G&D Workshop Concept Note

1. Introduction and workshop purpose

In recognition of the need to better illustrate secured G&D outcomes for Intermediate Outcome 1120[1] - *Increased integration of gender equality into national and regional DRR policies and programs* - a two-day workshop will be conducted with select NS G&D Focal Points (FPs) as well as Canadian Red Cross and IFRC CO and CCST members as the 'verifiable' and legitimate sources of information.

The purpose of the workshop is to gather/document evidence and examples of how the RRI has supported the incorporation of gender equality/inclusivity into regional DRR policies and/or programmes through the support it has provided to both NS and relevant regional organisations (via *inter alia* G&D FPs and CCST members), and the contributions made/secured from this work.[2]

2. Workshop Objectives

The workshop has three objectives, with the first objective being of primary importance:

1. *To create an evidenced-based baseline and endline that illustrates RRI achievements and progress in relation to Immediate Outcome 1120.*

2. *To provide G&D Focal Points with the opportunity to create their own personal stories of change related to the RRI and to learn from that analysis.*

3. *To provide content that supports baseline and endline achievement measures related to other RRI intended outcomes.*

3. Workshop Method

To secure the above objectives the workshop method will combine storytelling techniques with a Theory of Change (TOC) approach.

3.1 Storytelling

A storytelling technique will be used as a means to contribute key data to inform both the baseline and endline. As a contribution to the baseline, each participant will tell a short story describing the 'G&D situation' in early 2014 just before the RRI began. National Society FPs[3] will base the story on their respective NS/country, while CCST and CRC colleagues will tell the story from a more holistic perspective e.g. regional, strategic etc. As a contribution to the endline, each participant will also tell a short story describing the G&D situation as per 2017 (NS/country/regional/strategic).

---

[1] The main indicator for this is: # of NS that have increased use of gender inclusive DRR policies and programmes; which all commentators (CRC, CCST and consultant) agree is a restricted indicator that will not illustrate any meaningful change.

[2] As per Immediate Outcome 1120.

[3] A key starting point for FPs may be when you they were nominated as the gender and diversity focal point. This might be a useful landmark to look at before and after stories.

These individual narratives will be woven into two 'collective' narratives[4], which will come to qualitatively represent the baseline and the endline. The baseline narrative will be a retrospective picture that illustrates the 'extent' to which *and* 'how' *gender equality was integrated into national and regional DRR policies and programs* as per 2014. This product contributes to forming the *complete baseline* when combined with the TOC approach described in Section 3.2 below.[5]

The endline narrative will be a current picture that illustrates i.e. the 'extent' to which *and* 'how' *gender equality has been integrated into national and regional DRR policies and programs* as of today/2017. This product contributes to forming the *complete endline* when combined with the TOC approach.[6]

It is important that participants prepare for the storytelling exercise, as this will ensure richer, more vicarious evidenced-based data during the workshop. Participants will be provided with a set of reflective preparation questions in advance of the workshop.[7] A data set of relevant materials (reports, publications etc.) will be made available to participants at the workshop (G&D Reference Documents from the RRI Library).

3.2 Theory of Change approach

The storytelling exercise will be complemented with a Theory of Change (TOC) approach. The TOC approach will contribute key data to the baseline and endline narratives described in 3.1 above.

Workshop participants will develop a TOC that reflects the Initiative 'at design' stage and capture the intended causality of the RRI intervention at the time of its formal approval (2014). The TOC should depict the logical sequence of direct outcomes, intermediate states and impacts and identify appropriate assumptions, pre-conditions and drivers along each causal pathway.

The processes of RRI intended *change*[8] will be outlined through the causal pathways from outputs (goods and services delivered[9]) through direct outcomes (changes resulting from the use of outputs by key stakeholders) through other 'immediate' and 'intermediate' outcomes towards the 'ultimate outcome' i.e. impact.

In our case, it is important to acknowledge that the Immediate Outcome (1120) is already given, and we should not be distracted into creating a new Immediate Outcome. Nor should we elevate the workshop exercise to the 'intermediate' and 'ultimate outcome' levels within the TOC approach, as these too are already givens and cannot (and should not) be changed.

Specifically, the workshop approach will be to further 'unpack' the baseline and endline narratives along an axis of interconnected domain changes (formal, informal, individual and systemic) to illustrate (a) what were the expected impacts of the change (since the Initiative does not directly work at the community/individual levels) within these domains; and (b) what was

---

[4] This exercise will be finalised after the workshop by the co-facilitators.

[5] Which will be supplemented by data obtained through the walk through survey with each NS and interviews with NS DRR/DM Focal Points.

[6] As per footnote 4.

[7] To help prepare for the story telling exercise, participants are asked to think about the questions in the table at the end of this document.

[8] These identified changes are mapped as a set of interrelated pathways, with each pathway showing the required outcomes in a logical relationship with respect to the others. The pathways are mapped in a chronological flow and once complete represents a shared understanding that describes the intervention.

[9] Referred to as 'activities' in RRI project documentation.

actually affected by the Initiative within these domains e.g. systemic change in DRR policies, training of gender focal points (Section 4.2. below explains this further).

To help with baseline formulation, once the TOC direct outcomes and pre-conditions have been identified, it should be possible to articulate these in a 'negative/lacking' sense to contribute to the baseline narrative. For example, an outcome/pre-condition of 'Women participate in decision making processes at all levels' becomes 'Women do not fully participate in decision making processes at many levels'. This approach also validates the logic of the ToC, as there would be no reason to include such an outcome if the problem did not exist.

In our TOC 'mapping', it is also important to identify the drivers i.e. where the Initiative had a measure of control and was able to make a meaningful influence. We also need to identify the main stakeholders involved in the change processes and what role they play/played, as well as how they were/are affected (or not) by the changes.

In an evaluative sense (although somewhat beyond the scope of our work) it would be possible to make a judgment as to the validity of the original project design, by comparing the outcome from the workshop to the original logic model. This could be very useful for the next GAC application and as input into the TOC for that process.

4. Analytical lenses

When developing the TOC it is important we apply two analytical lenses. There are:

1. The Government of Canada's (GoC) feminist policy objectives.[10]
2. Formal/informal and individual/systemic dimensions using legal, political, organisational, economic, social and environmental factors.

4.1. GoC's feminist policy objectives

With regard to the GoC's feminist policy objectives these are: women's increase in decision-making, women's access to and control of assets, and support for the human rights of women, girls and boys; as well as Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV) in DRR.

It will be important to identify through the workshop exercises the extent to which these objectives have/have not been supported, along with what results were secured.

4.2. Formal/informal and individual/systemic dimensions

Identifying the formal/informal and individual/systemic dimensions allows us to determine the RRI contribution to securing Outcome 1120 in a rich and analytical way (this is almost like plotting the results in matrix form).

When identifying the formal/informal and individual/systemic dimensions of the change it is important to be clear about what those definitions mean. For the purposes of our task the following definitions are probably most appropriate:

---

[10] See: http://international.gc.ca/world-monde/issues_development-enjeux_developpement/priorities priorites/policy-politique.aspx?lang=eng#5

- *Formal* dimensions refer to changes undertaken by governmental organisations.
- *Informal* dimensions refer to changes and actions where non-state actors are dominant as the sites and mobilisers of change (individuals or social groups; civil society or even the private sector). They also include observed important changes in the daily life of people.
- *Individual* dimensions refer to the changes (perceived and real) experienced/observed in individuals i.e. increased willingness/ability to discuss G&D issues, as well as the actions initiated by the G&D FPs e.g. attended trainings.
- *Systemic* dimensions (i.e. how 'system wide' is the initiative) are captured through the identification of both informal and formal dimensions.

The following table shows tangible examples of formal/informal dimensions of change against key legal, political, organisational, economic, social and environmental factors. It is this type/level of analysis that we should be striving for.

Factors	Formal	Informal
Legal/political	National Action Plans for Disaster Management New Disaster Management Law Early warning systems Integrating disaster risk reduction into reconstruction strategies e.g. buffer zone	The use of disaster related activities to mediate ongoing political tensions
Organisational	Development of national and local disaster management plans National coordinating body for rehabilitation and reconstruction established New structures and roles of disaster management agency	New NGO engaged in raising disaster awareness and preparedness Community groups formed that concerned with disaster risk reduction (this kind of initiative is a good example of informal changes happening in communities)
Economic	Donation of fishing boats Microfinance activities to recover livelihoods in affected areas	Arrangement by community groups to secure livelihood in case of disaster (risk sharing)
Social	Disaster preparedness socialization and campaign	Changing perception on risk Moving from coastal region Dependence on aid
Environment	Mangrove plantations	Heightened awareness of the value of environmental systems/environmental services

When comparing the full output secured through the workshop to the TOC model we can also see the *unplanned* changes secured (as well as those that were *planned*). Capturing this in the narrative would be extremely valuable as unplanned dimensions are often difficult to record.

5. Expected workshop outputs

The two main expected outputs from the workshop are:

1. *Baseline and endline for Outcome 1120*: The baseline and endline will be presented in the form of a narrative description (1-2 pages) accompanied by a TOC diagram.[11] The diagram will show an overview of the causal pathways, the cause-to-effect relationship between different results/changes, and the drivers and assumptions that apply along the causal pathways. The narrative will attempt to explain how or why one result led to another and identify the roles of the main stakeholders in the change processes.

2. *G&D Focal Point individual change stories*: Each FP will create an individual change story that illustrates their contribution to the RRI.

6. Conclusion

Using this combined story telling/TOC approach we can capture the change that has occurred within a number of interacting domains (including social, economic, environmental, and legal systems). The added value and expected results of this approach and workshop are three-fold.

1. To create richer, more illustrative evidenced-based stories of change than could be secured through interviews and questionnaires.

2. To help illustrate for the next GAC proposal what continued G&D investment needs to happen and why.

3. The opportunity to support G&D FPs to better illuminate the G&D dimension in this and other relevant outcomes as a means of reflective practice (and thus supporting their learning from such practice).

It should also be possible to attribute the change to being primarily linked to formal responses (governments, legal interventions, organisational structures) and/or informal responses (individual, groups, households, community).

---

[11] As per recommended TOC approaches.

Reflective questions

Early 2014	November 2017
What was the understanding of G&D in the NS? What did people know about G&D? How did leadership/senior management react to the subject?	What is the understanding of G&D in the NS now? What do people know about G&D today? How do leadership/senior management react to the subject now?
What were people's (staff, volunteers) attitudes to G&D in the NS? Negative, positive, indifferent? Was there a focal point for GD in your NS? Did the NS work with any other NSs on GD issues?	What are people's attitudes to G&D in the NS like today? Negative, positive, indifferent? How has the focal point for GD benefited your NS? How has/does the NS work with other NSs on GD today – do you think this peer to peer has been beneficial?
What NS programmes/projects had a G&D dimension?	Which NS programmes/projects have a G&D dimension now? Are there any tools / guidelines / approaches that have supported this? Which ones?
What IFRC/PNS programmes/projects had a G&D dimension?	Which IFRC/PNS programmes/projects have a G&D dimension now? Is the NS more engaged in these programmes/projects
What G&D strategies/policies existed in the NS?	What NS G&D strategies/policies exist today?
What G&D training had NS staff received?	What G&D training has been provided to staff over the years? Who provided it? How has it been useful? Has this led to more NS staff being aware of GD issues / working and supporting GD activities?
What was the National Disaster Management Office (NDMO – or equivalent body in your country) attitude to G&D inclusion?	What is the NDMO attitude to G&D today?
What NDMO policies/strategies had a G&D dimension?	What NDMO policies/strategies have a G&D dimension today?
Which Ministries/government agencies or departments did the NS discuss G&D with? What were G&D discussions about? Did the National Society have a relationship with or co-operate with ministries or government agencies focused on women, gender, diversity or gender-based violence, e.g. the National Commission of Women, The Ministry of Women's Affairs… etc	Which Ministries/government agencies or departments do the NS discuss G&D with today? What are G&D discussions about today? Has the NS relationship increased/strengthened with government agencies focused on women, gender, diversity or gender-based violence, e.g. the National Commission of Women, The Ministry of Women's Affairs… etc