Home Affairs to establish comprehensive disaster warning, rescue and rehabilitation activities at the district and taluka levels in disaster prone states. Work in Gujarat immediately following the earthquake and in Orissa after the super-cyclone have included partnerships with grassroots women's groups and campaign to build a network of village women's groups respectively.

UNDP has also partnered with civil society organizations, such as Women's Political Watch or the Institute for Public Affairs – as well as civil society partners related to combating HIV/AIDS.

UNDP/India and Gender Mainstreaming

As can be concluded by reading Darshini Mahadevia's Background Report, this section could potentially include pages describing how UNDP/India has recognized women's needs and strived to incorporate women as both beneficiaries and participant-contributors to socio-economic development. There is limited utility, however, in repeating what UNDP/India staff know and what has been summarized in the Background Report. Further, as the Backgound Report relied on documentation (primarily independent evalutions of CCF-1 projects, and ProDocs for CCF-2 projects) and brief interviews, and as this Country Study involved

---

[5] Sustainable Energy and Environment Development (SEED)/Community Centred National Resource Management (CCNRM).

[6] Public Policy and Local Governance (PPLG)/Decentralization and Participatory Planning (DPP).

very little time in the field, there has been quite limited opportunity to develop an in-depth critique of gender mainstreaming at the level of implementation. Further, this discussion should be framed in light of the objectives of the Gender Mainstreaming Team and our commitment to providing some useful feedback to UNDP/India staff.

It is in that spirit, that the objective of this section is to use UNDP/India's past and current efforts to focus on women and gender in two ways: to illustrate positive accomplishments, and to suggest where UNDP's programs might make further progress toward gender equality by taking more of a Gender and Development approach than the still predominating Women in Development one. Hence this discussion is in three parts: First, for the Evaluation Team, it sets forth a quick summary of gender within the key documents, the CCF-1, CCF-2 and UNDAF. From them, one should note the extent to which gender has been "visible and explicit" – but recognize that the douments are but the very first step in what should lead to impacts on the ground. Second, to frame the discussion for UNDP/India staff, we share the definition of "gender mainstremaing" that the Gender Mainstreaming Team has used as its foundation for investigating gender mainstreaming by UNDP. Third, we offer an analysis of the levels of "gender mainstreaming" by UNDP/India – particularly focusing on where there have been **women**-focused projects or program components, efforts to include **women** as beneficiaries or participants in mainstream activities, or approaches seeking to enhance **women's empowerment** or gender equality – and suggest a need to shift to a more gender-oriented approach.

Gender Mainstreaming and the Critical Foundation Documents: CCF-1, UNDAF and CCF-2

UNDP's completed country program, CCF-1 ending in 2002, "focused on growth with equity, with poverty alleviation and human development as its central concerns." (EO Evaluation/ES) It represented a shift to more direct focus on pro-poor concerns. It had four broad themes: Employment and sustainable livelihoods, Access to basic services, Management of Development and Sustainable Development (environment) with *many* cross cutting themes, *of which gender equality was but one*.

Most of the projects for which the Background Paper could review documentation and evaluations were initiated and implemented within the context of CCF-1, i.e. prior to the UNDAF establishing gender equality as a critical area of importance. As is noted below, however, there was a striking degree of focus on women – in terms of their needs, but also as valuable contributors to household or community economic well-being.

In 1999, the UN system carried out a Common Country Assessment intended to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the UN system in India. The process of working both with the Government of India and with a broad range of development partners resulted in *identifying gender equality and decentralisation as two critical areas of importance to India's future development*. The current UNDAF (United Nations Development Assistance Framework) states: "The process of dialogue with Government and broad consultations with development partners helped identify two areas of key importance for India's future development: (i) promoting gender equality, and (ii) strengthening decentralisation." At the same time, it recognized how the issues are inter-related, stating that "Promoting gender equality is an important way of making decentralisation more effective." "The main objectives of promoting gender equality will be to Enhance women's decision-making capability, Promote equal opportunities and Support policy changes." The UNDAF also identifies areas of collaborative action. It is a model of attention to gender equality within the process and focus of nationally owned identification of key goals, objectives and actions. This explicit and focused attention to gender equality was a major accomplishment of the UN Inter-Agency Working Group on Gender Equality, that included UNDP and UNIFEM among others.

The current country program (CCF-2 for 2002-07) is different structurally, in that rather than encompassing many small projects, it is formed in large programs. A meeting of stakeholders reviewing the CCF-1 concluded that "significant contributions to the ongoing proccess of mainstreaming gender in national policies" should be one of seven main country program directions. The four thematic then became: (a) the promotion of human development and *gender equality*, (b) capacity-building for decentralization, (c) poverty eradication and sustainable livelihoods, and (d) vulnerability reduction and environmental sustainability. From the CCF-1, there has been a shift to gender mainstreaming of *all* programmes, with gender introduced as a cross-cutting theme. This should result in a shift from a WID (Women in Development) approach to a GAD (Gender and Development) approach. UNDP also has a dedicated project with the Department of Women and Children's Development that focuses on women's empowerment. As will be discussed further below, the GAD approach may have been accomplished more by adding a WID

component to a large program (consistent with the shift from multiple smaller projects to larger programs) than by taking a gendered approach throughout the program.

This is noteworthy and contrasts with the UNDP/EO evaluation that recommended 10 "possible options" for the upcoming program, none of which explicitly addresses gender equality – and then suggested, "[c]ross-cutting themes like gender equality, sustainable human development, HIV/AIDS and environmental sustainability should be *appropriately incorporated.*" Such guidance from NY put gender equality into a string list, and contrasts with the prominence otherwise stated in India's Tenth Five-Year Plan and in the UNDAF. The UNDP/India staff did well to elevate gender equality to a more powerful and signficant level.[7]

Definition of Gender Mainstreaming

This Gender Mainstreaming Evaluation Team determined from early in the process that it was essential that we decide – and share with others throughout UNDP – an agreed definition of *gender mainstreaming*. The Evaluation Team's operational definition, as set forth in its Inception report, was guided by the definition included in the 1997 ECOSOC Resolution[8] and subsequent UN and UNDP policy papers:

(i)   Gender Mainstreaming requires that **gender analysis is an integral part of all activities** undertaken by UNDP, including but not limited to: country assessments, baseline research, program/project design, program/project implementation, and all monitoring and evaluation. This must be consistent with the ECOSOC definition, ensuring that UNDP activities do not have negative impacts on gender equality, and that women and men benefit equally.

(ii)   **Support for gender equality should be a key element of all policy dialogue with partners**, including governments, other donors and civil society organizations, taking due cognizance of United Nations commitments to gender equality, partner government's own commitments to gender equality (e.g. CEDAW and the Beijing Platform for Action), and local perspectives and priorities regarding gender equality.

(iii) **Developing and implementing institutional strategies** to ensure that UNDP develops and maintains appropriate capacity to achieve gender mainstreaming, including policies, expertise, human resource policies, and sufficient resources for effective implementation.

This three-pronged definition is an essential touchstone for testing an approach or analysis for whether it represents the "stretch" to gender mainstreaming, or relies on an earlier approach of focusing on women in development.

Analysis of UNDP/India's Gender Mainstreaming

From project documents and discussions in CCF-1 evaluations, it appears that UNDP/India has done a commendable job paying attention to the **needs and contributions of women**. The Background Report offers a list of more than 20 achievements under CCF-1, starting with a "remarkable increase in women's participation in project implementation in most of the projects of SEED/CCNRM". From focusing on women in self-help groups (SHGs) and women in agriculture, to working with elected women and land ownership, to recognizing how women may help combat desertification or protect wildlife, UNDP/India has demonstrated that it did not forget women as beneficiaries or participants or contributors – and has in fact

---

[7] Note that this section does not address a PRSP because there is not such a process in India. Similarly, India has taken little account of the Millenium Development Goals (MDGs), insisting instead that its own goals are more ambitious and more appropriate to its circumstances.

[8] Mainstreaming a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women's as well as men's concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality. UN Economic and Social Council. E. 1997. L.10. Para 4.

dedicated core resources to working with them. The fact that the cited evaluations pay attention to gender, noting both successes and questions, is also laudable (and not always the case elsewhere).

Rather than using this study to re-state what has already ably been reported, it offers an opportunity to look at ways in which an enhanced gender approach – one that goes beyond the WID/women focus to a more purposeful focus on mechanisms to improve gender equalty – might be possible within the context of similar programs (recognizing, of course, that while some may have been done so in the field, evaluations or limited documentation may not have captured it).

Gender is about socially learned and socially practiced divisions of roles, responsibilities and power. Each time that UNDP and its partners encourage women's participation in roles or institutions different from current practice, a number of common gender issues may arise. For example, how does the change in a women's role affect her other roles, such as adding to the already numerous burdens on her time? Or, how do men react to the change – and in case of confusion, fear or rejection, have UNDP activities worked with the men to help them understand and accept the changes? Lastly, what happens as women and men's roles change, in terms of how effectively they communicate and collaborate?

The following group of projects are ones that focused on women's access to leadership, power, status – i.e. empowerment. In each case, beyond the focus on women in isolation, there are some gender issues that might warrant attention.

Women-Focused Empowerment	Gender Aspect
Women heading village level committees, #4, p. 33[9]	How do the men in the committees respond? If well, did the the UNDP partner purposefully focus on this? Or was there some element that helped, such as particularly respected women, or male leaders who were open to women's leadership?
Women able to mobilise community finances for public works, #6, p. 33	How do they mobilise finances in relation to men who may control them? Once they mobilise the finances, who controls them and uses them?
Women achieve leadership skills, including skills to negotiate in arenas that were solely male domain, #10, p. 33	Was this focused just on the women, or did the programme work with men as well, or work purposefully with the women and men together? As a result of this, were there impacts at the household level – i.e. what indicators were tracked?
In the families, women are having relatively greater say in the use of money they have earned, #12, p. 33	Were there instances of resistance by men in the household? Did the program focus just on increased income generation, or was there a programmatic focus on negotiating control?
Gradual change in women's perception about their own health and nutrition needs is coming forth, #17, p. 34	Was there any impact on men? Improvements in household well-being? Men's interest in how their wives were doing?[10]
The opening up of the world for women, in a highly patriarchal society such as Rajasthan, itself is empowering for women. Larger issues of gender equity are still far-fetched goals here. (#3, p. 34)	How far-fetched? Were efforts made to include the men, to work for them not to resist or feel threatened by women's increased empowerment? Were small steps made toward gender equity? For such changes, what are realistic expectations for the pace of meaningful, sustainable change? The frustration may be that change comes slowly ("Slowly the gender stero type is changing ... A disappointment is

---

[9] Numbers and page numbers refer to Darshini Mahavedia's revised Background Paper.

[10] Experience in Eritrea revealed that men were glad that their wives were "feeling better", and that they started wanting to read their wives' magazines to learn about women's health!

	that the process is slow.", #14, p. 33) but sometimes it is slower changes that are more sustainable.
In a project on Wildlife protected area management in Jaldapara ... women's representation was ensured on the Eco-Development Committees by 51:49. This sectoral programme by its design was meant to overcome women's drudgery, which it did.	How did the design focus on women's effective participation on the Committees? Did it overcome women's drudgery as part of the protected of the area, or was there a project component for that, e.g. labor-saving devices?
In area of health, women have started articulating their gynaec problems. It is likely that IMR and MMR have reduced in the villages. #1, p. 35	"Assessment of gender relations in the project area has *not* been carried out [to] analyse whether reversal of gendered hierarchies have begun or not." This could be an example of how attention to gender may affect development indicators (or MDGs), and why it is important to measure baselines and change through the course of intervention – and beyond.
BDMSA's central approach to the empowerment of rural women has been to attempt to improve their lives not simply through a single intervention but to simultaneously undertake multiple activities which reinforce each other (livelihood support and asset creation, water security initiatives and social support services) ... based on an recognition that only a combination of initiatives will begin to have a dent on the status of women. p. 36	Did the combination of activities only include activities for/with women, or did any address men "in the picture"? Was women's status improved through empowering them alone, or was there any attention to the men with whom they relate?
Enhanced Rural Non-Farm Employment and Productivity and Income Potential of the Poor (especially Artisans and Women), p. 40	Aim to enhance women's employment, but no mention of gender impacts. Was there no attention to gender, or was it just not evaluated or reported? Maybe some good lessons were learned, for sharing with others – either from what was not done, or what did work?
Eighty percent of the workers in the Indian Coir industry are women but there is no mention of gendered impacts of the project, p. 40	A missed opportunity?

Thus there is more to gender mainstreaming, when applying a GAD approach, than adding a women's focus. The objective is not only to include women, and not only to address women's needs. While projects or program components that focus on women's empowerment are a positive approach to gender mainstreaming, and to be encouraged, there are lessons about how to ensure that the empowerment activities and results are contextualized – particularly taking account of the men within the women's families or communities. For example, within PPLG/DPP, the gender programme is "Capacity-Building of Elected Women Representatives and Functionaries of PRIs" – which is good. At the same time, an evaluation in Orissa observed (and it is great that an evaluation looked for this and picked up on it!): "Some women did not communicate in PRI meetings because their political party instructed them or male members dominated; opinions of women from lowest strata were not taken seriously, women did not get cooperation from the bureaucracy. In Andhra Pradesh, the burden of women increased after becoming members of the PRIs, and there was no behavioral and attitudinal change observed in the male members of the family."

Further addressing women's needs does not suffice if the provision of assistance does not result in sustained change, i.e. if women do not develop the capacity to address their needs, or if programmatic assistance does not result in lasting removal gender-related impediments to the meeting of their needs. Compare, for example, "women have made efforts to bring dropped outchildren back to school" and "children who were working have been pulled out of jobs by the implementing agency and put back in schools" (#15, p. 33). The second case risks that children go back to work once the implementing agency is gone. In another case, to what might UNDP attribute the report that "new livelihood activities have been introduced; migration has

reduced, income have increased, families have procured productive and other assets, meeting of consumption expenses and increase in educatoin investments on children"? (#19, p.34) Was it solely from changes in the women, or have there been any shifts in gender roles, in expectations, in how men and women relate to one another and contribute to family and household?

The very understanding of the development problem or challenge must begin with some fundamental questions about gender relations and power. For example: Do gender-defined roles preclude women (and girls) from gaining access to resources? Does time spent fetching wood or water prevent them from generating income for themselves and their families, or from tending to their own health needs? Or do laws, or practices, regarding land ownership by women undermine incentives to improve and utilize land productively?

As was noted in *"Moving from Policy to Practice: A Gender Mainstreaming Strategy for UNDP India,"* gender mainstreaming is not a process which begins and ends with women. It does not mean only having an equal number of women and men in the organization or supporting programmes exclusively for women, although it includes these aspects. Gender mainstreaming implies including women, but does not imply excluding men. UNDP sees gender mainstreaming as a strategy for bringing about gender equality through creating space for everyone – women and men in the organization as well as in communities – to contribute to the process of articulating a shared vision of sustainable human development and translating it into a reality.

Some therefore say that "gender" means focusing on men as well as women – but it is not as much a matter of men's needs, as how in their relations with women, in the division of labor or in the space that they allow for individual human capacity and growth – they may block the way to improved economic and social well-being. Initial questions might include: Do men, as a result of gender-based expectations, prevent their wives and daughters from being healthy, productive members of a family team? Do attitudes toward the value of a girl or woman, the failure to recognize the dignity of that human being, undermine human development objectives? Is it possible to stop the spread of AIDS without working with boys and men – and without changing their view of their roles in sexual relations?

General concepts are not nearly as helpful as real examples – and UNDP/India's work for and with women provides some useful ones:

UNDP's CCF-1 Project	Evaluation Observation	Possible Gender Mainstreaming Approach
Janshala work with Schools and Communities, a multi-sectoral, multi-UN Agency project with an objective of increasing girls' education	Community participation had mixed results, enrolment of girls did not improve to the extent anticipated, developing gender sensitivity among teachers seems to have increased girls' enrolment.	To what extent did the project focus on the women and men in the community groups, and how they worked together? Was there a gender analysis first, of what factors are impeding girls' enrolment?
"Sub-programmes" helped improve the status of women within the family and society	Women gained confidence and organizational backing to question men's desertions, drinking habits and oppressive traditional practices	Sub-programmes sounds like componente within a larger programme. How did it link with the larger programme, development objectives, and participants?
"Located within the empowerment approach, the projects are attempting to go beyond improving access to food security alone. They are contributing to improving women's access to agricultural land, markets, banks, district administration and Pahchayati Raj Institutions. In all	With regard to land rights, needless to say, the experiences of the organizations were different. There were variations in the success of the ventures even within one State, making it obvious that success was, to some extent, based on the overall strategies of the NGO partner. P.	Here is a project focused on women's empowerment, but perhaps implemented differently among project sites. What may account for the differences in results? Are they related to cultural differences? Were there differences in the approach to gender?

three states, local groups are mobilizing community support for joint registration of agricultural land in the name of men and women. P. 37	37. In some projects, domestic violence continues ... dowry continues ... early marriage of girls continue ... traditional hierarchy remain. P. 38	What factors may be of interest regarding the continuation of discontinuation of violence?
At the village level, the project specifically targeted women, as approximately 80% of the members ... The implementing agency also formed male SHGs for savings.	But men distanced themselves from the mainstream activities of the project. The gender division therefore remained in the SHG formation.	Involving men, or focusing on men as well as women, may reveal yet unrecognized gender barriers to development. If UNDP's project work is as much about identifying issues and opportunities for GOI programmes, as about results for a small number of participants, these kinds of issues are noteworthy.
TBS is known for successful implementation of water structures…	... But the gender inequity continues to bother the area (sex ratios declined, female literacy remains low, children remain in the labour force)	It is increasingly common – and a notable improvement – that water projects involve women (recognized as primary users but also those who fetch and consume). These programmes may be examples of where focusing on women alone is a missed opportunity – and understanding gender may improve programme results.
National Leather Development programme, where women historically have played a supportive role in the industry. P. 40	In the micro enterprises and SSI sectors, they were rarely the business heads. Women have remained a part of the traditional household labor force in the industry ...	In only one sub-programme, Athani, empowerment of women and enhancing their participation was included in the core objectives. Looking at the success in Athani indicates that it is possible to include gender components in the develompent of the leather industry. P. 40

According to one UNDP/India staff member: "In certain program contexts, it is so obvious, e.g. access to energy, that failure to address gender would be disastrous." But in other cases, it is possible to be creative, to **find opportunities to advance gender equality**. For example, in UNDP's work with steel rolling mills not a single woman was working there. Now, however, they are doing energy conservation audits, and have hired two women to do it – expecting these women will have technical expertise, not fudge the numbers, and would follow the protocol! (Note: This discussion led to brainstorming about not just women's participationg, but gender: potential negative gender impacts, such as steel workers pushed for greater productivity, increasingly tired, drink more, and possibly increase violence in the home.) (?)

A DWCD report acknowledged the impacts of gender equality focused Human Development Reports: "The State Human Development Reports have emerged as a powerful tool for advocacy for gender justice since their inception in 1995. Gender mainstreaming in the HDRs has been done both in the form of specific chapters on gender as also highlighting gender concerns in the sectoral analysis of education, health, livelihoods and governance…. Seven States have already prepared their State HDRs and eigh State HDRs are being finalised. In the State of Karnataka, after the publication of the report in 1999, the State

government launched a massive program (*Sthree Shakthi*) for the empowerment of ruiral women thorugh the institution of self-help groups. The objective is to enhance the financial stability of rural women, thereby creating an environment for social change through the promotion of thrift and credit." UNDP's Human Development Resource Centre also has a programme on promoting gender equality that includes action research on women's leadership, on vulnerability of women, and on the impacts of macroeconomic policies on women.[11]]

Lessons from the Field: Disaster Management & Vulnerability Reduction

As we compare gender mainstreaming approaches that add a women's component, with approaches that seek strategic opportunities to promote gender equality, this progam is noteworthy for how it has gone beyond focusing on women, to working with women and men with an eye toward enhanced gender equality. "The programme envisages women's participation in risk mangement at the community level and post-disaster rescue and relief works. Since it is known that disasters have different impacts on men and women, this project has … [incorporated] this knowledge of gendered impacts of disasters. The programme is run through formation of teams of volunteers at the village level .. in which 30 percent participation of women is ensured."

This programme also illustrates the opportunities lent by gender sensitivity within the process of implementation – which is often not reflected either in project design documentation or in reporting. A UN Volunteer, without any specific gender training, introduced the concept of community-led preparations after the destruction of the Super Cyclone of 1999. She started by convening community groups, and asking them to map their villages. When the men produced a map, the women protested that it left off key places or resources – and thus the women came up with a separate "map". From that small exchange of information and collaboration, the programmed has developed into developing and practicing "mock drills" – through which they have purposefully facilitated equal and respectful partnerships of women and men. Along with achieving the disaster prevention objective, the programme has increased men and women's work together (rather than separately) and building respect for women's contributions. Such achievements are noteworthy, but may not appear either as separate "gender budget lines" or as documented results. They are, however, the sort of gender mainstreaming that ought to occur throughout UNDP's work.

A different illustration can be found in a programme through which UN Volunteers train women to be masons. Evidently, this is not new in India, but there are still more instances of women serving as "labourers" than having the training to be masons. Recognizing an unmet need for further masonry expertise in rebuilding after the cyclones, UN volunteers thought to capitalize on the opportunity to increase women's income generating opportunities, status in the economy, and contributions to rebuilding. Further, however, they seem to have thought about gender factors, such as how the mason-trainees' male family members react, how the women will work with male masons, and how women may get business from government contracts. Those are the sorts of questions that look beyond merely teaching women skills, and beyond increasing women's income generation – to an empowerment that takes account of the men in the community and seeks sustainable results. The enthusiasm of women trainees was inspirational – as was, as well, the dedication of the UN Volunteers who are seeking to increase the program's scope.

COOPERATION WITH PARTNERS

The Government of India

As was stated above, the key partners for UNDP in India are government entitites. In India, it is essential that any donor or foreign intervenor be sensitive to the importance of Indian ownership and leadership. As a consequence, UNDP can encourage its GOI partners to mainstream attention to gender and promote gender equality – but cannot require it.

---

[11] Recent Reports: Impact of Maharashtra's Agricultural Policies on Women Farmers: A Gender Budgeting Analysis; Gender Budgeting - Impact of Policies and Programmes on Women of Agricultural Households in Gujarat; Impact of Recent Policies on Home-Based Work in India; Gender Analysis of Select Gram (Villages) Panchayats Plan - Budgets in Trivandrum District, Kerala; Gender Budget Perspectives on Macro and Meso Policies in Small Urban Manufactures in Greater Mumbai.

It was noted in a number of instances, however, that the extent to which government partners do not understand gender mainstreaming tends to undermine UNDP's efforts to promote it. One government representative in fact suggested that too many of her government colleagues would prefer to do a little more of the same, at the margins, rather than doing things differently – which tends to impede any innovation, including transformational approaches for gender equality. Among the UNDP staff, a number of program staff honestly acknowledged that without a greater understanding of how gender relates to their work, they do not feel equipped to "make the argument`` or explain the relevance to their GOI partners (a real indication of the importance of greater capacity among UNDP staff and their partners).

Yet there were some positive signs. For example, in the short time available for this investigation, the team met with a number of government representatives who are open to, and quite proactive regarding gender equality – particularly in the Planning Commission, which is a key UNDP partner, and in Orissa. From UNDP's experience with them, one may recognize the importance of finding "champions" within government, who can promote gender equality among their colleagues – with the substantive as well as financial support of UNDP.

UNDP/India has also developed a strategy of using the Human Development Report, both national and State, as a mechanism for raising awareness of women's needs and gender disparities, and for building capacity to understand the challenges. As UNDP does not write the reports itself, but instead works with members of government, academics and civil society to transfer the capability to gather data, analyze it, and write the reports, there are opportunities to build capacity and to disseminate information related to gender equality. The State Human Development Reports have proved a strategic and visible way to improve understanding of women's needs and of gender relations in different areas of India. They have three inter-related benefits: (1) building Indian, State-level capacity and systems to collect sex-disaggregated data and analyze information for gender implications, (2) revealing trends and issues calling for policy responses and resources, and (3) triggering new programs focused on gender equality. As this is an area where UNDP has respect, the opportunity to build capacity, and the possibility of spreading awareness and understanding quite broadly throughout India, it is a noteworthy approach.

The message does seem to be getting through to some: One government partner stated: "UNDP puts us on guard and doesn't let us bypass the [gender] issues. We are trying to bring gender to the center."

Other UN Agencies

The UNDP/India example is a positive one with regard to collaboration among UN agencies to promote gender equality. The Inter-Agency Working Group on Gender and Development (IAWG/GD) was formed in December 1994 under the leadership of UNIFEM and UNICEF. Their first task was to adopt a common approach to gender mainstreaming in all UN programming in India, and the second was to begin collaboration for the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing. The IAWG/GD also spun off a number of subgroups, such as groups on sex-disaggregated data, advocacy, women's empowerment and poverty alleviation in 1997, a group on Violence against Women and Girl Children in 1998, on Engendering the Tenth Five-Year Plan and on Gender Impact Assessment in in 2000, a Task Force on Women's Participation in Local Governance in 2001, and a group on Pre-Birth Elimination of Females in 2002. They also worked together to provide inputs for the UNDAF process, including the group suggestion that promoting gender equality would be the 'greatest common numerator' for the UNDAF to build upon. In 2001, UNICEF, UNIFEM and UNFPA took the lead to promote attention to gender in the 2001 Census. This IAWG/GD seems to have been quite an effective mechanism for sharing resources – though it was disappointing to find that they did not share information about gender training that one organization might be offering and that might be instructive for others.

For the future, this well-functioning system in India will be replaced by a new, centrally designed system: the Knowledge Management Networks. The new system offers some benefits: First, gender is among the 9 topics that will be covered in India. The gender group will be housed at UNIFEM – and the poverty group at UNDP. Second, this approach expands the working group beyond the UN family to include government, NGO and advocate members.

There are, however, two aspects that should be be watched regarding implementation. First, there is a danger that the gender group will be isolated from the others – and that gender will not be mainstreamed into all

groups. One way to address this, is to have some members of the gender group also subscribed to the others – for cross-listing and discussion when relevant. Second, the KM groups will be more electronic than face-to-face. The danger is that where there is a need to build relationships and exchange information between and among UN agencies, this may happen less once electronic. Perhaps this is over-concern for gender, but it is often a more "male" approach to networking to use computer networks, while women (who are many of the IAWG/GD members) often network more effectively person-to-person. [See Recommendations]

There is also project-level collaboration, such as Janshala (elementary education and community participation) through which UNDP is working with UNICEF, UNESCO, ILO and UNFPA. With regard to HIV/AIDS, both the CHARCA project and the India Railways projects are examples of UNDP-UNIFEM collaboration.[12]

Looking more particularly at the UNIFEM-UNDP relations in India, and potential overlap or collaboration for gender mainstreaming, there have been some positive examples of working together, such as the sub-group on sex-disaggregated data, both working with the GOI on gender within the Tenth 5-Year Plan. But there remain some areas of great sensitivity. With regard to gender budgeting, there seems to have been competition and/or lack of clear areas of support (given that there is plenty of need, or opportunities for partnerships or training throughout India and the states). It was discouraging to find that one UNDP staff member who works on gender budgets was not at all aware of a stack of UNIFEM gender budgeting publications that had been given to the Gender Mainstreaming Team earlier in the week.

It is also important that when UNDP scales up or integrates UNIFEM approaches into mainstream projects, UNDP should not forget about UNIFEM and its partners, when in fact UNIFEM may have additional expertise to offer, and the women's organizations with which UNIFEM has worked may be helpful partners. "UNIFEM's ideas and approaches are mainstreamed, but the women leaders and organizations end up marginalized – as does UNIFEM itself." [RECOMMEND: UNIFEM should continue to innovate and experiment (and to advocate for women's needs and rights) with UNDP integrating new understanding or approaches within its broader development program. But UNDP should credit and recognize UNIFEM contributions, and keep UNIFEM involved in implementation when UNIFEM expertise and networks would contribute.]

Despite the general collegiality of the IAWD/GD, it is not clear that UNDP staff know of and utilize women-focused and gender resources among the UN partners – including not only UNIFEM, but also ILO and UNFPA. It may be instructive to note that in Orissa, where the community is smaller, the UN agencies seems to have collaborated more effectively, including when UNDP staff have attended others' training. This is something to which the Knowledge Management Network facilitators (and the UNDP Gender Group) might pay attention.

Other Donors

This inquiry was quite limited in India for two reasons: (1) the length of the investigation, and the inclusion of a site visit to Orissa precluded covering everything, and (2) India only permits a limited number of bilateral donors. We were informed, however, that UNDP's HIV/AIDS work involves partnerships with donors such as GTZ and AusAID on issues of rights and gender. It would have been instructive to have met with DfID – and we would recommend that UNDP's gender working group invite a representative of DfID to come and speak with them about ways in which DfID may be mainstreaming gender or promoting gender equality through its work in India.

A brief meeting with a representative of the Ford Foundation in India who focuses on microfinance projects revealed that it might be useful for UNDP to seek out others working on microenterprise, and exchange information with them.

---

[12] "UNIFEM in collaboration with UNDP is partnering with the Indian Railways in institutionalizing gender-focused strategies to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS in India. The implementing agency is Railway Women's Empowerment and AIDS Prevention Society (REAPS) and NGOs of South Central Railways."

Civil Society

UNDP has partnered with the Women's Political Watch (WPW) for approximately ten years. It was meaningful for them that when a new UNDP Res Rep had newly arrived in India, her first major speech was at a high level summit on Women and Poverty. From this organization's perspective, UNDP support has not only been "behind the curtain" (i.e. funding), but visible: "UNDP has lent clout, voice, and has stood behind us – increasing the government's receptivity." Apparently, it has been important to them that UNDP has redefined "sustainable development" by saying that affirmative action is very much a part of gender mainstreaming.

Further, it was suggested that UNDP has enlarged this women's NGO's perspective on gender. NGOs tend to be very issue focused, and not necessarily cognizant of the larger context. UNDP has reportedly helped them to recognize the need to educate more people, to think about the context for women. Putting gender mainstreaming in the context of sustainable development, of intersectionality (e.g. gender budgeting linking poverty and governance), UNDP has helped to "domain it in the right place." Now, with gender budgeting and the Ministry of Finance, the issues are reaching men, men in power.

This brief investigation included a lively and rich discussion with civil society about promoting gender equality and women's rights in India. The group that UNDP/India convened represented years of work and thought and expertise – to be admired and appreciated by advocates for gender equality around the world. This group clearly has already worked with "gender equality initiatives 101", and has experience on which to base concerns and ideas for new approaches. UNDP collaborates with a number of them, and they are a valuable source of experience. Where they have greater expertise – or spend more time thinking about gender issues – it might behoove UNDP not only to support them, but also to bring their thoughtful and well-founded thinking into UNDP from which UNDP staff might gather ideas with which to enhance the promotion of gender equality within mainstream programming.

INTERNAL CAPACITY – both Individual and Institutional

This is one of the most interesting aspects of UNDP's gender mainstreaming in India – and noteworthy for the Gender Mainstreaming Evaluation. UNDP/India got off to a remarkable and solid start when in 1999 it sought and received funds from the global gender program to hire a Gender Advisor (Kalyani Menon Sen).[13] Part of the gender advisor's work was a gender sensitization workshop in December 1999, followed by a second round in 2000. The training was strategic and quite effective – at least with the one-third of staff who were included, and recognizing that some people have left UNDP while others have joined since then.[14] The country study team met with at least seven individuals during its investigation, as well as earlier interviews by Darshini Mahadevia – and they came forward, eager for an opportunity to share their insights. We also had a group discussion with the gender working group.

The impressions from both were similar:

- There is an impressive level of caring about gender equality. (Of course it is always possible for people to pay lip service – but there was really no reason to come forward unless they really cared about it, or somehow saw it as internally important, which in of itself is far beyond most country offices.)

- All said that they appreciated the gender training, and that it had changed the way that they think about both their personal lives and their work. "The heart of the exercise was individual improvement … no abstruse programmatic agenda … more honest … was bonding, really connection that mattered: internalizing!"

---

[13] At that time, there was a joing programme of UNDP/UNIFEM by which UNIFEM identified people who could promote and support gender mainstreaming in UNDP, and UNDP gave funding to country offices to hire them. Upon the end of the one-year UNDP/UNIFEM arrangement, the UNDP global programme paid for this gender advisor directly.

[14] UNDP/India's response to the Gender Evaluation Team's zoomerang survey was that 25-50% of the staff have received gender training.

- All had a better sense of "gender", as compared with "WID-focused" work, than tends to be the case in many country offices and at UNDP headquarters.

- All said that they feel that they need additional training, and would welcome it.

The UNDP/India Gender Group

In addition, one result of the training was the establishment of a **Gender Group** – which still exists to this day, and has a mandate to "facilitate the implementation of gender mainstreaming strategy in UNDP-India." Its focus is personal, organizational and programmatic. For the personal and organizational, activities have included inputs to the 2001 UNDP/India restructuring, a code of conduct in 2002, 12 issues of an electronic newsletter/forum about gender, initiative of a learning circle, some study visits and guest lectures, and staff sensitization on sexual harassment and child abuse.

For the programmatic, the Gender Team has

- reviewed project documents prior to PAC meetings

- introduced a checklist on gender as part of the ProDoc

- worked to establish gender as a cross-cutting theme under CCF-2, and one of the UNDAF priorities

- overseen annual MYFF (Multi-Year Funding Framework) reporting

- appraised implementing partners on gender parameters

- and assessed gender mainstreaming in partners.

Their own diagnosis of how they have progressed and what is needed next is also "right on the mark":

- Loss of momentum after departure of the Gender Advisor (and therefore a need to re-establish such a position): "It is sad: We have lost that momentum"

- Need for a stronger enabling environment to sustain and encourage the group: "If UNDPfrom headquarters had maintained its commitment, there would have been a clear signal and UNDP/India would have 'continued the journey'."

- Regular "refresher" for those already trained, and training for newcomers (what they have referred to as a "must" – and we agree)

- Need to expand the group from one that is exclusive to one that is inclusive

In October 2004 the Gender Group held a retreat during which they agreed on the need to provide gender orientation for *all* staff, to reach a common understanding about what "gender mainstreaming" means, and to initiate a gender audit of the major programs. When meeting with the Gender Mainstreaming Team representative, members of the group suggested current challenges – with which this study would concur:

- Inadequate in-house capacity on gender mainstreaming (particularly for implementation)

- Lack of monitoring tools

- Lack of conceptual clarity among UNDP partners

GENDER BALANCE IN UNDP/India

The gender balance, both in terms of numbers and the level of expertise/authority, is strong in UNDP/India. Of the 75 staff in UNDP/New Delhi, 32 individuals, or 43% are women. In programs, there is a near balance of 24 men and 23 women. The HDRC and PPLG units have more women than men. In operations, there are significantly more men than women. By skill level, there is a high concentration of women in professional positions and concentration of men in administrative positions. Many senior managerial positions are occupied by women – including the Resident Representative.

CONCLUSIONS

Key Next Steps for UNDP/India to Strengthen Gender Mainstreaming

- Focus on shifting more effectively from a focus on women, as beneficiaries or target populations, to approaches that promote gender equality

- Focus on shifting from ensuring that gender is in documents, including ProDocs, to understanding how gender relations affect the implementation of development programs

- Focus on shifting from achieving general gender sensitivity to developing expertise on gender in relation to particular sectoral or multi-sectoral initiatives

- Hire someone of mid-level development expertise who would be dedicated to gender mainstreaming[15]

UNDP/India has made real efforts to mainstream gender, despite mixed messages from headquarters such as the change from a gender practice area to a "gender driver" – and should be congratulated. There was good capacity-building, good foundation laid – but they were not pursued consistently. Nevertheless, as UNDP staff has a first level of capacity for gender mainstreaming that exceeds the norm, and there is still a functioning Gender Group, there remains a unique opportunity to build in-depth and effective gender mainstreaming mechanisms. The heart is there, there is some real commitment.

The Gender Group is poised to resume momentum and take action – for which they need time to deliberate and formulate their own action plan. Through changes in leadership, gender equality supporters in UNDP/India have enjoyed ongoing commitments to gender equality. At this stage, they would welcome a strong signal to move forward and re-double their efforts.

There is still a need to improve understanding of gender mainstreaming – both of more people and with greater depth, to reach from explicit mention of women's empowerment and gender equality in documents, to effective programmatic implementation.

To promote gender equity/equality with government partners, UNDP staff need more information and understanding tied to their sectors or GOI partners' focal areas from which to advocate, persuade or teach. This is not an environment for outsiders to preach about gender quality; rather it calls for sensitivity to Indian ownership and sovereignty – building on what women's rights and gender equality advocates of India have been doing already for decades. "We need to take on board the Ministry partners – some are not that gender sensitive at all and not that opposed – but do not see the value of it."

---

[15] Note that individuals responsible for the Human Development Resource Centre or for UNDP's HIV/AIDS programme cannot dedicate the requisite attention to gender while managing such competing responsibilities.

> **Advice from one Government Partner**
>
> UNDP should support pilot projects that
>
> * illustrate the impediments to gender equality
>
> * show what can be done differently – better, and
>
> * bring examples from elsewhere, such as Grameen Bank from Bangladesh.
>
> India does not need more studies from UNDP; but need more innovative action research.

There is a clear need for, *and interest in*, mentoring. Ideally, this should be internal. It should also be provided by someone who not only understands gender from a theoretical perspective, but also is informed by development experience in the field.

There are successes in gender mainstreaming that are not being captured when not explicit, such as the disaster preparedness work in Orissa. The fact that it is not visible and explicit does not mean it is not happening.

UNDP could be a champion for gender mainstreaming throughout UNDP globally – but to do so, there is a need for concerted action and explicit backing by management.

RECOMMENDATIONS

UNDP specific

The **first and major priority** should be to build on the Gender Group's October 2004 retreat ideas, and to **arrive at a UNDP/India Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan** (Strategic steps, not Ad hoc). Alternatives to be considered and debated among UNDP staff would include:

- Engaging an external consultant, perhaps part-time, as a Gender Advisor

- Establishing an internal special advisor/coordinator, who should be someone of at least mid-level experience, including both gender and field-based development experience

- Investing in sector-focused gender expertise for one person in each of UNDP/India's programmatic units, to share with the others of the unit

- Putting out a tender for institutions to bid on providing advisory services to UNDP/India on gender, including short workshops, briefing notes, guest lecture series (open to UNDP and other UN agencies)

- Building assessment of attention to gender into each individual's job performance expectations and RCA

- Asking the RR and DRR to issue a memo that clearly reiterates UNDP/India's commitment to gender mainstreaming, including the promotion of gender equality within the context of program design and implementation, and in the course of discussions with government and civil society partners.

Make a concerted effort to **clarify and strengthen gender-related collaboration with UNIFEM**, including working with UNIFEM for advice on implementation and/or identifying women's organizations as implementation partners.

Undertake a **gender audit of UNDP/India's current programme**, engaging UNDP/India staff, as much for the learning process (as much, if not more, to learn than from workshops lacking connection to current work). Focus on mid-term monitoring, on visiting sites and talking with stakeholders, and on identifying additional strategic opportunities to promote gender equality. Pull together results into a lessons-learned document, and disseminate through the Knowledge Management Group (or otherwise).

To the extent that the Government of India may limit bilateral aid, **encourage donors to channel assistance through UNDP earmarked for gender equality programming** or gender mainstreaming.

Establish a process for **reporting gender mainstreaming successes** within mainstream programming focused on other objectives, such as energy or disaster management.

UN Country Team in India

Include **gender training in induction workshops for *all* UN staff** – not just UNDP.

Share information among UN agencies whenever one is offering **gender-related training**, either for participation, or at least for observation to see the various approaches.

Review all Terms of Reference for outside consultants (or assistance from headquarters) to ensure that gender is included – in a meaningful way.

Ensure that gender is mainstreamed into all Knowledge Management Networks through purposeful linkages. Ensure that UN agency gender experts or focal points meet at least four times per year for direct relationship-building and information-sharing.

Consider engaging **a "Gender Watchdog"/coordinator/resource person** for the whole UN Country Team.

<u>Lessons for the UNDP Evaluation Office's Global Gender Mainstreaming Evaluation</u>

UNDP must encourage, recognize and reward leadership, from the Resident Representative and Deputy Resident Representative, for there to be gender mainstreaming at the country level.

UNDP must invest in capacity-building for gender mainstreaming – both through introductory gender sensitization, and through experiential learning tied to existing programs and professional responsibilities.

Focused efforts are needed to shift from a women focus (women as targets or beneficiaries) to understanding "gender-based roles, responsibilities, power and access to resources" as factors that may impede or facilitiate social and economic development.

Expectations regarding the promotion of gender equality and policy dialogues must be appropriate to the cultural and political context. UNDP exercises less leverage with a government that manages development assistance (through its national plan rather than deriving from the MDGs, and through government executing bodies).

Even when micro-finance, self help groups, and gender budgets are added as program components to "add gender", they may fail to involve gender analyses and thoughtful approaches to building new gender relations. Some of the most promising gender mainstreaming takes place within the context of the mainstream program/approach, but implemented in ways that encourage greater dialogue, cooperation and respect between women and men.

Sex-disaggregated data provides information regarding certain questions, especially related to health, education/literacy, and maybe income. There is a need, however, to formulate critical questions related to gender equality – and then seek the data that will help to understand those issues.

Even when UNDP and UNIFEM collaborate on joint projects, there are still difficulties sharing information, appreciating one another's contributions, and defining ongoing mechanisms for cooperation. Lack of follow-through is as often a matter of neglect in the midst of other demands, but consistently results in misunderstandings.

UN Country Teams must share information regarding gender training, both so representatives from one organization might attend the training of another, and to assess the capability of potential trainers.

When national civil society organizations, institutes and academic communities are well ahead in thinking about gender, testing theories, and trying recommended approaches, UNDP must recognize them as resources – and work with them to test the next generation of approaches.

APPENDIX A:
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This country study would not have been possible without the preparatory work of several key people. First, the study and report could not have been undertaken without remarkable preparation within UNDP/India, namely the thought and work by Seeta Prabhu, Alka Narang and.Meenakshi Kathel Second, the collection of key documents, interviews with UNDP/India staff and review of other relevant information by Darshini Mahadevia – with the resulting draft and revised background reports – were essential. Third, many other members of the UNDP/India staff contributed their time and input[16]. Lastly, the guidance of Kalyani Sen-Menon with the UNDP/India staff regarding gender equality and gender mainstreaming can be credited with laying the foundations for both program work focused on women and gender sensitivity that are richer than most UNDP country offices.

<u>In Delhi</u>:

Alexandra Sagarra, Cluster Development & Poverty Reduction, Gender Focal Point, UNIDO

Alka Narang, Assistant Resident Represantative, UNDP/India

Chandni Joshi, Regional Programme Director, UNIFEM (and staff with whom we met)

Happy Pant, Knowledge Management Research Officer (Decentralization), UNDP/India

Harsh Singh, Assistant Resident Representative and Head, Sustainable Livelihoods Division, UNDP/India

Jo Scheuer, Sr. Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP/India

Joy Deshmukh-Ranadive, Senior Fellow, Centre for Women's Development Studies

Kalyani Menon-Sen, Director, NGO Jagori

Kumar Tiku, National Information Officer, Communications and Advocacy Group,UNDP/India

Maxine Olson, UN Resident Coordinator and Resident Representative, UNDP/India

Meenakshi Datta Ghosh, Principal Adviser (Health, Nutrition & Family Welfare), Planning Commission, Government of India

Meenakshi Kathel, Research Associate, Human Development Resource Centre , UNDP/India

Mithulina Chatterjee, Programme Officer, Public Policy and Local Governance Division, UNDP/India

Mona Mishra, Programme Officer, HIV/AIDS, International Planned Parenthood Federation, South Asia Regional Office

Neera Burra, Assistant Resident Represantative, Sustainable Environment & Energy Division UNDP/India

Reva Nayyar, Secretary, Department of Women and Child Develompment, Government of India (and staff)

Rohini Nayyar, Senior Consultant, Planning Commission, Government of India

Seeta Prabhu, Head, Human Development Resource Centre, UNDP/India

Shankar Sengupta, Programme Officer, Sustainable Livelihoods Division UNDP/India

Shashi Sudhir, Programme Office, Sustainable Environment & Energy Division UNDP/India

Sudha Pillai, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Panchayati Raj, Government of India

Suraj Kumar, Programme Officer, Human Development Resource Centre, UNDP/India

Syeda Hameed, Member, Planning Commission, Government of India

Usha Rao, Programme Analyst, Sustainable Environment & Energy Division, UNDP/India

---

[16] While it is always appreciated when staff lay the foundations for such an outsiders' investigation and make the time to speak with consultants, particular appreciation is due in this instance given that the UN Secretary General was in India, and at UNDP, during the very week of this study.

Veena Nayyar, President, Women's Political Watch (WPW)

<u>In Orissa</u>

Anindya Sarkar, UNDP, Orissa

Anita Anasuya, Programme Coordinator, Health & HIV, UNDP/India, Bhubaneswar

Aparajita Sarangi, Director, Mission Shakti, Government of Orissa

R.V Singh, Planning Commission, Orissa

Jitendra Kalra, Project Manager, Cluster Development Programme

Kalika Mahapatra, Senior Programme Associate, Vulnerability Reduction and Sustainable Livelihood, UNDP, Orissa

Rachna Singh, State Programme Officer, UNFPA, Bhubaneswar

Reuben Samuel, UNDP, Orissa

Shashank Grahacharjya, World Food Prgramme, Bhubaneswar

Tom Olsen, State Representative, UNICEF, Bhubaneswar

UN Volunteers, Orissa

AGENDA

Day 1: 25th April 2005

- 9:30   Meeting with Mr. Jo Scheur, SDRR

- 10:30   Meeting with Darshini Mahadevia, National Consultant

- 11:00   UNIFEM: Ms. Chandni Joshi, Regional Programme Director; representatives responsible for HIV/AIDS, Gender Budgeting, Anti-Trafficking, and other initiatives

- 12:30   Working Lunch wtih RR, ARRs (for Operations, Governance, Livelihoods, Environment)

- 14:00   Dr. Syeeda Hameed, Member, Planning Commission, Government of India

- 15:00   Reva Nayyar, Secretary, Department of Women and Child Development, Government of India

- 16:00   UNDP Staff Meeting

- 17:00   Dr. Kalyani Menon-Sen, Jagori

Day 2: 26th April 2005

- 10:00   Ms. Veena Nayyar, President, Women's Political Watch (WPW)

- 11:00   Neera Burra, UNDP

- 12:00   Meeting with UN Gender Focal Points

- 14:00   Individual Meetings with UNDP National Program Officers

Day 3: 27th April 2005

- Leave for Orissa

In Orissa

- Project Site Visit:
    - Mock Drill for Natural Disaster Warning
    - Visit to IT kiosk training young women
    - Observe and interview women in masons training
    - Presentation by UNVs managing mason's project

Day 4: 28th April 2005

- Breakfast Meeting with Gender Focal points from other UN agencies in Orissa

- Meeting with …

- Meeting with …

- Leave Orissa for Delhi

- Meet with Maxine Olson, Resident Representative

Day 5: 29th April 2005

- 9:30   Kumar Tiku (Communication & Advocacy Division)

- 10:00   Shashi Sudhir (Sustainable Environment and Energy Division)

- 10:30   Shankar Sengupta (Livelihoods)

- 11:00   Rohini Nayyar, Senior Consultant, Planning Commission

- 12:00   Interaction with Resource Persons and Experts (women's NGOs, Institutes)

- 13:30   Alka Narang, HIV/AIDS and Gender

- 14:00   Gender Group and Debriefing

- 15:30   Seeta Prabhu, Human Development Reports and Gender