Institutions for Inclusive Development (I4ID)
LEARNING TOOL

GENDER EQUALITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION (GESI)

Checklists for donors to use in design and procurement

July 2021

GENDER EQUALITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION (GESI) Checklists for donors to use in design and procurement

1. GENDER EQUALITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION IN THE BUSINESS CASE: WHAT TO INCLUDE (GOOD PRACTICE) AND WHAT TO AVOID
This tool can be used by FCDO and other relevant donors to guide the design of the programme business case, and to check the final document.

Document/process	What to include (good practice)	What to avoid/tips
Team requirements	For all types of programmes (adaptive or otherwise) try to aim for teams that have: ■ Team leader/facilitator: experience and skills in <u>facilitating</u> programme design processes that integrate GESI into all aspects. Has skills in inclusive ways of working. **(Must have)** ■ Core team members who understand their sectors from a GESI perspective. **(Desirable)** ■ Core team members experienced in consultative processes, analysing perspectives from men and women, and applying a gender/inclusive analytical lens to people, households, community, government, private sector and civil society organisations. **(Must have)** ■ Dedicated senior-level social development expertise (leadership/quality assurance). **(Must have)** ■ A balanced team of men and women (because, at minimum, it makes for a more conducive work environment). **(Desirable)** ■ If teams do not have knowledge and experience in gender and are already active, commission high level consultancy support to help the team see with a lens on GESI and identify entry points for action.	■ Teams that <u>collectively</u> have no skills or experience in GESI or in leading consultative processes that are gender blind/neutral. ■ Teams with one social development adviser (SDA) to 'add' GESI and no other team members with experience in GESI. ■ Believing women in general can understand/do GESI rather than people (male or female) with skills and experience. ■ TIP – If the team is small and/or skills and experience in GESI are lacking, ensure <u>full-time</u> senior-level social development advice to provide orientation and guidance on why GESI matters and to assist in the design and analysis of formative research, workstream objectives and strategies. ■ TIP – Ensure the team identifies and consults with women's rights and civil society organisations who work on sector issues from a GESI perspective and who understand legal and policy frameworks that discriminate.
Intervention summary	■ For all programmes, reference donor and departmental GESI and country-specific policies/strategies. **(Must have)** ■ For all programmes (adaptive or otherwise), it is useful to define key terms and concepts (e.g., inclusive institutions, inclusive growth, and disadvantaged groups; by gender, location and any other intersecting characteristics). When the programme involves farmers, civil servants, engineers, extension workers, teachers, ministry or department staff, etc., highlight that this	■ Lack of definition or explanation of inclusive economic growth or how it leads to poverty reduction. ■ No contextual analysis of power and gender inequality and exclusion as barriers to inclusion. ■ Broadly defined focus for interventions, such as 'in the common/public interest'. These can be problematic for GESI where analysis seeks to uncover competing interests and powers at play. ■ Lack of definitions of key terms (e.g., effective/inclusive).

Document/process	What to include (good practice)	What to avoid/tips
	refs to men and women. Retain that focus on men and women throughout. **Main programme activities** ■ In adaptive programmes, PEA needs to set out clear end goals that capture aspirations for GESI and a broad hypothesis for how to achieve goals through politically informed, locally led processes that are adaptive. **(Must have)** ■ Also important is a strong approach to evidence building on GESI (and other issues), securing commitment to action on GESI and viable avenues for joint decision making between coalitions of local actors that include those with a mandate on poverty, gender, inequality and discrimination. **(Must have)** **Expected results** For adaptive and other programme approaches: ■ Aim to make aspirations for GESI visible in the overarching programme goal(s). ■ Ensure gender equality and social inclusion as a goal is supported with a hypothesis on how this goal might be achieved, e.g., through **partnerships** between civil society organisations and specific government agencies, or coalition strengthening around a policy reform agenda); through capacity strengthening, convening and engagement. **(Must have)** **Key risks to success of the programme** These risks are likely to apply to a broad range of programmes: ■ Not addressing GESI would result in non-compliance with the International Development (Gender Equality) Act 2014. This is to be avoided. ■ Risk that coalition advocacy and/or other forms of engagement on GESI does not achieve policy reform or significant changes in practices within the programme time frame. ■ During programme implementation, there may be resistance (internal/external) to working on GESI (e.g., stakeholder may say there is too much focus; not enough time; too few resources; low capacity amongst partner organisations). In dealing with resistance, point out that programmes need	■ No mention of promoting gender equality/benefits to women or disadvantaged men/women/girls/boys as a critical intermediate outcome. ■ Overlooking sustainability: No plans for how to ensure action can be continued by local partners when the programme exits. No mention of risks associated with not mainstreaming GESI approaches. ■ TIP – Intermediate outcomes are likely to be: **action on the part of coalition partners** to reform policies and practices within institutions, organisations or private sector; gender-sensitive/inclusive voice and accountability mechanisms and protection mechanisms. This is likely to involve coalition building (civil society advocates to and works with government to reform policies or improve practices). ■ TIP – Output results: **Raised awareness** amongst partners/stakeholders (government/civil society) of inequality and exclusion; a **strong approach to evidence building** (to inform action/learning); **increased capacity** to apply GESI analysis; increased capacity to inform policies/practices so they are more inclusive/gender sensitive, including HR policies (equality, diversity, inclusion, safeguarding). Gender-sensitive approaches to: planning, training, innovation, design of product and services integrated across all workstreams.

Document/process	What to include (good practice)	What to avoid/tips
	to be compliant with the Gender Equality Act (GEA) and the leadership role and voice of the SDA(s).	
Strategic case	**Context and the need for invention** For all programmes (adaptive or otherwise): ■ The context analysis draws on a political economy/social analysis and consultative process that applies a lens on poverty, gender inequality and exclusion. **(Must have)** ■ A gendered and inclusive PEA is included and it examines at a broad level how institutions, organisations, private sector, potential partners, etc., may discriminate against women and girls, and exclude certain groups (age, ethnicity, location). **(Must have)** ■ A social analysis is also included and it sheds light on why the sector matters for GESI, and the social norms, attitudes, behaviours, and government/civil society organisational practices that potentially discriminate. Using a gender analysis, the context analysis explains why women and girls may be more disadvantaged in relation to the sector focus (health, education, access to products and services, jobs). **(Must have)** ■ The PEA and social analysis works together, drawing on people's perspectives and experiences in ways that highlight differences between gender, ethnicity, class, age, etc.	■ Broad statements about poverty that lack specificity. ■ Tokenistic sections on gender inequality – GESI should be integrated throughout. ■ Mixing terms such as gender equality and gender equity. ■ No mention of excluded groups/people (e.g., youth, ethnic minorities, disability). ■ No discussion on barriers faced by women in politics or in the labour market or any other sector. ■ No evidence of consultation with men/women as part of PEA and GESI analysis of differences.
Appraisal case	**Activities to be supported** ■ Connect some if not all activities to addressing poverty, exclusion and gender inequality and the specific disadvantages faced by women. **(Must have)** **Consideration of options** ■ Choose options with clear entry points for addressing poverty, gender inequality and exclusion and which will build capacities of partners to continue working after the programme ends. **(Must have)** **Critical success criteria: What matters for GESI** ■ Ability to find the right partners to continue advocating for the reform of policies and practices that discriminate, exclude and disadvantage. **(Must have)** ■ Likelihood of procuring the right service provider with social development expertise	■ Ambivalence and lack of specificity, e.g., if stating an intent to deliver benefits for poor people, specify which poor people. ■ TIP – Recognise that 'quick wins' in general can be problematic for GESI, as interventions are likely to be dealing with entrenched social norms, attitudes, and behaviours, or policies and practices that take time to change. ■ TIP – On the other hand, one quick win for GESI is ensuring that local programme partners have HR policies and practices that promote gender equality, diversity and inclusion in the workplace, along with safeguarding measures to protect employees from sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment. This action could go hand in hand with action to build leadership and local capacity for GESI analysis of policies, practices and social norms that discriminate. ■ Avoid a long narrative TOC or hypothesis of change that does not include a summary of the

Document/process	What to include (good practice)	What to avoid/tips
	and skills in leadership and for at least a critical mix of team members. **(Must have)**	problem from a GESI perspective or causal pathways to change with relevant assumptions.
	■ Having an exit strategy that protects gains in developing partner capacity to act for GESI. This is important for sustainability.	■ TIP – Contain ambitions and focus on what can be realistically achieved within a relatively short time frame.
	■ Being risk sensitive (rather than risk adverse); having strategies to deal with backlash and resistance from the status quo who may not consider GESI to be important. .	■ Avoid hubris and language that ascribes power that donors do not necessarily have. E.g., this programme will transform the lives of women and girls.
	Theory of change	■ Avoid results which are one-off measurements of success: e.g., access to bathrooms for women market traders in one town in Tanzania.
	Adaptive programme designs have clear goals, a hypothesis for how to achieve goals, and potentially some broad insights on how change might happen in a given context. They do not generally have a theory of change (TOC) that defines the problems being addressed, the outcomes and outputs, the causal pathways for change and the underlying assumptions. If the programme does have a TOC it's important that GESI is visible in impact, outcome and output statements and that there are activities that support some sort of action.	■ Avoid quantitative measures of success for GESI and focus on qualitative insights: why are policies more GESI sensitive? How are workplaces more conducive for women's involvement in decision making?
	■ During implementation, local actors define problems and solutions based on learning and a deep understanding of context. Of key importance therefore is who those actors are: a balanced team of men and women which includes sufficient expertise and lived experiences of exclusion and discrimination on the basis of gender and other intersecting characteristics.	■ TIP – Look for outcomes that keep on giving long after the programme ends. Example: In Nepal, a DFID-supported civil society coalition lobbied successfully to put disability into the national census. This new data enabled civil society organisations and government to plan an essential service package.
	In other programme approaches where there is a clearer pathway between broad goals, outcomes and outputs:	
	■ The narrative and visual TOC includes a summary of key relevant GESI problems (evidence based) that will be addressed. **(Must have)**	
	■ The causal pathways to change are informed by evidence of what works for results on GESI and what doesn't, in the same or similar contexts. **(Must have)**	
	■ Ensure people (male/female) are visible in impact, outcome and output statements and that there are clear causal pathways for change on GESI. **(Must have)**	
	What will success look like?	
	Success for GESI in both adaptive programmes and other programme approaches can include quantitative measures (e.g., number of policies and practices that promote GESI) but equally important are qualitative insights of what policies/practices were targeted for reform and	

Document/process	What to include (good practice)	What to avoid/tips
	why, and insights into the reform process. In many instances, programmes may be focusing not on policy change but on changing attitudes, behaviours, systems and processes in which case qualitative insights that describe the change are required as well insights into how change came about. ■ Other results might include insights on how a critical mass of people (men/women) in institutions or organisations are now 'seeing and acting with a lens on GESI' (because of raised awareness, strengthened capacity, tools, changes in attitudes and behaviours, policies and practices). ■ In defining success for locally led reform agendas, it is also important to consider the impact on beneficiaries (by gender and other intersecting characteristics).	
Commercial case	■ Procurement strategy and route to market rationale include compulsory social development expertise in the suppliers' bids for <u>more than two</u> of the team members, including the team leader. **(Must have)**	■ Absence of consideration of resources required to deliver on GESI.
Management case	■ Governance arrangements with at least one senior social development expert and appropriate senior SDA guidance and QA. **(Must have)** ■ An initial results framework which reflects the GESI levels of ambition laid out in the strategic case. ■ A plan for the team leader to oversee, during implementation, the development of: a workstream GESI Action Plans or the integration of GESI action into the main Action Plan. **Include a risk assessment that recognizes the importance of increased ODA scrutiny and reputational risk in relation to:** ■ Delivering on inclusive growth and institutions ■ Compliance with the UK GEA 2014 ■ Safeguarding against sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment ■ Guarding against modern slavery and sexual exploitation ■ Meaningful mitigation measures (e.g., social safeguarding through implementation of IFC performance standards, due diligence assessments)?	■ Lack of a plan on how to ensure SDA guidance and QA. ■ No/light-touch consideration for GESI in the results framework or risk assessment. ■ TIP – If the programme is small it may be possible to operate with part-time inputs from a social development expert.

2. REQUIREMENTS FOR BIDDERS

This checklist can be used by donors during the procurement process.

Integrating GESI into Terms of References for suppliers

☐ **Highlight the need for compliance with the Gender Equality Act 2014** and other relevant donor policy commitments, and the partner country's commitments to SDG 5 and 10 and any other relevant sector.

☐ **Specify team requirements for GESI skills and experience for all members**

    ☐ Team leader/facilitator: experience and skills in facilitating programme design processes that integrate GESI into all aspects. Has skills in inclusive ways of working.

    ☐ Core team members who understand their sectors from a GESI perspective. Experienced in consultative processes, analysing perspectives from men and women, and applying a gender/inclusive analytical lens to people, households, community, government, private sector, civil society organisations.

    ☐ Dedicated senior-level social development expertise (leadership/quality assurance).

☐ **Request an integrated methodology and approach for GESI**

    ☐ Methodology and conceptual approach that recognises gender inequality and social exclusion in any given sector/workstream and applies an analytical lens to the experiences/perspectives of men and women (as individuals and in communities, institutions, organisations, private sector) to understand differences on the basis of gender and exclusion.

    ☐ The methodology and approach should also consider how to promote gender equality, inclusion, diversity and safeguarding in the workplaces of partners/stakeholders.

    ☐ There should be a clear formative research agenda to work with partners/stakeholders to help them understand GESI and how to address it.

    ☐ Sustainability/exit strategy to ensure action continues after the programme ends.

☐ **Include due diligence requirements**

    ☐ Ask bidders to demonstrate that they have robust HR policies/practices to promote gender equality (equal recruitment/pay, benefits), diversity, inclusion and safeguarding, and that their policies and practices will be extended to the country of implementation.

3. SCORING GESI IN TENDER PROPOSALS FOR ADAPTIVE PROGRAMMES

Assessment panels should include a social development advisor as well as other panel members who understand specific development sectors from a GESI perspective. The checklist should be reviewed and consulted by all team members. The recommendations are indicative and appraisers should be encouraged to offer recommendations that improve on the checklist below.

Score	Rating	Description
0	**Non-compliant**	**Does not meet minimum requirements.** ■ **Policy framework:** No mention of the UK International Development (Gender Equality) Act 2014 (GEA), other UK policies and strategies to promote the reduction of poverty, exclusion and inequality, or gender equality, women's empowerment, and the SDGs (Goals 5 and 10); and to a country's own policies. ■ **Contextual analysis:** Very little or no analysis of gender inequality, the disadvantages faced by women and girls, and poverty and exclusion relevant to the context and focus of the programme. ■ **Conceptual approach and methodology:** Does not comply or provides insufficient information to demonstrate understanding, commitment, capability or suitable methodology and approach, with little or no evidence to support response. ■ **Team:** No evidence of social development expertise on the team or poverty and gender analysis skills across the team. ■ **GESI blind areas:** *partnership approach; integration of GESI in goals, etc.; risk management; due diligence workplace equality and safeguarding; adult/child protection; ethical research considerations.*
2	**Major reservations** **Non-compliant**	**Would require major revisions/clarifications.** ■ **Policy framework:** Insufficient reference to the GEA, UK and focus country policy/strategy on gender. ■ **Contextual analysis:** Limited analysis of gender inequality and social exclusion relevant to the context and the focus of the programme. ■ **Commitment:** Tokenistic reference to the need to demonstrate results for gender equality and social inclusion (GESI). ■ **Partnerships:** Understands GESI in terms of consultation with civil society/women's organisations rather than collaborative partnerships with a wider group of stakeholders (incl. government, private sector, civil society organisations, media) to understand policies/practices that discriminate, find entry points, make commitments and take action. ■ **Integration:** GESI is not sufficiently integrated into any of the key areas of the programme design: goals, objectives, theory of change, methodology and approach. ■ **Conceptual approach (methodology):** Aspirations for GESI rather than a conceptual approach. ■ **Team:** Team leader and members have insufficient integrated and specific social development expertise. ■ **GESI blind areas:** *risk management; due diligence workplace equality and safeguarding; adult/child protection; ethical research considerations.*
4	**Minor reservations** **Compliant**	**Would require minor revisions/clarifications.** ■ **Policy framework:** Reference to GEA/other UK and GESI global policies. Focus country policies/strategies overlooked. ■ **Contextual analysis:** Some analysis of gender and inclusion relevant to context, and the focus of the programme.

Score	Rating	Description
		■ **Commitment** to address GESI and to demonstrate results for disadvantaged women and those who are excluded. Insufficient recognition of gender inequality within excluded groups. Youth is a single category.
		■ **Integration:** GESI is partially or fully visible in the programme design: goals, objectives, theory of change and approach.
		■ **Conceptual approach (methodology)** limited. E.g., some reference to sex-disaggregated data; commitment to social and gender analysis as part of diagnostic and design stage.
		■ **Partnerships:** Understands GESI in terms of consultation with civil society/women's organisations rather than collaborative partnerships with a wider group of stakeholders (incl. government, private sector, civil society organisations, media) to understand policies/practices that discriminate, find entry points, make commitments and take action.
		■ **Team:** GESI is seen as the gender expert's responsibility rather than everyone's responsibility on the core team.
		■ **GESI blind areas:** *risk management; due diligence workplace equality and safeguarding; adult/child protection; ethical research considerations.*
		■ Risk of policy evaporation on GESI without donor oversight.
6	**Good** **Compliant**	**Requires very few revisions other than a broad assurance.** ■ **Policy framework:** Reference to GEA/other UK and GESI global policy and focus country's policy/strategies. ■ **Contextual analysis:** Good analysis of gender and inclusion relevant to context, and the focus of the programme. Clear recognition of gender inequality within excluded or marginalised groups. Intersectionality and the relational aspects of gender are understood. GESI is also understood as the result of discriminatory social norms as well as policies and practices on the part of governments, private sector and indeed civil society organisations. ■ **Commitment** to address GESI and to demonstrate results for disadvantaged women and those who are excluded. ■ **Integration:** GESI is visible in the programme design: goals, objectives, theory of change and approach. ■ **Conceptual approach (methodology):** Provides a conceptual approach on how to understand and integrate action on GESI into all workstream and diagnostic/action and learning approaches. May highlight critical questions in diagnostic/action processes: e.g., who has a voice, services, assets, resources, opportunities and who does not by gender and other intersecting characteristics? Examines whether policies, practices, processes, systems exclude/discriminate. Seeks entry points for action that leads to results (causal links explained in TOC). ■ **Partnerships:** GESI mainstreamed into stakeholder analysis approach. Identification of relevant partners (government, private sector, civil society organisations, media). Collaborative ways of working on GESI to identify problems, entry points, strategies and action plans. ■ **Team:** GESI is seen as the gender expert's responsibility rather than everyone's responsibility on the core team. Risk of policy evaporation without donor oversight. ■ **Some but not all areas are GESI blind:** *risk; due diligence workplace equality and safeguarding; adult/child protection; ethical research considerations.*

Score	Rating	Description
8	**Excellent**	**Requires very few if any revisions, other than a broad assurance.** ■ **Policy framework:** Reference to GEA/other UK GESI and global policies and focus country's policy/strategies with analysis of relevance to the programme. ■ **Contextual analysis:** Good analysis of gender and inclusion relevant to context, and the focus of the programme. Clear recognition of gender inequality within excluded or marginalised groups. Intersectionality and the relational aspects of gender are understood. GESI is also understood as the result of discriminatory social norms as well as policies and practices on the part of governments, private sector and indeed civil society organisations. ■ **Commitment** to fully integrate and address GESI and to demonstrate results for disadvantaged women and those who are excluded. ■ **Integration:** GESI is visible in the programme design: goals, objectives, theory of change and approach. Key terms and concepts are explained. ■ **Conceptual approach (methodology):** Provides a conceptual approach on how to understand and integrate action on GESI into all workstream approaches. Recognises the need to raise awareness, foster understanding and commitment to action within implementation teams and with partners. May highlight critical questions in diagnostic/action processes (as indicated above). Examines organisational policies, practices (processes, systems, etc.) to understand how they discriminate on the basis of gender and exclude. Seeks, and potentially defines some entry points for action and results. Causal links are explained in the TOC. ■ **Team:** Skills and experience in GESI are visible for the team leader and core members. In addition, there is social development expertise at a sufficient level of seniority. The team is balanced and committed to a work environment that supports equality, diversity and inclusion. ■ **GESI is visible in:** *risk management; due diligence workplace equality and safeguarding; adult/child protection; ethical research considerations.*