**Gender Marker Implementation**

**SOUTH SUDAN – CAP 2012**

1. **COUNTRY CONTEXT (detail CAP/PF etc.)**

South Sudan’s January 2011 referendum and preparations for secession on 9 July dominated the political landscape in the first half of 2011. The post-independence period ushered in a number of changes, including the appointment of a new government and the deployment of a new peacekeeping mission equipped with a strengthened Chapter VII mandate. The humanitarian situation remained fragile with increased insecurity, ongoing displacement, underlying vulnerability and rising food security concerns generating high humanitarian needs throughout the year.

**Secession from Sudan**

While the referendum passed peacefully, relations between Sudan and South Sudan deteriorated sharply over 2011. The interim period created by the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) came to a close in July 2011 with major aspects of CPA implementation unresolved, including border demarcation and oil-wealth sharing. The military takeover of the disputed Abyei area by Sudan Armed Forces (SAF) and the unilateral dissolution of the Abyei administration by the Government of Sudan in late May marked one of the lowest points in relations between parties since the signing of the CPA. The eruption of fighting in Sudan’s Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile states after independence has re-ignited tensions. Instability along and near the Sudan-South Sudan border continued to impact negatively on border communities and increased security risks for returnees making their way from Sudan. A temporary closure in commercial trade corridors from Sudan to South Sudan in May has led to shortages and steep price risks in fuel, food and other basic commodities in South Sudan.

**State building and preparations for statehood**

The Government of the Republic of South Sudan (GRoSS) formed a new broad-based transitional administration in August 2011. A Transitional Constitution was finalised to cover the interim period, articulating citizens’ rights and core functions of various branches of government. In another important step forward, the GRoSS elaborated its first South Sudan Development Plan covering the period from July 2011 to July 2013 and outlining key objectives and activities in four pillars: economic growth, governance, social and humanitarian development, and security. The new administration also began work to create and systematize key state functions.

Despite progress, a legacy of protracted civil war and chronic under-development mean that challenges facing the GRoSS remain substantial. The government is estimating it will take years before it can begin direct provision of frontline services. In light of this, humanitarian organisations will continue to provide the bulk of basic services and support in underserved areas until new planning and funding mechanisms come in place in 2012. The GRoSS negotiated with the UN to undertake developmental actions in the next 2 years under the abovementioned pillars, highlighting gender considerations.

**Increased insecurity and violence**

A more complex dynamic of insecurity and violence emerged in the wake of the referendum, driving up displacement, disrupting livelihoods and agriculture, and increasing emergency needs. Activity by rebel militia groups escalated in the weeks after the referendum, with communities in Unity, northern Jonglei and Upper Nile states particularly affected by ensuing clashes with the Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA). In Unity State, extensive re-laying of landmines along transport networks generated significant protection risks for civilians and impeded the ability of humanitarians to reach populations in need. In May, take over by Sudanese Armed Forces (SAF) of the Abyei area triggered the displacement of over 110,000 people into South Sudan’s Warrap State and nearby areas. The subsequent eruption of fighting in Sudan’s Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile states caused further displacement into South Sudan, with at least 16,500 fleeing the violence into Unity, Upper Nile and elsewhere.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Inter-communal violence also continued to plague South Sudan in 2011, with seasonal and large-scale retributive attacks increasing in several locations. Fighting between the Lou Nuer and Murle communities in Jonglei State spiked in April, June and August, leaving 848 dead and 32,750 displaced in a deadly cycle of attacks. Violence by the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) also continued, with 17 dead and 7,382 displaced in 20 attacks reportedly by the group in Western Equatoria and Western Bahr El Ghazal states. By mid-October, some 3,165 persons had been killed and 325,723 were internally displaced in conflict incidents since the start of the year according to reports by local authorities and assessment teams**.** The rise in violence created a number of serious protection concerns, including increased gender-based violence, forced recruitment into the armed forces, destruction of property, arbitrary detention and physical risks linked to extensive re-mining.

**High numbers of South Sudanese returned from Sudan**

South Sudanese returned to South Sudan in record numbers in 2011, following the start of the Government’s accelerated repatriation drive in late 2011. By mid-October, some 347,375 southerners had returned from Sudan since 30 October 2010, with the pace of new arrivals increasing before the referendum and again around the independence period. Humanitarian partners continued to support new arrivals with onward transport to final destinations, provision of critical supplies and services in transit, and with early reintegration assistance.

The slow pace of land allocation for returnees in final destination sites, for residential and agricultural purposes, emerged as a critical problem during the year. Insecurity in Abyei, Southern Kordofan and other border areas also posed protection risks to returnee groups before crossing the Sudan-South Sudan border. By mid-year, Renk County in Upper Nile State remained the only fully open corridor for new returnee arrivals, a situation that led to the build-up of approximately 20,000 people in Renk transit sites as of October 2011.

**Food insecurity and malnutrition reached alarming levels**

Concerns over the country’s fragile food security situation increased during the year. Despite initial projections for an improvement in food security in 2011 compared to 2010, a number of factors contributed to a reversal in initial analysis. This included low agricultural production, widespread insecurity, high numbers of displaced people and returnees, commercial blockages and sharp increases in the price of basic commodities. According to the Food Security and Livelihoods cluster, food security deteriorated to crisis levels in five of South Sudan’s 10 states by midyear, including the border states Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Warrap, Unity, Upper Nile states as well as Jonglei State. The June results of the Food Security Monitoring System indicated that some 11% of households in South Sudan are severely food insecure and 33% moderately food insecure. This situation is expected to ease temporarily in November and December this year, during the harvest. However, a large cereal deficit is expected to be carried over into 2012.

The nutrition cluster also reported that acute malnutrition rates in South Sudan continue to be of concern. Results from pre-harvest surveys conducted in 17 counties in revealed that 11 counties across five states have worrying levels of global acute and severe acute malnutrition.

**Humanitarian space has contracted**

The humanitarian operating environment in South Sudan remained extremely challenging in 2011. Seasonal rains continued to render main areas inaccessible for parts of the year, compounding logistical challenges imposed by an underdeveloped transportation infrastructure. The rise in violence in 2011 was also accompanied by a rise in interference in aid operations, primarily by military actors. By September, relief partners recorded 97 incidents of interference in which SPLA or other state actors commandeered relief assets, occupied relief premises, physically assaulted staff or restricted the ability of aid agencies to access populations in need. Another 19 incidents were committed by unknown assailants. Interference with humanitarian operations imposed serious costs on the relief effort in early 2011 in terms of delays, lost funds, lost supplies and by impacting the safety and security of humanitarian personnel.

**Brief Gender Analysis**

Where the characteristics of the target populations are described with respect to gender, the focus is usually on women (and to a lesser extent girls). Returning and displaced households are disproportionately (67%) headed by women: this causes difficulties for the households in a patriarchical society to access resources such as food, water, shelter and civic engagement. Female-headed households are expected to rely on the graces of their husband’s family. Recent evidence has shown that husbands have started to also to return to South Sudan: it is not known how this is affecting family dynamics.

Traditionally the structures of Sudanese families are large and complicated: multiple wives are often associated with one man; roles are ascribed to wives in different ways and consequently taking care of children does not necessarily denote birth relationships; and families have reasons to be secretive about the numbers of boys and girls that they have. Consequently, agencies who are responsible for registering beneficiaries report difficulties in accurately counting and disaggregating according to gender and generation (DAGG). Notwithstanding, some agencies are able to provide DAGG analysis (either because their service models dictate individual relationships or effort has been put into targeted surveying), and this has been used to a varying extent for programming as evidenced in CAP 2012.

As in many countries, it is difficult to determine the extent of sexual violence occurring in the emergency settings. Anecdotal evidence suggests that community members prefer to avoid areas around army barracks for fear of attack (barracks remain in townships). There have been reports of military personnel raping or sexually assaulting women and girls, although the number of reports is very low, disproportionate with the expressed concerns: it is expected that fear of consequences of reporting limits measures of incidence. Domestic violence against women and girls is high: surveyed respondents reported physical assault and non-consensual sex with regular incidence cycles as the most prevalent. There are significant barriers to reporting sexual violence to the authorities: in practice, women and girls have been referred to traditional courts that seek to provide resolutions that maintain the honour of families involved (e.g. marriage to the rapist), and survivors of sexual violence may be imprisoned for adultery. While reports from men and boys regarding sexual violence and domestic violence are low, it is acknowledged that there are significant social barriers to reporting and low capacity in the service sector to manage it. Early and forced marriage of girls is common. There are significantly high rates of dropping out, particularly after primary school and more so for girls than boys. The rates of maternal mortality are considered amongst the highest in the world. While literacy rates for men are marginally higher than those of women in rural areas, the rates of paid employment of women are significantly lower than for men (there are anecdotal reports that some men actively stop their wives from being employed through lobbying their employers). Conflict and displacement exacerbates the incidence of sexual and gender-based violence.

**Funding processes**

The South Sudan humanitarian community moved from sectors to standing up interagency clusters in 2010. The cluster members participate in the Consolidated Appeals Process. Common Humanitarian Funds, Emergency Response Funds and Central Emergency Response Funds are available to agencies operating in South Sudan in 2011. Almost all of the projects considered under these funding mechanisms are listed in the CAP (with the exception of emergent projects for the ERF): consequently the projects are coded for their abilities to consider gender implications.

**GENDER MARKER IMPLEMENTATION (use bullet points)**

**2.1 Approach and Entry Points**

* Regular participation in the Inter-Sector Working Group (inter-cluster coordination group), HCT and the HC’s core team meeting and negotiated sessions facilitated access to the clusters, senior humanitarian management (including donors) and the HC respectively.
* Initially many of the clusters expressed that they had no need for further gender training as they had received this from the previous GenCap Advisor. Structured analysis of cluster and cluster lead performance according to competence in gender constructs and application of the Gender Marker tool provided the basis of the plan to approach clusters to provide assistance. The clusters that did not perform well in Gender Marker codings (i.e. neglected to consider gender systematically) or applied the Gender Marker coding inappropriately were targeted with assistance. Those clusters who requested assistance were also engaged.
* One-page gender analyses for most of the sectors were drafted based on the CAP 2011 project proposals. It was intended that this could demonstrate to all of the agencies (with varying abilities) the components of a gender analysis, generate useful considerations for their CAP 2012 projects and serve as pointers for their own project development. Several workshops were developed and run on the basis of these gender analyses. Where gender was not mentioned in cluster proposals, assistance was provided in the ADAPT ACT framework.

**Step-by-Step Actions Taken to Support Country Roll Out**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Rationale / Comment**  ***(if not self evident)*** | **Value of Action** | | | **Comment on rationale for value attributed** |
| **E** | **U** | **M** |  | |
| Review of all CAP 2011 projects, reviewed SGBV literature | Scope gender competence of Clusters and Cluster Leads, assess capacity to apply GM | X |  |  | \* Build credibility through using South Sudan analyses and strategies  \* Statistics were useful | |
| Draft Gender Analyses based on CAP 2011 | Use sector-specific SS analyses to inform all cluster members |  | X |  | \* One-page analyses for each cluster (2 for Protection) so that all members had easy access to analysis  \* Distributed cluster-specific ADAPT ACT framework | |
| Ran gender analysis workshops with clusters | Explained the features and rationale of gender analyses |  | X |  | \* Emphasized the dynamics of gender roles and importance of coherent logic | |
| Ran GM workshops with cluster cords + with clusters | Explained the mechanics of GM tool |  | X |  | \* Highlighted the performance of each cluster in CAP 2011 regarding (a) gender equality measures (b) use of GM tool (using stats from CAP 2011 Review) | |
| Targeted assistance for clusters that did not perform well |  | X |  |  | \* Discussed performance with Cluster Leads and with UN Cluster HoOs  \* Prioritized help for bottom third + those interested | |
| Provide feedback on Cluster Strategies during Cluster Defenses |  |  | X |  | \* Highlighted ways to include gender analyses and equality measures | |
| Assisted Peer Review Panels to code GM |  |  | X |  | \* Built skills in using GM tool | |
| Addressed the HCT on Gender Equality & GM | Highlighted roles for Management, Cluster Leads and Donors | X |  |  | \* Mobilized donors to highlight the importance of gender in programming by giving concrete example of their impact. | |

E: Essential; U: Useful; M: Minimal

**2.2 What would you repeat and why?**

* Review the CAP projects from the previous year, analyze the gender competence and use of GM tool. This enabled me to target my assistance with rationale. The statistics were useful in highlighting where performance could improve.
* Draft sector-specific gender analyses – this was regarded as practical assistance, in lieu of targeted field surveys.
* Engage management and donors to expect improved performance on incorporating gender equality measures in programming.
  1. **What would you change and how?**
* With more appropriate timing, would spend time with clusters to develop specific assessment tools so that the programming cycle is more meaningful for them.
* Ensure that OCHA was more engaged in the process.

**2.4 Constraints**

**External Constraints - that are specific to the context/country**

* The number of attendant agencies, the volume of projects and the timeframe of the ‘CAP’ meant that many of the cluster coordinators focused on broad cluster strategies and did not always have much time to support agencies in their designs of projects. Perhaps there would be stronger project design if the planning was construed as an annual cycle and there was stronger capacity to assess the impact of projects.

**Internal Constraints**

* It would be helpful to have a tip sheet for Protection Cluster excluding the Sub-Clusters – such as protecting and engaging wgbm in human rights defending as well as safeguarding the vulnerables.
  1. **Enablers and Opportunities**
* The tip sheets were rated as useful.

**2.6 Use of SADD**

* The Education, Nutrition, Health, SGBV, CP and Protection Clusters collect SADD.
* The Clusters engaging with large populations (e.g. Emergency Returns, NFIs & Emergency Shelter) struggle to disaggregate data according gender and generation.
* The NFI & ES Cluster requested help with disaggregating its data according to gender and generation and the Nutrition Cluster asked for me to collaborate with them on the analysis of their SADD after the CAP.

**2.7 Use of the Gender Marker Toolkit and**

*General Appreciation of the tools:* The Child Protection, Food Security & Livelihoods, Nutrition and Education Clusters commented that the GM Tip Sheets were useful in building understanding and giving concrete examples.

**2.8 Comment on any steps taken to foster consistency on coding by clusters**

I delivered training, distributed GM tip sheets, modeled GM coding, discussed nuances, and provided feedback on the peer review panels’ coding. I also worked with an OCHA officer charged with supporting peer review panels to provide advice when I was not able to be present.

* Most of the peer review panels had large numbers of project proposals (20-60) to review and did so by projecting the documents on to the wall. The space to consider gender analysis and equality measures was limited. Modeling the coding, articulating my rationale, referring to the tip sheets and providing feedback on their coding worked well. It would have been better if the peer review panels consistently used the vetting forms.
* Feedback about suggested changes to improve coding was limited.

1. **CLUSTER PARTICIPATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cluster | Commitment to Gender | Acceptance of the GM | Needs (training, support, etc.) | General comments |
| Nutrition | High | Links of poor nutrition to prep roles & maternal mortality drove gender competence | Requested support on GM vetting and needs analysis |  |
| Health | Moderate | Prioritizes major restructure of basic health services over gender mainstreaming | Accepted support for GM vetting. Co-Lead asked for gender mainstreaming discussion |  |
| Education. | High | Treated gender as a cross-cutting issue in emergency education | Requested gender analysis trainings for cluster and groups and GM vetting support. |  |
| *Protection* | PC: Variable  CP, MA & SGBV: high | CP, SGBV and MA proposals were most likely to consider gender; Protection, which focuses on vulnerable groups cf HR abuses or individuals struggled. | Requested gender analysis trainings. Accepted GM vetting support. |  |
| *Food Security* | High | Gender competence of FAO high: WFP is low. | Requested gender mainstreaming workshop |  |
| *WASH* | Moderate | Focus on gender disaggregated latrines, water collection and management (Sphere standards) drove gender conception. Engineers like the GM formula | Nil |  |
| *Coordination & support services* | Low | Concern about the ability of clusters to collect DAGG. Supported GenCap role in talking about GM in CAP | Asked for assistance to include gender into CAP proposal. Provided GM training to Cluster Coords & agencies seeking funding tips | Belief that coordination is a gender-blind activity. Depended a lot on individuals |
| *Multi-sector (refugees)* | Low |  | Nil |  |
| *Logistics and Telecoms* | Low | Discussed the possibilities of using gendered employment and training strategies. Not taken up. | Nil |  |

It should be noted that in CAP 2011, UN agencies (including Cluster Leads) often submitted project proposals that were gender-blind as well as lacking in sufficient detail to articulate basic program logic. Since UN agencies are responsible for leading Clusters in cross-cutting issues such as gender, I asked heads of Cluster UN agencies to improve performance. This brought about some change, but not widespread. A donor indicated that she had seen dramatic improvement occurred in another context when gender was incorporated into the performance management criteria of senior management.

1. **HC/HCT LEADERSHIP & ENGAGEMENT**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Interlocutor | Commitment to Gender | Acceptance of the GM | Needs (training, support, etc.) | General comments |
| DSRSG/HC/RC | High | Yes | Values straightforward, highly practical training for staff | Supportive |
| HCT | Moderate | Yes | GM training | Supportive |
| DFiD | High |  |  | Told agencies gender no longer discretionary |

1. **DONOR OUTREACH**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Donor | Commitment to gender | Base funding decisions on the GM | Needs (training, support, etc.) | General comments |
| Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SIDA) | Moderate | No, however will ask agencies to make projects gender-sensitive | The new focal point would like to participate in any training re gender | Keen to see focus on gender not women (latter often brings about backlash in SS) |
| ECHO | Moderate | No, however will ask agencies to make projects gender-sensitive | The new focal point would like help with gender review of projects/documents required | Interested to grow in gender competence and shape policy |
| DFiD | Moderate | No, however will ask agencies to make projects gender-sensitive |  |  |
| USAID (OFDA) | Moderate | Haven’t done much on it in the past, want to look at how to consider gender from now on |  |  |
| CIDA | Moderate | No, however will ask agencies to make projects gender-sensitive |  |  |
| AusAid | Moderate | No |  | Gender is high on policy agenda |

1. **RESULTS – The Gender Analysis of the 2012 CAP Document & Project Sheets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CAP – CHAP Section** | **Yes** | **No** |
| Strategic Priorities include gender equality | **X** |  |
| Selection Criteria include gender equality |  | **X** |
| CHAP narrative features gender analysis/issues | **X** |  |

**Gender Dimensions in Cluster Response Plans**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cluster** | **Gender in**  **Needs Analysis** | **Gender in Objectives-Results-Indicators** | **Gender in Response Strategy** | **Gender in Monitoring** |
| Education | √ | x | x | √ |
| Food Security & Livelihoods | x | √ | √ | x |
| Health | Maternal mortality | x | Maternal mortality | x |
| Nutrition | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| Protection | √ | √ | x | x |
| NFIs & Emergency Shelter | x | x | x | x |
| WASH | √ | x | √ | √ |

**Gender Code Results – CAP 2012**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cluster** | **Total # projects** | **Code 0** | **Code 1** | **Code 2a** | **Code 2b** |
| Coordination & support services | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Education | 26 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 1 |
| Emergency Telecommunications | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Food Security & Livelihoods | 59 | 2 | 21 | 35 | 1 |
| Health | 46 | 1 | 16 | 28 | 1 |
| Logistics | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mine Action | 9 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| NFIs and Emergency Shelter | 11 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Nutrition | 27 | 0 | 16 | 11 | 0 |
| Protection | 40 | 2 | 11 | 18 | 9 |
| WASH | 41 | 1 | 11 | 29 | 0 |
| Multi-Sector | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | **271** | **14** | **91** | **154** | **12** |
| Percentage | **100%** | **5%** | **34%** | **57%** | **4%** |

*CAP2011 (rev)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percentage | **100%** | **23%** | **32%** | **40%** | **5%** |

*CAP2011 (orig)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percentage | **100%** | **12%** | **48%** | **36%** | **5%** |

**Gender Code Results – CAP 2011**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cluster** | **Total # projects** | **Code 0** | **Code 1** | **Code 2a** | **Code 2b** |
| Coordination & support services | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Education | 21 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 0 |
| Emergency Telecommunications | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Food Security & Livelihoods | 37 | 2 | 16 | 18 | 1 |
| Health | 61 | 3 | 40 | 16 | 2 |
| Logistics | 9 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Mine Action | 10 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Multi-Sector (ER & Refugees) | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| NFIs and Emergency Shelter | 14 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 0 |
| Nutrition | 22 | 2 | 18 | 2 | 0 |
| Protection | 30 | 2 | 12 | 7 | 9 |
| WASH | 43 | 9 | 10 | 24 | 0 |
| Total | **255** | **30** | **122** | **91** | **12** |
| Percentage | **100%** | **12%** | **48%** | **36%** | **5%** |

. **Gender Code Results – CAP 2011** *(revised)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cluster** | **Total # projects** | **Code 0** | **Code 1** | **Code 2a** | **Code 2b** |
| Coordination & support services | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Education | 21 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 1 |
| Emergency Telecommunications | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Food Security & Livelihoods | 37 | 8 | 7 | 21 | 1 |
| Health | 61 | 9 | 17 | 30 | 3 |
| Logistics | 9 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Mine Action | 10 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Multi-Sector (ER & Refugees) | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| NFIs and Emergency Shelter | 14 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 0 |
| Nutrition | 22 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 0 |
| Protection | 30 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 7 |
| WASH | 43 | 11 | 13 | 19 | 0 |
| Total | **255** | **58** | **81** | **104** | **12** |
| Percentage | **100%** | **23%** | **32%** | **40%** | **5%** |

**Comments**

* The use of the abovementioned strategies resulted in 18% fewer gender-blind projects and 17% more projects that incorporated gender into needs, activities and outcomes of the CAP project designs, i.e. 44 fewer projects scored code 0 and 50 more projects scored 2a in CAP2012 in comparison with the revised scores of CAP 2011. If Logistics and ETC projects are excluded from the analysis, there has been a 25% reduction in the number of projects that are gender blind. The proportion of projects coding 1 and 2b increased by 2% and declined by 1%: there are 10 more projects coding as 1 in CAP 2012 than CAP 2011 while the number of 2b projects remain the same. The statistics are unable to articulate whether the significant changes in gender-blind and gender-sensitive projects are due to a migration of projects from 0 to 1 and 1 to 2a, or 0 to 2a. It is believed that in most cases the former process was in play. The exceptions to this were the UN agencies: where suggestions were taken on board, the projects tended to go from code 0 to 2a.
* The analysis is different if CAP2012 is compared to the original CAP2011 (bearing in mind that the way projects were coded changed – increasing the likelihood of more “0”s in 2012 - and there were fewer quality assurance checks). Overall, 21% of projects improved from scoring 0 or 1 (incomplete gender application) to 2a or 2b (incorporation of gender in needs, activities and outcomes). The proportion of projects that scored 0 (or gender blind) decreased from 12% to 5% in CAP2012 (7%) and scores of 1 (i.e. gender described in needs and/or assessment) decreased from 48% to 34% (14%). Conversely, the proportion of projects that incorporated gender throughout the projects (2a or 2b) rose from 41% to 61% (20%): there were 21% more 2a projects in 2012 than 2011 (57% cf 34%); though the percentage of 2b projects declined from 5% to 4% (a statistical artefact from the increase in the number of projects from 255 to 271, since the number of 2b codes remained the same).
* Many of the Health CAP projects rely on services targeting maternal mortality to incorporate gender into its project design: this is consistent across this and last year’s CAP. Otherwise the health projects are silent about gendered rates of usage and means to improve consumption rates of clinical services cf traditional medicines and practices. Conversely, the Nutrition sector are collecting gender- and generation-disaggregated data and incorporate family roles into gender analysis in order generate gendered activities into many of their projects. Some of the Food Security & Livelihoods Cluster incorporate family roles into their gender analysis (mostly those concerned with livelihoods and generating income) and the activities, while others disregard the influence of gender on the provision of food (mostly those concerned with providing food to households).
* The Child Protection and SGBV Sub-Clusters are strong on gender competence, while the broader Protection Cluster is variable in its consideration of gender in project conceptualization. I believe that this is in part due to the different ways beneficiaries are conceptualized: the CP & SGBV Sub-Clusters tend to work with individuals through case-management strategies, and in South Sudan the Protection Cluster by and large focuses on vulnerable groups (e.g. female-headed households, child-headed households, disabled, elderly) which are not disaggregated by gender. This is consistent across both years. However, UNHCR responded to requests to add gender to their projects by decreasing reliance on the “female-headed households” catchphrase and adding analysis into their needs assessment.
* There is significant improvement in the consideration of gender in the CAP2012 projects proposed by the NFI & Emergency Shelter Cluster. This is largely due to a donor giving clear instruction that gender was no longer discretionary, along with assistance on how to incorporate gender into the project design.

**Comment on the use of the Gender Marker to track GBV results:**

* There are 12 stand-alone projects that focus on responding to or changing conditions that lead to sexual and gender-based violence that scored a gender marker code of 2b.
* A review of the 271 CAP proposals reveals that 94 proposals (34%) seek to reduce the likelihood or reduce the impact of sexual and gender-based violence (see attached spreadsheet). All but 3 of the proposals mention a form of sexual or gender-based violence in the needs assessment. 67% of the proposals were rated as 2a; 13% were 2b; 20% were 1 and 2% were coded 0.
* The range of reported SGBV focused on: rape and other sexual violence; sexual exploitation; physical assault; maiming; forced and early marriages; abductions; child recruitment; exclusion from education; exclusion from paid employment or decisions about the use of proceeds; exclusion from available health services; discouragement from eating nutritious food; disadvantaged when seeking access to land entitlement; disadvantaged in the application of law; or death. Seventy-six (81%) of the projects listed girls as the targets of the SGBV (all except paid employment and maiming); 67 (71%) listed women as targets of all of the above; 23 (24%) listed boys as targets of physical assault, abduction, recruitment, maiming, sexual assault and death; and 10 (11%) listed men as targets of physical assault, maiming and death.
  + Women and girls are overwhelmingly described as being likely to be subjected to sexual and physical violence from their family; from known others or strangers while trying to attend school, collect water or ablute; or from armed forces or attacking tribes.
  + While men and boys were targeted to be maimed or killed with Explosive Remnants of War by virtue of their range of movement and activities: women were rated as more likely to suffer more from an ERW injury (and more likely to die) as they were less likely to have resources spent on them for treatment in comparison with males.
  + Women and girls are more susceptible to health conditions leading to death due to cultural practices of early marriage and childbirth; poor nutrition; violence; and overwork.
  + Women and girls are overwhelmingly described as the primary caregivers in the households. Many proposals commented on how the wellbeing and ability of female heads of households to access resources significantly affects the well-being of their dependents, such as their children, elderly family members, members with disabilities, and members who are chronically ill.
* Proposals were fielded from 7 Clusters: Protection (including CP, Mine Action and SGBV - 35); Education (20); Food Security & Livelihoods (10); Health (11), NFIs & Emergency Shelter (3); Nutrition (4) and WASH (10). The spread of proposals emphasizes the need to coordinate SGBV assessments and responses across the humanitarian clusters.
* The range of service activities included:
  + community awareness, peacebuilding, setting up committees to identify and resolve issues; removing hazards (e.g. provide gender-segregated latrines, increase the number of water points) and impediments to institutional services (e.g. improved targeting, better gender balance in service providers), support to generate income;
  + psychosocial responses, medical responses, legal responses, safe spaces, coordination of services;
  + work with the government to improve capacity to deliver responses, review legislation, advocacy.

It is noted that while hospitals and medical clinics have an important role in providing clinical assistance with physical injuries from assault (e.g. domestic, strangers, inter-tribal conflict) and often psychosocial support, almost all of the proposals focused on improving women and girls’ access to either reproductive health services or mitigating actions for sexual violence (i.e. PEP kits).

1. **KEY LESSONS LEARNED**

At a personal engagement level

* People found it very easy to believe that considering gender complicates humanitarian action. Timing, patience and perseverance gave the opportunities to raise issues and examine complexities that ultimately give greater clarity.

At the level of the clusters:

* It was useful to engage with those clusters who sought assistance to build momentum with the wider group.
* While it was helpful to have an analysis about the relative strengths of the clusters and cluster lead agencies, it was important that the leads did not interpret the gaps as criticisms.

At HC/HCT level:

* It is very helpful to be engaged with the HC and the HCT to influence the broader system.

At the level of the donors:

* Donors enjoyed hearing how they had an impact and having that acknowledged publicly.

1. **NEXT STEPS**

* Since the CAP, work has been undertaken with the Food Security & Livelihoods Cluster to design gender sensitive performance indicators.
* Work will be done with the SGBV Sub-Cluster and the Inter-Sector Working Group to coordinate humanitarian responses to SGBV.
* Further assistance will be given to donors to utilize the Gender Marker system and select projects that promote gender equality and serve to reduce or mitigate SGBV.
* It will be advocated that OCHA will take on the responsibility to monitor the projects for their impact on gender equality and continue the application of the Gender Marker.

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)