



# **Case Studies on Rights-based Approaches to Gender and Diversity**

Carol Miller  
Marilyn Thomson

Published by:

Gender And Development Network  
c/o WOMANKIND Worldwide  
Development House,  
56-64 Leonard Street,  
London EC2A 4JX  
UK

Tel: +44 (0) 20 7549 0360

Fax: +44(0) 20 7549 0361

Email: [gadnetwork@womankind.org.uk](mailto:gadnetwork@womankind.org.uk)

Website: [www.gadnetwork.org.uk](http://www.gadnetwork.org.uk)

First published 2005

# Contents

<b>Abbreviations and acronyms.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Section 1: Background and overview.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Introduction .....	1
Rights-based approaches .....	2
Discrimination .....	4
Social inclusion or exclusion.....	6
Process of participation .....	8
For diversity, against discrimination in the EU.....	9
Making the links between internal organisational culture and programmatic effectiveness .....	10
Concluding remarks.....	12
<b>Section 2: Case studies .....</b>	<b>14</b>
CARE India: gender and diversity in the RACHNA Programme .....	14
Save the Children UK: Integrating diversity into child rights programming .....	23
HelpAge International: Inclusion of older people .....	30
Minority Rights Group International: Gender and minority rights .....	37
Single Parent Action Network: Diversity and participation course .....	43
What are the lessons from gender mainstreaming for disability mainstreaming?... ..	48

## Abbreviations and acronyms

APRODEV	Association of World Council of Churches Related Development Organisations in Europe
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women
CRP	child rights programming
DfID	Department for International Development (UK Government)
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council, United Nations
ERJ	Exclusion, Rights and Justice Team (DfID)
EU	European Union
GAD	Gender and Development
HAI	HelpAge International
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ISOFI	Inner Spaces Outer Faces Initiative
KaR	Knowledge and Research Programme
OCM	Older Citizens Monitoring project (HAI)
LSE	London School of Economics
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MIPAA	Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing
MRG	Minority Rights Group
NGO	non-governmental organisation
ODG/DEV	Overseas Development Group/School for Development Studies
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
RACHNA	Reproductive and Child Health, Nutrition and AIDS Programme
RH	reproductive health
SPAN	Single Parent Action Network
SRH	sexual and reproductive health
UN CRC	UN Convention on the Rights of the Child

# Section 1: Background and overview

## Introduction

This report presents the findings of the second phase of the GAD Network project on gender and diversity. The first phase explored conceptual approaches to gender and diversity that underpin debates around diversity within the UK context and examined how diversity is being taken up in a range of international development organisations in response to these debates. The [phase one report](#) found that discourse around the term ‘diversity’ reflects primarily an organisational development and management approach emanating from human resources departments and driven by the UK political and legislative context. When queried about approaches to diversity in programmatic work, many of the organisations described their work related to specific identity groups (e.g. work with women, disabled people, ethnic minorities, children, older people) and/or discussed their approaches to discrimination, to social inclusion and to human rights. There was no standard approach to ‘diversity’, as such.

Six case studies are presented in this report. Five are drawn from organisations and networks that represent a specific community (Save the Children UK/children; HelpAge International/older people; Minority Rights Group/ethnic minority communities; Single Parent Action Network UK/single parents; the KaR Programme/disabled people).<sup>1</sup> The sixth is from a large international development organisation working with the poor to eradicate poverty (Care International). Of the six case studies, only Single Parent Action Network (SPAN) focuses on work with communities in the UK context. Drawing on the case studies, we explore the way in which issues of diversity are being addressed in programming across different organisations. While many organisations may not use the term diversity explicitly in relation to their programmatic work, they are attempting to address diversity through a number of different entry points. Several organisations (ActionAid Brazil, ActionAid India and Oxfam GB) were generous in sharing information about their work with marginalised groups (e.g. sex workers, black women and disabled people) and their work on social exclusion (Department for International Development, DfID). However, due to time constraints, we were unable to develop case studies on their work.

The case studies demonstrate how attempts to operationalise a rights-based approach to programming bring issues of difference to the fore; and with this, the need to tackle head on discrimination and social exclusion experienced by certain groups in every society. In the sections below we attempt to provide greater clarification of some of the key concepts (e.g. rights-based approaches, discrimination, social exclusion, participation) and through the case studies to provide some examples of approaches and tools that are being used by different development organisations. Where relevant, we also draw on examples beyond the case studies to explore approaches being used by other organisations. There is still some confusion within organisations over how these

---

<sup>1</sup> The case study on disability mainstreaming draws on a research project that is part of the DfID-supported Disability Knowledge and Research (KaR) Programme, which is managed in partnership by the Overseas Development Group at the University of East Anglia and Healthlink Worldwide, a London-based international non-governmental organisation.

key analytical concepts are related and where the distinction lies between analytical constructs and operational approaches. Here we present these concepts as related and overlapping.<sup>2</sup>

The case studies also suggest that there are no standard methodologies or tools currently being used to address diversity in programming. What we find, instead, is a variety of approaches and tools that are being used at a number of different levels. Where possible, we have documented these tools in the [Resources Section](#) of the Gender and Diversity Resources Kit.

Like the first phase, one of the main concerns of this phase of the GAD Network research has been to consider how far gender equality stays in focus in rights-based approaches to programming. In this paper we continue to explore the tension between efforts to make specific identity groups visible to policy makers and efforts to address issues of difference and discrimination in a more integrated way. We conclude with reflections on some of the most promising strategies that have emerged from the case studies.

## Rights-based approaches

In recent years, rights-based approaches to development have been adopted by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and international agencies, and written about extensively by academics. But there is no coherent set of approaches or understanding of what it means in development practice.

*'It is a general statement in favour of equitable development, involving widespread participation of those with no direct control of, or access to, the power of the state. In this case it may be acceptable to support a rights based approach as a means of moving forward in development'.<sup>3</sup>*

Rights-based approaches are closely related to international human rights standards and consist of activities on three core principles: accountability and transparency, equality and non-discrimination, participation and empowerment.

Some organisations see rights-based approaches as a set of values that guide development practice, while others consider that rights create entitlements for rights-holders but duties for states and a range of other duty bearers. These organisations therefore focus on the actions of governments that violate or fail to support the realisation of rights and which contravene obligations that governments have signed up to.

*'A rights-based approach thus assumes the creation of an enabling environment in which human rights can be enjoyed. A rights-based approach*

---

<sup>2</sup> See related discussion in Appendix 2: Technical Annex, Beall, J. and Piron, L.H, 2002, *DfID Social Exclusion Review*, LSE and ODI, December.

<sup>3</sup> 'Rights or Values?' *Ontrac*, No.23, Jan 2003.

*also promises an environment which can prevent the many conflicts based on poverty, discrimination and exclusion'.<sup>4</sup>*

The case studies presented here show how a rights-based approach operates at different levels. For example, in programmes a key element is to enable the community or specific stakeholders to participate in the formulating of policy by supporting them in the process of identifying their demands, raising awareness and advocating at a local level for the rights of the excluded groups. Rights-based programmes might also involve lobbying for policies that remove barriers to accessing rights, or targeting key duty bearers who are responsible for ensuring that rights are respected. This might include training programmes for the judiciary to ensure they understand new legislation that gives rights to excluded groups (such as the rights of widows to inherit land) or new legal measures to protect boys and girls from sexual exploitation, rather than criminalising them under prostitution legislation.

A good example of rights-based programming at the community level is the HelpAge International (HAI) Older Citizens Monitoring project. This helps groups of older citizens to participate more fully in society by supporting them to identify their rights and by offering practical support, such as getting the necessary documentation to enable them to access the social services and benefits to which they are entitled. Another example is the CARE Reproductive and Child Health, Nutrition and AIDS (RACHNA) Programme which attempts to reorient long-standing approaches to reproductive health in relation to international agreements on reproductive rights. In this context, participatory community processes help to uncover the underlying factors impacting on women's health and reproductive rights. Community-level exercises have pinpointed issues of identity-based exclusion, marginalisation and abuse as critical to health impacts. For Save the Children, child rights gives the focus to their programming and advocacy work and they have developed a range of tools and approaches to ensure that young people are made aware of their rights.

A rights-based approach also consists of advocacy activities with governments and international institutions to hold them to account to meet their obligations, to strengthen existing policy and to bring in new legislation. In the case studies we have included examples of organisations that have been successful in influencing UN committees and processes. They work through the framework of international conventions and mechanisms to influence at the highest level in order to improve the conditions of the group for whose interests they are lobbying. Although the organisations represent a specific community – HAI working on the rights of older people, Minority Rights Group (MRG) with ethnic minority groups and Save the Children promoting child rights – they also highlight the linkages and relationships between different groups. For example, HAI makes the inter-generational links between older people as carers and orphaned children in their work on poverty and HIV/AIDS.

The case studies show how these organisations are integrating some activities to address other strands of discrimination on the grounds of different identities (ethnic, religion, disability, age, gender, class, caste, sexual identity, among many others)<sup>5</sup> and how these

---

<sup>4</sup> Goonesekere, R., 2002, *A Rights-based Approach to Realizing Gender Equality*, DAW

<sup>5</sup> For example, the Ford Foundation has identified 22 different grounds for discrimination in their asset building and community development programme [www.fordfound.org](http://www.fordfound.org)

aspects of diversity affect their specific stakeholders. They are involved in networks with other organisations, such as the GAD Network which advocates on women's rights. They do this to ensure their specific constituency group's concerns are included in GAD activities and in the UN Commission on the Status of Women and other UN bodies and events. The MRG case study illustrates an example of a workshop for members of the UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) in which they raised issues of concern to the rights of minority women. HAI was also successful in lobbying for and inputting into the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing (2002).

## Discrimination

The principle of non-discrimination is fundamental to the 1945 Charter of the United Nations which states that human rights and fundamental freedoms should be available to all human beings, without discrimination on the basis of race, sex, language or religion. Since its foundation the UN has adopted a whole range of international instruments and human rights standards concerned with non-discrimination that have been ratified by many governments around the world. (See [Tools Section](#) for relevant UN International Treatise)

Despite these universally recognised rights, discrimination is present in every society, in different forms and at different levels – from individual acts to wider social oppression. Discrimination can be broadly defined as the unfavourable treatment of one group by another based on racial, religious, sexual or other categorisation. Acts of discrimination begin with stereotypes. These are preconceived and oversimplified generalisations – about a particular ethnic, religious, gender or other group – that categorise all members of such groups as thinking and behaving in the same way. If these stereotypes are reinforced by society this can lead to prejudice, and when people act out their prejudices based on these generalised beliefs and attitudes, then they discriminate. Discrimination may be the result of the norms and values of a given society, or of the structures and practices within organisations that directly or indirectly deny equal access to specific groups. The different forms that discrimination can take are:

- *intent discrimination*: the deliberate act of biased or prejudiced persons
- *unequal treatment*: routinely different treatment for different groups of people
- *institutional (systematic)*: social and cultural norms are entrenched in processes and practices within organisations and institutions that have a negative impact on individuals and minorities
- *inter-institutional*: intentional discrimination in one field can result in unintentional discrimination in another.<sup>6</sup>

Societies very often classify people according to perceptions of one aspect of their identity – be it gender, disability, ethnicity or sexuality – whereas people often have more complex identities. The MRG case study presents the findings of research which

---

<sup>6</sup> Parker, A.R., Lozano, I., Messner, L.A., 1995, *Gender Relations Analysis: A Guide for Trainers*. USA: Save the Children.

emphasises the importance of advocacy activities that recognise the intersection of discrimination on the basis of different identities. They have taken action to address discrimination within the framework of existing international legislation focussing on the UN level, but are also supporting their partners through capacity building to use the existing mechanisms to address discrimination issues at regional and national levels.

In order to tackle discrimination at the programme level it is essential to analyse different social identities and which groups in the community are excluded or discriminated against and why. This would include disaggregating data to ensure that different categories of people and their specific needs are made visible in baseline studies and needs assessments. NGOs often adopt participatory approaches to ensure that the voices of socially excluded groups are heard. For example, a range of participatory research and other tools have been developed to support the participation of members of these groups to come together to formulate demands. The case study on CARE India's RACHNA programme provides one example of the way in which participatory approaches can help uncover discrimination and exclusion based on age, gender, caste and sexuality.

A rights-based approach involves identifying the power relations between different groups in decision-making and in accessing resources, and understanding the specific cultural contexts in which discrimination occurs. So, for example, if the programme aims to ensure inclusive basic services, such as education, in a given community, the first step would be to find out why some children are able to go to school and who is excluded from school. The next step might be to raise awareness of the rights of the group that is excluded. A common strategy is to strengthen the capacity of local civil society organisations working on these issues, so they can define their own rights and needs, and demand the services they want. As outlined in the case study, this is one of the main aims of SPAN, which works in the UK with single-parent self-help groups to build capacity and skills for influencing policy makers at the local level.

As noted above, the MRG case study points to the importance of advocacy activities that recognise the intersection of discrimination on the basis of different identities. This is equally important for other programmatic interventions by development agencies. While the case studies do not refer explicitly to intersectional analysis being used as a tool, it is clear that there are efforts to address the intersection of multiple identities. One observation is that, in practice, programmes tend to address the intersection of two areas of identity (e.g. gender and ethnicity; gender and disability; age and gender). In organisations dealing with single issues (such as HAI, Save the Children and MRG) the case studies illustrate efforts to explore how the key defining aspect of identity in focus (older people, children and minority ethnic groups, respectively) intersects with other areas of identity to produce multiple forms of discrimination that demand attention from policy makers.

The RACHNA programme attempts to understand the impact on sexual and reproductive health outcomes of the intersection of a wider range of identities (e.g. gender, caste, sexuality, age, migrant status), whilst recognising that flexible approaches are needed to respond to the particular ways in which discrimination and marginalisation are played out. It also points to the importance of participatory processes for providing people with the space to identify, for themselves, the key

defining features of their identity and for recognising that these may change depending on the context in which they find themselves. SPAN's diversity and participation course explores the usefulness of participatory approaches for addressing issues of multiple identity (e.g. single parenthood *and* age, ethnic minority group, disability, sexual orientation, migrant status, geographical location) and for exploring commonalities that can be used as a basis for collective action and social cohesion.

## Social inclusion or exclusion

International development agencies such as the World Bank, and some NGOs, use the concept of social *exclusion* in order to promote social *inclusion*, while others stress the *inclusion* of disadvantaged groups in development programmes. Others consider that focussing on inclusion ignores the rights of groups to exclude themselves in societies that discriminate against them on the grounds of religion, caste or other identity issue.<sup>7</sup>

The concept of social exclusion has a number of definitions and is used in different ways. At one level, it is a process and the result of power relations between individuals or between groups. Exclusion is associated with poverty, the denial of rights and of full participation in society for certain groups. The concept has come to the fore since the Social Summit in 1995 and has been taken forward by international organisations – for example, by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in relation to the labour market and employment opportunities. Exclusion from economic life includes exclusion from labour markets, livelihood strategies and other opportunities. Exclusion from services, social security and protection must be addressed in order to ensure participation in social life, while exclusion from political life relates to access to decision-making and citizenship.

In DfID the concept is used to analyse social disadvantage and is also used operationally in programme work. The European Union (EU) uses the term social exclusion but prefers to emphasise social integration or cohesion rather than inclusion. An extensive review of DfID's social exclusion work was recently carried out by the LSE and ODI<sup>8</sup> in consultation with DfID's Exclusion, Rights and Justice (ERJ) Team. Since then the Department has adopted the following working definition:

*'Social exclusion is the experience of certain groups that suffer discrimination on the basis of their social identity and that are disadvantaged economically, socially or politically as a result.'*<sup>9</sup>

According to the review, social exclusion was seen as less threatening than demanding gender equality and less intimidating than a rights-based approach and was seen as providing the space to address difficult issues of social discrimination such as caste or race. Social exclusion is a concept that DfID has taken on board both within its policy and programme approach and within the structure of the organisation, as indicated in the review.<sup>10</sup> DfID has reorganised and within its Policy Division, the ERJ is responsible

<sup>7</sup> Beall, J. and Piron, L.H. *DfID Social Exclusion Review*, LSE and ODI, December 2004

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> We are grateful to Cindy Berman, Julia Chambers and Stephanie Tuffee, Exclusion, Rights and Justice Team, Policy Division, DfID, for sharing information about DfID's work on social exclusion.

<sup>10</sup> Beall, J. and Piron, L.H. *op.cit.*

for taking forward work on social exclusion. There are four work streams: Gender Equality, Tackling Exclusion, Human Rights, and Safety Security and Access to Justice. The role of the ERJ is to develop policy and provide support to regional and country offices on the above issues. Other teams in DfID (such as the PRS Team) work more specifically on implementation tools and mechanisms. Although they do adopt an integrated approach to tackling exclusion, they also have staff responsible for specific groups, such as disabled people, children and older people.

The [Analytical Matrix on Social Exclusion](#) that was used to synthesise DfID's programme work provides a helpful breakdown of different categories of exclusion for analysis, problem identification and operations. It emphasises four categories of exclusion: in relation to rights, on the basis of social identity, on the basis of place (regions affected by conflict, refugees and displace people for example) and exclusion from the labour market.

Social exclusion is related to concern for equality before the law, to non-discrimination and to another related concept – that of *inequality*.<sup>11</sup> Another report commissioned by DfID from ODI<sup>12</sup> identifies two dimensions of inequality: inequality of outcomes and inequality of opportunity. Economists often favour the concept, as inequality can be measured quantitatively across different dimensions. The differentials between social groups and individuals are measurable using human development indices, for example in relation to income, ownership of land and other assets. Economists measure human outcomes such as access to health or education or the extent of civil society participation, and can measure inequality according to the differences between individuals or social groups in different categories. However, in order to measure inequality according to dimensions of difference the disaggregation of data is essential, and this information is not always available or is not in a standardised format for comparison across regions.

The review of DfID's work points out that discrimination and social exclusion contribute to the *inequality of outcomes* for different groups. Interestingly, the root causes – the social, political and economic drivers – are often similar for inequality and for social exclusion. However, not all inequality between groups can be explained by social exclusion. This point is of particular relevance in relation to gender. As the ODI paper observes (p.40), while some see gender and social exclusion as equivalent concepts, others warn against this. For example, Jackson (1999) argues that women are oppressed as women through the particular operation of gender relations, which, she argues, is not the same as women being socially excluded. Women's experience of exclusion, like that of men, may be gendered. She argues, however, that the gendered nature of women's exclusion relates to the power relations between the sexes that are founded on the specifics of gender relations. The ODI paper compares Jackson's position to that of Kabeer (2000, p.88):

*'Gender by itself does not translate unproblematically into exclusion. However, gender can differentiate, and exacerbate, other forms of disadvantage, and thus feed into the destructive synergies, which underlie*

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.* p42.

<sup>12</sup> Anderson E., et al, 2004, 'Inequality in Middle Income Countries', ODI (commissioned by DfID ) cited in *DfID Social Exclusion Review*, p.42.

*hard-core exclusion. For instance, while the stigma of leprosy operates regardless of gender, gender mediates and exacerbates it.'*

The ODI paper points out that while gender and exclusion should be seen as closely linked, they are not synonymous. This is important and it suggests that a social exclusion framework must explicitly take into account other cross-cutting issues such as gender. While this may seem obvious, and a social exclusion approach should in theory provide space for addressing discrimination of different social groups, putting this into practice is not easy. The case study on disability mainstreaming below, for example, explores some of the challenges of keeping gender or disability in focus when using a social exclusion approach.

The response to the social exclusion of different groups in some organisations is to promote socially *inclusive* approaches. HAI, for example, indicates that older people are often invisible in data and that there should be a greater emphasis in public policy on analyses from an age perspective. They also recognise that the social exclusion or inclusion of older people depends on factors such as gender and material circumstances. Therefore, policy should be based on disaggregated data according to age, gender, ethnic origin and ability, and should acknowledge the entitlements of the poorest as a group but also as citizens, migrants and bearers of rights. The principles for inclusive approaches promoted by HAI are to ensure that older people's voices are heard, to support civil society to raise the concerns of older people, and to ensure that their rights and roles are not overlooked in policy processes and development programmes. HAI is concerned that national consultation processes – such as those related to Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) – have not included the perspective of poor, older people and other excluded groups, despite being specifically mandated to include these. HAI maintains that there is an inherent link between inclusive approaches and social progress and, if some groups continue to be marginalised, then 'we are not doing development very well'.<sup>13</sup> In order to achieve inclusion, HAI and other organisations promote participation as a key approach, which we consider in the following section.

## Process of participation

Participation is a term that is central to rights-based approaches and rooted in human rights standards. Full participation in social, economic and political life is considered a basic human right, but there is a variety of interpretations of what participation actually means in development practice. It is generally understood as the active involvement of adults and children in decisions about processes, programmes and projects that affect them. In practice, the term covers a wide variety of activities and is not without its critics, who argue that it can be used as a new form of manipulation. For example, increasing the economic participation of excluded groups can mean exploitation of their labour, rather than bringing them increased benefits. The term empowerment is closely associated with participation. This is generally taken to mean supporting groups and individuals to develop their potential in order to mobilise local resources, participate in decision-making, build consensus and hold local authorities to account. Addressing

<sup>13</sup> Case study by Sylvia Beales in APRODEV, HAI, One World Action, WIDE, 2004, *Transforming the Mainstream*, p.12

power relations is often a central component of participatory approaches, as empowering marginalised groups to negotiate and put forward demands can lead to positive social changes.

There is a whole methodology on participatory research and planning with a range of tools and approaches that are used to enable different groups to be involved and have their voices be heard.<sup>14</sup> Participation strategies – such as the timing of meetings, separate meetings for women or different age groups, and improving leadership and negotiating skills – are employed in projects to address the constraints to participation of certain groups. This is a slow process; it requires time to get the different groups involved and therefore requires commitment and resources in order to be sustainable in the longer term.

The organisations presented in the case studies have adopted participation as a positive and integral part of their rights-based approaches. HAI is committed to building participation into programmes, its network and within the organisation. This includes: integrating older people's experience into the formulation of targets and indicators; analysing barriers to participation, including time, costs and resources; internalising the principles of participation in its governance and working practices; and supporting older people's groups to advocate in their own rights. Save the Children also has included children and young people in research and advocacy activities and has developed accessible resources for young people on citizenship and child rights. Children's participation in the governance of the organisation is also being discussed.

The SPAN UK case study focuses on the innovative diversity and participation course that was piloted in 2004. The course is designed to support single-parent self-help groups to develop awareness of their own diversity and to strengthen strategies and skills to widen participation of other single parents living in their local communities. The case study provides an interesting example of the way in which participatory approaches can be used to make visible the most marginalised or excluded groups (e.g. black and ethnic minority groups, refugees and asylum seekers, disabled people) within a specific community (single-parent families) and thereby enable the organisations and/or networks developed to support single parents to become more inclusive. The case study asks how far development interventions, aimed at encouraging community organisations to reflect on their own diversity and develop more inclusive approaches within their organisations, would serve as an effective entry point for addressing gender and diversity.

## **For diversity, against discrimination in the EU**

As noted in the [phase one GAD Network report](#), there are some important developments with regard to diversity and discrimination legislation that will affect organisations based in the UK and in Europe. These agreements need to be monitored by civil society organisations to ensure that the commitments to promote and protect diversity and equality are in fact carried out by governments.

---

<sup>14</sup> See for example, Slocum, R, et al (eds) 1995, *Power, Process and Participation: Tools for change*. Intermediate Technology publications, London.

In the past two years there has been a strong push from the EU on diversity and non-discrimination. This will have an impact on the cultural environment and the policies of UK-based international NGOs. For example, as employers they will be regulated by new anti-discrimination legislation. Governments will have a duty to actively promote gender and racial equality from 2005, and the priorities and criteria for EU development assistance will also be influenced, which in turn will impact on programme funding. So it is important to highlight the nature of these new initiatives on diversity and non-discrimination.

The Amsterdam Treaty (1997) gave the European Community new powers to combat discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, and the power to combat sex discrimination was widened. In 2003, the EU Commission launched a five-year campaign *For Diversity, Against Discrimination* which included a consultation exercise throughout 25 member states on a green paper on discrimination. Two new directives from the EU strengthen rights and combat discrimination: The Racial Equality Directive and The Employment Equality Directive. (For further information go to: [www.stop-discrimination.info](http://www.stop-discrimination.info).)

The UK Government now has a public duty, not only to respond to cases of discrimination but to promote gender and race equality. One outcome of this new legislation on the domestic front is that the UK Government has decided to create a single Commission for Equality and Human Rights which will change the way equality issues are promoted and enforced in this country (see discussion of the 2004 consultation in the GAD Network phase one report). Legislation has been introduced and is likely to be approved in the current parliamentary session. However, the new Commission will not be fully operational until 2006, so it remains to be seen how this new diversity focus will operate in practice.

## **Making the links between internal organisational culture and programmatic effectiveness**

The report of the first phase of the GAD Network research outlines how UK-based international development organisations have responded to the changes in the UK/EU legislative framework with regard to diversity. Many organisations, including DfID, Oxfam UK and ActionAid UK, have undertaken diversity audits of their own internal policies, practices and procedures. DfID cites many of the above-mentioned legislative influences as factors behind the introduction their first *Annual Report on Diversity* in February 2004. DfID, along with some NGOs (Oxfam, ActionAid UK, Voluntary Service Overseas), has developed diversity policies and/or strategies to support it in implementing its obligations under the new legislation. Most of these policies/strategies are designed to broaden the diversity of staff and to promote changes to the culture of the organisation in ways that are supportive of diversity.

The phase one report notes that questions have been raised about the appropriateness for country offices of diversity strategies developed in response to the UK/EU political and legislative context. Nonetheless, there are some interesting examples available of DfID country offices developing their own diversity strategies to reflect the specific contexts in which they work (e.g. Nepal and Zambia). In this report, the CARE India case study

provides one example of the efforts of a country office to respond to wider efforts across CARE International to address diversity issues internally (the CARE website provides examples of diversity audits carried out by some CARE country offices). International development organisations are increasingly making links between an internal organisational culture that values diversity and improved programmatic effectiveness. Not only is 'practising what they preach' seen to increase credibility, it is also argued that a more diverse staff will strengthen an organisation's understanding of local societies and broaden knowledge and professional expertise. These issues were addressed in some detail in the first phase report. The case studies presented below confirm that organisations are thinking about their own diversity and how this impacts on their work with poor and marginalised groups. SPAN, for example, has specific criteria for the representation of diverse groups on its National Co-ordinating Committee to ensure that gender and diversity are embedded in its decision-making processes. The discussion on disability mainstreaming explores some of the lessons from gender mainstreaming for other areas of diversity with regard to the importance of making links between internal organisational structure/culture and programmatic work on gender equality.

The case study on CARE India's RACHNA Programme is also of particular relevance in that it explores the dynamics between staff attitudes around sensitive cultural and social issues and programme effectiveness. Importantly, its strategies for addressing gender and diversity from a rights-based perspective operate at two integrated levels: programming strategies and internal organisational strategies to support a culture of reflection and attitudinal change about issues of gender and diversity. Also within the RACHNA programme, an innovative pilot has been launched called *Inner Spaces Outer Faces Initiative* (ISOFI). ISOFI addresses the dynamics between internal organisational culture/values and programmatic effectiveness. The pilot is based on the understanding that staff attitudes and cultural norms about sexuality and gender have hindered the effectiveness of programmes promoting sexual and reproductive health. Among the aims of the initiative is to deepen staff members' personal understanding of the concepts of gender and sexuality and strengthen their gender and sexuality analytical skills.

Save the Children has a handbook and other resources to support staff to integrate a diversity analysis in their work but recognises that this is not sufficient. As an international organisation, Save the Children employs a wide range of people across the world and therefore a diversity approach requires an understanding of the range of cultural, political and social contexts within which they operate. In its diversity primer it suggests that staff teams have to be aware of the power dynamics affecting their work. An examination of all aspects of operations, from programming to human resources practices, as well as the staff's own beliefs is essential. There are also inevitable differences in working styles, attitudes and communication. Save the Children suggests that people who work for an international organisation should be aware of those differences and how they impact in the workplace. This has to go in hand with management responsibility to oversee and take forward a diversity approach.

## Concluding remarks

The case studies suggest that there is no standard approach to diversity apparent in programming, but that diversity issues are being raised through a number of different entry points (e.g. rights-based approaches, discrimination, social exclusion/inclusion, participation). There is considerable effort underway to clarify key concepts and to understand how they are inter-related and how they can be operationalised. Much more could still be done to disseminate the existing work (such as the recent reviews on human rights and on social exclusion prepared by ODI for DfID) and to strengthen understanding across different institutions.

The case studies also illustrate that there are pockets of innovative work to address issues of diversity more systematically in programming. All the case studies demonstrate the importance of understanding different cultural contexts, the need for disaggregation of data, the importance of participatory research and stakeholder involvement in planning and activities. They also recognise the importance of highlighting the obstacles to accessing rights and that these might require different interventions according to the stakeholders involved. Again what we find is that there is no uniform approach to programme interventions to address diversity issues but that these are dependent on the context. A growing understanding of the reality of people's multiple identities and the need to tackle multiple forms of discrimination is evident from the case studies. However, the examples given suggest that in practice it may only be manageable to work through targeted interventions focussing on the intersection of two or three areas of identity. From the perspective of gender, the case studies suggest that rather than being side-lined by a concern with a wider range of diversity issues, the approaches being taken by the organisations are, on the whole, enabling more nuanced understandings, and programmatic responses, of the lived experience of multiple identities.

The case studies also highlight the tension between demands for greater policy attention to specific identity issues (e.g. gender, race and ethnicity, age, disability, sexuality) and moves towards more unified approaches to addressing issues of difference (such as rights-based approaches, social exclusion/inclusion, diversity strategies). From the examples explored in this paper, it is possible to argue that while more holistic and integrated approaches are important, they will not do away with the need for a specific focus on women/gender inequality (and for specific attention to other identity issues as well). Nonetheless, networking and collaborating across organisations/networks to understand and address the underlying causes of discrimination/exclusion of different groups needs to be emphasised. The APRODEV/HAI/One World Action 2003 workshop on mainstreaming and inclusive approaches in EU development policy, and the recent work on lessons from gender mainstreaming for disability mainstreaming, are examples – but much more could be done. This is particularly important in relation to identifying joint advocacy actions at an international level as well as co-operating at local and country level.

Participation and participatory approaches are prioritised in all case studies and it is crucial that approaches adopted are supportive of real participation and empowerment rather than tokenistic or rhetorical. The case studies suggest that enabling the voices of the most marginalised and excluded groups to be heard is not only central to rights-

based approaches but is essential for ensuring appropriate and effective development interventions.

Strategically, the case studies indicate the importance of working simultaneously at a number of different levels to address issues of diversity: internal organisational level; programming level; and advocacy level. They also suggest multiple-tracked approaches to diversity are required. For example, this might involve:

1. identifying what is common in the shared experience of ‘discrimination’ and, from this, what can serve as the basis for collective work
2. identifying when and where single-strand issues warrant targeted interventions (in addition to mainstreaming)
3. identifying and addressing multiple identities and multiple forms of discrimination.

While more work needs to be done to strengthen the ways in which diversity issues are addressed in programmatic work, the case studies document some promising approaches being used by different organisations and should be of considerable relevance to other members of the GAD Network.

## Section 2: Case studies

### CARE India: gender and diversity in the RACHNA Programme<sup>15</sup>

#### **Introduction**

This case study explores the recent experience of gender equity and diversity integration in CARE India's Reproductive and Child Health, Nutrition and AIDS (RACHNA) Programme. The RACHNA programme should be of interest to GAD Network members for a number of reasons. First, RACHNA attempts to address gender and diversity issues through interventions at two levels: programming strategies and internal organisational strategies. RACHNA thus provides an important illustration of the dynamic relationship between addressing diversity as an internal organisational issue and addressing diversity in programme work.

Second, CARE is in the process of reorganising its reproductive health (RH) programme to encompass more fully the range of interventions outlined in the Cairo Programme of Action, adopted by governments after the International Conference on Development and Population in 1994. This re-orientation relates to the rights-based framework being adopted by CARE, which addresses the underlying causes of poverty and injustice in all its programmes and seeks to ensure diversity and gender equity in all country programmes. CARE's RH programmes are thus beginning to address underlying social and structural causes of poor health, including issues of discrimination and marginalisation (e.g. inequities related to gender, class or ethnicity), national, district and local priorities and social norms. Of particular relevance in this regard is an innovative pilot launched within the RACHNA programme, the *Inner Spaces Outer Faces Initiative*, which supports a process of mainstreaming sexuality and gender as fundamental components of reproductive health and rights.

The case study suggests that there is no one tool or checklist for working on gender and diversity from a rights-based perspective. Instead the RACHNA programme provides an example of how CARE has embarked on a *process* of organisational and personal change to support its commitment to human rights and social justice as well as the different entry points that are available. Here we can only give a schematic overview of some of the highlights of the RACHNA programme, focussing primarily on processes and approaches that are being used to support its reorientation.

#### **Background on CARE**

CARE is an international confederation of twelve national Members; each an autonomous NGO in its own right. CARE's Member offices in North America, Europe, Asia and Australia carry out a range of project-related, advocacy, fundraising, and communications activities in support of CARE International's relief and development programmes in over 65 countries worldwide. In the great majority of the countries in which CARE International works, all programmes and projects are implemented

---

<sup>15</sup> We are grateful to the following people for providing information: Geetika Hora, RACHNA Programme, CARE India; Elisa Martinez, Senior Programme Advisor, Impact Evaluation and Gender Equity, CARE USA; and Madhuri Narayanan, Senior Advisor, Gender and Diversity, CARE USA.

through a single integrated operational presence, termed the Country Office, under the leadership of the CARE International Country Director.

CARE International's mission is to serve individuals and families in some of the poorest communities in the world. CARE attempts to work with local communities to address root causes of poverty and to empower communities and households to make lasting changes in their lives. CARE has developed a set of six Programming Principles to inform and guide the way it works: Promote Empowerment; Work in Partnership with Others; Ensure Accountability and Promote Responsibility; Oppose Discrimination;<sup>16</sup> Oppose Violence; and, Seek Sustainable Results. CARE International's Programming Principles represent the fruits of several years of effort to distil the essence of CARE's rights-based approach. There is ongoing work by CARE staff around the world to attach specific behaviours and indicators to each principle in order to ensure that interventions will examine power, identity and accountability as well as pay attention to underlying causes of poverty. This work will also support the use of the Programming Principles as tools for effective planning, programming, and monitoring and evaluation.

One example is the CARE Rights-based Rating Scale to rank interventions on a scale from one to five for each of the Programming Principles. A specific tool on addressing gender and diversity issues in relation to each Programme Principle has been developed. Many of these documents are available from the CARE Rights Based Approach Resource Centre which brings together various papers, tools and manuals that describe CARE's experience in applying a rights-based approach to development. At this juncture it is also worth mentioning CARE's excellent Gender Equity Building Blocks, which are a collection of field examples and methods that integrate gender equity and diversity issues into programming (with sections on concepts, analysis, strategic choices, implementation methods, partnerships, and information systems). Links to many of these tools and action research projects are given in the [Resources Section](#) of the Gender and Diversity Resources Kit. All of the above should provide some indication of the broader context in which the RACHNA programme is evolving.

### ***Gender and diversity in CARE India***

Since 1950, CARE India has worked primarily with women by implementing programmes to improve their health, nutritional and socio-economic status within their local contexts. Although these programmes were working towards meeting some of the more obvious and practical needs of women, over the years there has been growing awareness that, while important, such interventions may not ensure that women have more control over their own lives. Over the past five years there has been considerable effort by CARE India to strengthen its approach by identifying and addressing the structural inequities that create and perpetuate the subordination of women.

In 1999, a Gender Task Force was set up, with the aim of creating a more gender-sensitive organisational climate and articulating the connections between CARE India's vision, goal and gender objectives. In the same year, the Design, Evaluation, Monitoring and Organisational Learning Team developed a gender training manual. In 2000, a

---

<sup>16</sup> Of particular relevance here is Principle 4: Oppose Discrimination, which states: *'In our programs and offices we oppose discrimination and the denial of rights based on sex, race, nationality, ethnicity, class, religion, age, physical ability, caste, opinion or sexual orientation.'*

gender vision and goal and a Gender Integration Institutional Plan were developed to act as a unifying framework, providing guidelines to integrate gender in all organisational policies and programmes. Throughout 2001 and 2002 a number of regional workshops were held to support staff in understanding key concepts around gender and rights-based approaches, organised by the Design, Evaluation, Monitoring and Organisational Learning Team.

What is clear from the documentation surrounding these various activities is the very conscious effort of staff to grapple with the implications for their work of a shift to a rights-based approach. This has involved a reorientation away from thinking about project design and strategies with a narrow focus on the symptoms of gender discrimination (women's ill health, nutrition, illiteracy, income poverty etc.) and away from the perspective of technical outcomes (e.g. reductions in mortality, improved nutrition, literacy, income generation). It has meant thinking about approaches and skills for recognising discrimination and for supporting a more holistic analysis of the underlying causes of discrimination and the dynamics through which denial of rights and discrimination perpetuates poverty (e.g. social and gender analysis, PRA/PLA). It has also meant thinking about new ways of working to challenge discrimination (negotiation, advocacy and more).

A report in February 2002<sup>17</sup> pulled together some of the learning emerging from the above-mentioned workshops and analysed some of the gaps on gender and diversity that needed to be further explored. Among these was the recognition of the challenges of supporting staff to 'break the thinking that gender issues exist only in the communities' in which they work. At the same time, the workshops generated considerable discussion of diversity issues beyond gender, such as those of caste, religion, class, language and the rural-urban divide which are all sensitive issues in Indian society. It was also noted that the question of how CARE India could be more conscious of recognising and addressing a wider range of diversity issues was an equally sensitive one for staff. The report concludes that '*the current focus has been on gender alone*' and that CARE India '*needs to build its internal expertise in other diversity issues*' as well.

The RACHNA programme provides one example of CARE India's reorientation towards thinking about gender *and* diversity within the framework of a rights-based approach.

### **The RACHNA programme<sup>18</sup>**

The RACHNA programme represents the current phase of a 40-year partnership with the Government of India and USAID, aimed at impacting maternal and child health. The programme reaches over 100,000 villages and 22 cities of India. It targets families with pregnant women and children under two years, men and women of reproductive age, youth, female sex workers, migrants and truckers. While much has been achieved over the past decade in using participatory methods to enhance the effectiveness of programmes, it is argued that:

---

<sup>17</sup> *Towards a gender-sensitive organisational culture: Learnings and challenges in CARE India*, February 2002.

<sup>18</sup> Much of this section draws on the document: CARE India, October 2004, *Experience of gender equity and diversity integration in RACHNA: Towards lasting improvements in the health and well-being of vulnerable communities in India*.

*'the paradigm shift has come when staff had the courage, and made the commitment, to address such previously taboo subjects as caste-based exclusion, son preference, gender and sexuality, and violence against women'.*

It is beyond the scope of this case study to capture in full the multi-faceted and multi-layered approach that is being used to support the process of re-orientating the RACHNA programme. There have been numerous background papers prepared and participatory community processes used to uncover the underlying factors impacting on women's health and reproductive rights. As a first step, key gender issues specific to the target groups within RACHNA were identified. Through this process the following objective of the programme was defined:

*'Enhancing capabilities of women to negotiate decisions that affect their health and well-being within and outside the household'.*

Community-level analysis exercises pinpointed the issues of identity-based exclusion, marginalisation and/or abuse as critical to health impacts. These helped to demonstrate the central relationship between health outcomes and gender/social dynamics that had previously been 'off the table', including:

- active exclusion from health services, based on gender and caste
- harmful cultural practices which inhibit health practices
- the importance of adolescence as a time when gender roles and differentials crystallise
- power inequities sustained by rigid gender roles, where checks on women's mobility and sexuality reflect fears about social control, and undermine women's status and health
- violence in public and private domains, as both cause and consequence of women's disempowerment.

Building on the above, a series of facilitated dialogues was held with the RACHNA team to help move the programme closer to really understanding what it means to address the underlying causes of poverty and, related to this, what is required to mainstream gender and diversity. To give one example, staff attempted to articulate in measurable terms what RACHNA would hope to achieve in each of the priority issues/areas (e.g. those bulleted above) that had been identified through investigation into underlying causes.

Here the CARE Programming Principles were used to identify what might be changed to bring RACHNA to a fuller rights-based approach, asking questions such as:

- What might be a 'minimum standard' for the issue? (Indian law, human rights law, ethical and religious norms)
- What are some concrete and sustainable contributions that RACHNA could make to move in this direction?
- What kinds of internal measures could be used to hold ourselves accountable for these goals? (Here, the Programming Principles were used to map out 'activity-level' commitments for RACHNA to strengthen Empowerment, Opposition to

Discrimination, Opposition to Violence, etc.).

The outcome of all the above has been the identification of two inter-related sets of operational strategies to address gender and diversity issues in RACHNA: Programming Strategies and Internal Organisational Strategies.

Programming Strategies include:

- working with women as primary target groups
- organising women into collectives
- creating a strong cadre of change agents in communities
- implementing short learning cycles and innovative pilots (see discussion on ISOFI below)
- facilitating meaningful engagement with the government system.

Internal Organisational Strategies include:

- building staff capacities for gender and social analysis
- promoting a culture of reflection and questioning
- investing in reflective documentation and learning
- gaining mission-level support to strengthen work on gender and diversity
- engaging in state-level networks and alliances.

Again, we cannot provide the details on the rationale and modalities for each of these areas of work. However, it is worth elaborating a few points. With regard to Programming Strategies, for example, there has been a conscious effort to address diversity issues in a number of ways. Recognising the existence of caste and class-based divisions has led to the selection of change agents from different groups in the communities. Other innovations have been the inclusion of men as change agents and youth as peer educators. By including youth, RACHNA is attempting to ensure that young people are taught at an early age to challenge stereotypes and mindsets. This is also reflected in the life-cycle approach which RACHNA has adopted in addressing reproductive health issues.

With regard to Internal Organisational Strategies, significant emphasis is placed on strengthening internal team skills to integrate gender and issues of social exclusion for achieving greater impact, rather than depending solely on external expertise. Through workshops, debates and cross-visits to other organisations, staff are being enabled to challenge their beliefs and attitudes about issues of gender and diversity and find meaningful ways of addressing these in their own lives and through their work. Linked to this is the challenge of promoting a culture of reflection and questioning. There are efforts to move away from merely focusing on carrying out tasks in a routine manner. Instead there is a move towards constantly reminding themselves of the RACHNA programme goal and of the need to ensure that those 'left out' from health services are encouraged to participate in programme activities. This means constantly asking the following questions:

- Are the most vulnerable groups in the communities being reached?
- Is the current data collection and monitoring system tuned to track impact on vulnerable groups?
- How is the social position of women in the communities being improved?
- Are partner organisations skilled to address these issues?

Although this new approach is still at an early stage, a number of lessons have been documented so far. The two main findings are that:

- Communities are not homogeneous and therefore the women RACHNA works with cannot be viewed as a homogeneous group. They have significant differences based on other identities such as religion, caste and class, and therefore are able to participate and benefit from the programme differently. While having common goals and unifying principles, RACHNA has to allow for flexible approaches to respond to different community realities and change processes.
- Changing mindsets, which have been fostered by patriarchal values, requires intensive engagement with the communities it works with. But social change must begin within CARE – staff need to be encouraged to challenge their own mindsets, biases and behaviours in order for them to facilitate positive change among partners and communities with which CARE works.

### ***Inner Spaces Outer Faces Initiative***<sup>19</sup>

The two-year pilot ISOFI was launched at a workshop in May 2004 as one of the innovative short learning-cycle projects within the RACHNA programme (another ISOFI pilot is being implemented in CARE Vietnam). The project was developed by CARE USA in partnership with the International Centre for Research on Women (ICRW) and co-funded by the FORD Foundation. It aims:

*‘to facilitate a strong foundation in CARE for integrating sexuality and gender in its programmatic approach for achieving reproductive health – both in terms of stronger health results and gender equity, by a systematic and deliberate analysis of sexuality, gender, power relations and identity’.*<sup>20</sup>

Silences around issues of sexuality, gender, identity and power are understood to have hindered the effectiveness of programmes promoting sexual and reproductive health. CARE is now working to mainstream gender, sexuality and a rights-based approach into its reproductive health programme worldwide.

*‘At a minimum this requires understanding that sexuality is socially defined and constructed, that institutional arrangements for sexual behaviour (such as marriage systems) define gender-based power relations and that social norms and ideologies manifest idealised views of male and female sexuality. It also requires understanding how in a given social setting, existing institutions and*

<sup>19</sup> This section draws on two sources: ‘Inner Spaces, Outer Faces: Integrating Sexuality and Gender into CARE’s Reproductive Health Programs’, ICRW and CARE Proposal to the Ford Foundation, August 2003; and the CD-ROM of the ISOFI Launch Workshop, May 25-29, 2004.

<sup>20</sup> CARE India, October 2004, *Experience of gender equity and diversity integration in RACHNA: Towards lasting improvements in the health and well-being of vulnerable communities in India.*

*norms define knowledge, behaviour, [selection of] partners, motivations, and power dynamics within men and women's sexual relationships and behaviour'.<sup>21</sup>*

The central challenge here is that while

*'sexuality and gender affect reproductive health, they are rarely addressed directly in reproductive health programmes due to the culture and habit of silence that prevails both at the community level and within the lives of staff members who implement the programmes'.<sup>22</sup>*

Even where staff members have learned to talk technically about gender and reproductive health, they tend to skirt around or ignore sensitive issues and cultural norms about sexuality that underlie reproductive health needs and outcomes – due to their own personal discomfort about addressing issues of sexuality and gender. This has profound implications for reproductive health and other development programmes, but particularly for those aimed at preventing or managing the consequences of HIV/AIDS and gender-based violence.

ISOFI seeks to address these challenges systematically, through an organisational strategy that promotes both personal learning and programmatic realignment. The two-year pilot is seen as preparatory work needed for CARE staff and partners to develop the skills necessary for this sensitive work, to document the process of organisational learning and to disseminate the learning widely within the organisation. The launch workshop introduced staff to the framework of the initiative. The focus is on working with staff to:

- deepen their own personal understanding of gender and sexuality concepts
- strengthen their gender and sexuality analytical skills
- develop their participatory gender and sexuality analysis and design skills for programming.

Significant emphasis is also placed on managing and documenting the process of organisational change that all of the above entails.

Some of the highlights from the launch that are of particular interest relate to the critical thinking on clarifying the differences between traditional approaches to reproductive health and a rights-based approach that takes into account gender and sexuality. For example, presentations and discussions worked through the implications of taking a rights-based approach to gender and sexuality, introducing the concepts of bodily integrity, choice, self-determination, consent, freedom from coercion, discrimination and violence as well as respect for diversity. Four case studies were prepared and distributed to the group for analysis and discussion. Each case study presented a scenario ranging from a young couple who find themselves confronted with an unwanted pregnancy, to a service provider who feels uncomfortable with certain issues concerning sexuality that have arisen while working with sex workers. Each case study

---

<sup>21</sup> 'Inner Spaces, Outer Faces: Integrating Sexuality and Gender into CARE's Reproductive Health Programs', ICRW and CARE Proposal to the Ford Foundation, August 2003, p.2

<sup>22</sup> Ibid. p.2.

presents a situation that a programme may be confronted with in practice when working with a particular community.

Participants discussed the gender and sexuality components and the various consequences to sexual and reproductive health programmes if these components are not addressed. The results were divided into three general categories (1) social consequences, (2) sexual and reproductive health (SRH) consequences, and (3) sexual and reproductive health programming consequences. The outcomes are included here because they demonstrate the way in which links are being made between gender, sexuality, and underlying causes of poverty and discrimination.

Social Consequences	SRH Consequences	SRH Programming Consequences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• perpetuation of unequal sexual relations</li> <li>• homophobia</li> <li>• perpetuation of unequal power relations</li> <li>• perpetuation of unequal gender relations</li> <li>• silence on critical issues</li> <li>• cyclical nature of violence</li> <li>• cyclical nature of underlying causes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• unwanted pregnancy</li> <li>• unsafe abortion</li> <li>• HIV/AIDS/STIs</li> <li>• gender and sexual violence</li> <li>• death</li> <li>• fistula and other serious disabilities</li> <li>• psychosexual issues (no satisfaction, fear, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• decreased RH-related morbidity and mortality</li> <li>• increased sexual health</li> <li>• people better prepared for mutually satisfying relationships</li> <li>• increased communication</li> <li>• increased self-esteem of people/self-agency</li> <li>• increased gender equity</li> <li>• decreased marginalised/vulnerable people/stigma</li> <li>• decreased poverty</li> </ul>

The following chart was presented as part of the session and demonstrates how an ISOFI Learning Project differs from a traditional reproductive health programme.

	Analysis	Action/Intervention	Outcomes
<b>Traditional RH Projects</b>	Traditional RH parameters	Traditional RH activities	Improved RH morbidity and mortality
<b>ISOFI 'Learning' Projects</b>	Traditional <i>plus</i> sexuality and gender	Traditional <i>with</i> sexuality and gender integrated	Improved RH morbidity and mortality Improved sexual health Improved social justice and reduced poverty

It is difficult to capture fully in such a short study the ISOFI approach in particular and the reorientation of the RACHNA programme in general. As these processes are still in

their early stages, it is difficult to share more in the way of progress in implementing either the internal or programmatic strategies. This case study nonetheless provides some insight into the innovative and multi-faceted approach that CARE is taking to address gender and diversity in its work. The [Resources Section](#) of the Gender and Diversity Resources Kit provides details for those who are interested in following the development of the RACHNA programme.

## Save the Children UK: Integrating diversity into child rights programming<sup>23</sup>

### **Introduction**

This case study of Save the Children UK's work on diversity provides an insight into how the organisation is working to address diversity and discrimination against children. The case study focuses on the internal process of developing an approach to work on equity and how Save the Children UK would like to integrate diversity into programming. It also outlines the key components of child rights programming (CRP), which includes a focus on discrimination and equity, and provides a practical example of how the programme in South America is addressing discrimination by involving young people in monitoring their work.

### **Background to Save the Children UK**

Save the Children fights for children in the UK and around the world who suffer from poverty, disease, injustice and violence. It has programmes tackling education, health and HIV and focuses on children who are affected by emergencies, poverty and exploitation. It also carries out research on a wide range of issues, such as the impact of globalisation, child poverty, and child rights issues.

Save the Children UK is a member of the International Save the Children Alliance, which brings together 27 organisations working in over 100 countries. They are independent organisations but have similar missions and values and work together to develop joint strategies and strengthen their collective capacity in programme work, advocacy for children's rights and fundraising. Together as the Alliance the organisations actively engage with the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child and participate in major international and regional conferences to advocate for children's rights. In recent years they have strongly involved young people in these advocacy activities. In their programme work they actively encourage children's participation and have a variety of publications and training packages for children and teachers on a range of child rights issues.

Together with a number of other organisations, Save the Children UK is currently part of the *Make Poverty History*, and as an active member of the *Growing up in Poverty* network is involved in research looking at poverty and children in different countries.

### **Discrimination**

Save the Children UK's approach to issues of discrimination has been informed by its commitment to realising the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN CRC), with non-discrimination as one of its core principles. Save the Children UK has a history of tackling discrimination experienced by the most marginalised and excluded groups of children. Over the years, its efforts to tackle discrimination have reflected the tension between a commitment to non-discrimination as a principle extending to all areas of organisational operations, and being a distinct focus of work in programmes, policy and

---

<sup>23</sup> This case study expands on an earlier paper by T. Hyder and C. Csaky 'Diversity Programming: approaches and next steps', Save the Children, Policy and Learning Team, December 2003 and other information provided by Tina Hyder, the Save the Children's Diversity Adviser.

advocacy. Thus the principle of non-discrimination has been central to the work of Save the Children UK, but the implications for practical action have been harder to realise and, as with other organisations, Save the Children UK has tried a number of operational models.

Save the Children UK works to challenge discrimination and to help children know and enjoy their rights, and through its advocacy work puts pressure on governments and other players to respect children's rights. It defines discrimination and the children most affected by it and acknowledges that children may face multiple forms of discrimination:

*'Discrimination means treating people less well than others because of who they are, and is a denial of rights. It can include discrimination based on race, age, disability, HIV status, sexual preference, religion and gender. These forms are linked, so a girl who is disabled and from a particular ethnic group may be triply disadvantaged.'*

*Vulnerable groups such as refugees and street children are often heavily discriminated against. This can lead to exclusion, blocked opportunities, exploitation, abuse and even death.'*<sup>24</sup>

Based on their experience Save the Children UK promotes a unified overall approach to tackling discrimination, which it believes is most effective, for the following reasons:<sup>25</sup>

- The impacts of discrimination, whatever the root causes, are likely to be marginalisation, social exclusion, lack of access, an increased likelihood of poverty and lack of power. As such, there are overlaps in the actions required to address them.
- Common analytical frameworks can be used both to define problems and find solutions to discrimination based on gender, ethnicity, disability or other factors.
- The inter-relatedness of issues of identity means that it is important to have a unified strategy to tackle discrimination, particularly multiple discrimination.

Therefore a diversity approach is promoted to tackle discrimination, in order to capture the complexity of identity and note intersections between components of identity. In this way the organisation believes it will be better able to find effective overall approaches to tackling discrimination. However, it also recognises that it is appropriate in some cases to focus on specific issues in programme and project work, such as racism or gender inequality, in order to address rights violations against specific groups.

### ***Diversity: a unified approach***

Save the Children UK has tried various approaches to work on diversity issues. Technical posts<sup>26</sup> dedicated to strengthening programme and policy impact on disability and gender equality achieved significant progress in addressing these issues, developing policies and guidelines for integrating them into child rights programmes. Initially, gender, disability and HIV/AIDS were defined as cross-cutting issues and were

<sup>24</sup> See 'equality and rights' section at [www.savethechildren.org.uk](http://www.savethechildren.org.uk)

<sup>25</sup> Save the Children UK, 2004, 'Diversity Primer'.

<sup>26</sup> A disability adviser came into post in the policy section of the programmes department in 1987, followed by a gender adviser in 1995.

supposed to be considered in all programmes. However, the principles of gender and disability equality were not integrated into all aspects of the organisation's work as the general perception was that having a few specific projects on disability or gender (e.g. on violence against girls), targeted research and advocacy were sufficient.

In the late 1990s advisers working on disability and gender, along with the HIV and child focus advisers, produced a working paper<sup>27</sup> noting the importance of finding the common ground when working on issues of discrimination. This highlighted three important points:

- There are similar actions required by programmes to tackle and improve action on a wide range of equality issues (for instance, training for staff and partners, awareness raising, advocacy, creation of or implementation of legislation, action by children from discriminated against groups to claim their rights and so on).
- A focus on specific issues of discrimination (gender, disability, HIV) with dedicated posts, meant that other issues were missed (for instance, ethnicity and caste).
- It was also acknowledged that the intersections between issues of discrimination must be understood, as it is difficult to tackle one form of discrimination without taking into account others. For instance, action on promoting disability equality will only be successful if issues of gender and caste are taken into account.

As a result an organisational initiative, including a staff training programme and the development of tools for analysing the impact of power, leading to effective programming on issues of discrimination, was developed by the advisers. However, this initiative failed to be rolled out across the organisation. The principle of a unified approach to issues of discrimination was not lost and can be seen in the current organisational approach that seeks greater coherence in applying the principles of non-discrimination to all aspects of work.

In 2003 organisational restructuring led to a sharper focus on Save the Children UK goals and the creation of a new team with responsibility for organisational policy and learning. Within the Policy and Learning team a new Diversity Adviser's post has been created with responsibility for all areas of discrimination and diversity, including gender. The Diversity Adviser works collaboratively with the Child Rights Adviser and the Learning and Impact Adviser.

The aim is to use CRP and the country planning and review processes to integrate awareness of diversity issues and to plan effective programme and advocacy work to tackle discrimination in all sectors. By using management systems, the focus is removed from only training and awareness raising, to achieving clearly stated minimum standards in planning, monitoring, evaluation and advocacy. The focus on diversity issues requires analysis of which groups of children experience discrimination and acknowledges that there are many groups experiencing multiple- discrimination.

As patterns of discrimination vary from place to place, the aim of a commitment to diversity as a means of tackling discrimination is not about imposing strategies from the

---

<sup>27</sup> Internal working paper: entitled 'Avoiding Issue Overload' (1995)

centre of the organisation. Instead, the team proposes that country programmes should analyse patterns of discrimination and impacts on children relevant to local contexts, and plan activities accordingly. They stress that, as there is near universal discrimination on the basis of gender, disability and ethnicity (for reasons of language, religion, culture, minority status, etc.) attention must be paid to these particular areas of discrimination in all analyses.

The current challenge for Save the Children UK is to ensure agreed commitment throughout the organisation to tackling discrimination from a diversity perspective. To do so, the Diversity Adviser is promoting the following approach:

- organisational awareness and understanding of how discrimination operates and coherent action to tackle discrimination. This is being addressed through the production of induction materials and training tools as well as establishing links between human resources practices and action in policy and programmes
- measures to analyse and tackle patterns of discrimination
- learning from experience about what works.

Some tools have already been produced to support staff to integrate diversity into programme work. For example, guidelines for CRP include tackling discrimination as one of the four principles of the approach, and a useful [checklist](#) has been provided to guide staff through the key elements to be addressed in the project cycle.

Within Save the Children UK a commitment to diversity also implies an acknowledgement of the range of cultural, political and social contexts within which it works. It requires awareness from staff, at all levels, of the power dynamics within which they operate. To tackle discrimination and promote diversity the organisation suggests that it is important to examine all aspects of its work, from programming to human resources practices, as well as beliefs. It also suggests that it is of equal importance to maintain technical knowledge and skills as they apply to particular areas of discrimination, such as gender and disability.

Save the Children UK has a wide range of publications for children and young people, a special website just for them called Global Eyes, and a number of training packs for teachers on global issues that affect children. Among these are anti-discrimination training resources by and for young people, activity packs on sexual discrimination as well as a teacher's guide on how to facilitate and assess children's active citizenship.

### ***Tackling discrimination from a diversity perspective***

Save the Children UK is committed to a CRP approach in all of its programme work. This means that child rights provide the framework within which all programme work fits. This approach respects children as social actors and aims to maximise sustainability, efficiency and overall impact. Non-discrimination is one of the four general principles of the UN CRC. Article 2 of the UNCRC says that:

*'States Parties shall respect and ensure the rights set forth in the present Convention to each child within their jurisdiction without discrimination of any kind, irrespective of the child's or his or her parents' or legal guardians' race,*

*colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status.*<sup>28</sup>

The UN CRC and other human rights instruments are tools through which discrimination can be tackled and rights upheld. Although the notion of respect for difference is at the heart of a diversity approach Save the Children UK stresses that it is important that respect for different cultural traditions and practices does not happen at the expense of a commitment to human rights.

### **Key elements of a child rights programming approach**

The key principles of human rights: universality, equity, or non-discrimination apply to children's rights. The recognition of the complexity of identity and the ways in which discrimination and power relations impact on people (including children), combined with a desire to value difference has led Save the Children UK to take a unified, holistic approach to this issue, which they refer to as diversity.

Other core principles of a CRP approach are the right to survival and development and the best interest of the child. There are two other important elements to CRP: participation and accountability. The right to participate in decisions that affect them and for their voices to be heard is a key child rights and human rights principle and considered good development practice. Therefore child participation is promoted in every area of the organisation's work and in each part of the programme cycle. Accountability means, not only holding duty bearers to account but also seeking ways of increasing Save the Children UK's accountability to children and to involve children in governance (children as stakeholders). In order to be accountable to children they monitor the impact of their work and how it affects children's lives against five 'dimensions of change' (identified in the global impact monitoring process), and they give great importance to organisational learning through monitoring their successes and mistakes.

### **Diversity, equity and global impact monitoring**

Save the Children UK's approach to measuring impact is known as GIM (global impact monitoring). Dimension 4 measures changes in equity and non-discrimination in the lives of children and young people. The information that is needed to indicate a change in this dimension are:

1. disaggregated data which gives a general picture of which children and young people experience discrimination
2. disaggregated data about the involvement of discriminated against groups of children in thematic areas
3. information about the impact of activities that have promoted changes in the ability of children to speak out; changes in attitudes and access to services; and finally changes in policies and practices.

### **Equity and non-discrimination of children and young people**

An example of how diversity is being incorporated in Save the Children UK programme work is provided by the views of young people involved in their sexual and

---

<sup>28</sup> Although we only refer here to the UNCRC, it is important to note that children also have rights under the wider international human rights framework e.g. girls have specific rights under CEDAW.

reproductive work in South America.<sup>29</sup> The context in which programme work takes place is particularly relevant in Bahía, Brazil, where the poverty and discrimination against the majority black population is the framework for the work with young men and women. Other elements incorporated are respect for the sexual choice of the young people and the prevention of violence against women.

During the Save the Children UK Sub-Regional Planning Meeting in 2004, in which young people from Colombia and Peru participated alongside delegates from other Brazilian networks, dialogue took place on Black Conscience, Poverty and Discrimination. This prompted the visiting staff teams from Colombia and Peru to suggest modifications in the structure of the education of young people in the project.

In Peru, emphasis is given to optimising the conditions for the participation of young women in all spaces and reducing barriers to their access. Their partner organisation, the Instituto de Educación Sexual (IES) has achieved equity in the representation of young women in school and community groups. In Colombia, focus groups were formed for the evaluation of the second year of project activities and quality factors, including gender equality and testimonies were gathered from young people, such as the following:

*'I think that all the men and women have their own space, there is no discrimination between the sexes in the project, we are all equal. With respect to my peers, I have noticed that both the men and women are well-balanced.'*

**17-year-old girl, Colombia**

*'I have noticed a lot of respect for gender equality within the project. We all receive the same training, have the same levels of participation, and the same respect for what we think and feel.'*

**16-year-old girl, Colombia**

*'I have had the opportunity to work alongside women in multiplication work and I don't think that there is any rivalry between the genders, rather a complementarity that has made it possible to strengthen the project.'*

**17-year-old boy, Colombia**

### **Changes in the lives of children and young people**

It is not possible at this point to provide consistent and relevant data on changes in the lives of the young participants in the project. However, several surveys have been carried out during which testimonies were gathered that will be used to study the life histories of the participants in the project, as part of the evaluation process of the project which will be conducted in 2005.

*'Now I find it easier to communicate with my peers and to have conversations with adults. They consider me to be more responsible, they come to me for information and they let me participate in community spaces...'*

**17-year-old boy, Brazil**

*'I think that people listen to me, because of what is said in the evaluation guides, and they take more notice of my opinions during debates'*

**18-year-old young woman, Peru**

---

<sup>29</sup> Save the Children UK, 2004, *Global Impact Monitoring Report*

*'I have changed my way of thinking and I feel revitalized as a person. I know other spaces, I feel more responsible and I have new horizons.'*

**17-year-old girl, Brazil**

*'I am a new person. I see new spaces and new opportunities.'*

**16-year-old girl, Peru**

Although at this stage it is not possible to provide data relating to the impact of the programme work, the testimonies of young people in Brazil demonstrate a change in their perception of prevention. They also underline the need to integrate the subject of HIV/AIDS with other aspects such as poverty, discrimination, ethnicity and education, from the rights perspective.

*'Today, when the Black Awareness Day is being celebrated in Brazil, I passed through my neighbourhood on a bus. I felt sorrow because of the poverty. I felt that because I am black, young and female, I have so many reasons to feel vulnerable, but I also know that now I have the chance to help to change things, to inform other young people so that they do not acquire HIV.'*

**17-year-old girl, Brazil**

*'Stop. Nobody will keep me quiet. I represent a people and I have the right to education, the right to a dignified health system... I want to have freedom of expression... I am the voice of a people that suffers and cries, but that is happy... I am a young man, but not any young man, I am a young man in action for life.'*

**17-year-old boy, Brazil**

## HelpAge International: Inclusion of older people

### **Introduction**

This case study provides an example of how a rights-based approach has been developed to give a voice to a largely marginalised sector of society and to challenge the discrimination faced by different groups of older women and men. Help the Age International (HAI) has a focus on social inclusion and participation as key elements in its advocacy and programme work.<sup>30</sup>

### **Background to HAI**

HAI is a global network organisation with an affiliate membership structure of over 200 civil society organisations, largely based in developing countries. It has a decentralised structure working through local partners who sign up to HAI's principles, which are derived from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. HAI is committed to strengthening the capacity of its members and partners and to balancing South and North through its governance structure. Regional groupings operate with a yearly calendar of regional meetings, largely based in developing countries, which provide opportunities for members to raise issues of concern to them.

The Policy, Communications, Advocacy and Research staff are in a separate department to Programmes, called the Development Department. Strategic goals at the programme level are set at regional and country level with input from the Development Department and programme staff in the London office. These goals in turn take forward the strategic goals of the organisation, which are debated at senior management team level, with input from all HAI departments, and agreed with the wider Board.

The Development Department works with the Programmes section to make the connection between projects, programmes and processes at national level and HAI's proposed policy outcomes. The aim is to use the experience and data collected in the course of programmes for policy influence in support of older persons, as well as for programmes development. This has led, for example, to a dialogue on how HAI programmes should include issues of disability and children. There has also been discussion on how the experience at programme level can be used with donors to scale up support to older people within national poverty programmes, and the inclusion of older people in programmes to target the chronically poor. There is collaboration with country offices (and via them, partners) on, for example: programme content and focus; the management of concrete projects, such as the Older Citizens Monitoring Programme which is presented below; support for proposal development; and monitoring, development of information systems including data disaggregation, support for participatory research and the development of policy positions.

### **Mainstreaming**

Mainstreaming ageing into policies and processes is a key approach to HAI's advocacy work with governments, which includes strengthening direct dialogue and consultation

---

<sup>30</sup> The information in this case study is drawn from a number of HAI documents and publications and from interviews with Sylvia Beales and Fiona Clark, Policy, Communications and Research Section, HAI.

between governments and civil society organisations representing older people. At programme level two key strategies guide HAI's work.<sup>31</sup>

Social inclusion, which is rights-based and multi-sectoral, promotes participation and furthering existing human rights obligations as a central element, to ensure that the voices of all older people are being heard and that they participate in processes that affect them directly.

The second strategy is social protection, especially in relation to poverty reduction and the importance of supporting the poorest to access basic services and specific transfers (including cash transfers). Both of these strategies emphasise the importance of recognising difference and basing information from data disaggregated by age, gender, ethnic origin and ability. This case study provides information on how these two strategies are being implemented within HAI's programme and advocacy work.

### ***Rights-based approaches***

Human rights are central to HAI's vision and are integrated at two levels. Programmes that have been designed to take forward the UN Principles of the Human Rights of Older Persons (Care, Dignity, Inclusion, Participation, Independence); and advocacy work to promote the rights of older people as expressed in the body of human rights agreements and the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing (MIPAA), agreed in 2002.

HAI has increasingly focussed its efforts on promoting the rights of older people in a dialogue with governments and international institutions, while continuing to support the needs of vulnerable groups of old people in direct programme work. Since the signing up of governments to the MIPAA, HAI has used this as leverage to engage with governments, donors and communities to raise awareness of the issues facing older people in poverty. It has also used MIPAA to advocate for the promotion of the rights and entitlements of older people and the inclusion of issues of age in poverty reduction plans and the MDGs.

HAI has defined a ten-point action plan to end age-based discrimination.<sup>32</sup> This includes action on rights, freedom from poverty and violence, social protection, inclusion and the participation of older women and men in policy processes and programmes. HAI aims to deliver programmes that take forward the principles of non-discrimination and equality. This means focusing on the poorest and most disadvantaged, being inclusive in reach and intent, and ensuring that there is an end to discrimination on the basis of gender, race, disability and age.

The rights-based approach is demonstrated in a range of HAI's programme activities. These include direct legal challenges to abuses of rights in Africa; rights education; and sensitisation and collaborative work with governments (e.g. Tanzania) to ensure older citizens are included in the PRS processes. Programmes offer practical support to ensure that older people have the necessary documentation to access their legal entitlements. Examples of this are activities such as litigation in South Africa, Swaziland and Lesotho to challenge violations of the rights of older men and women. These activities have led

---

<sup>31</sup> HAI 'Annual Progress Report 2003-4'.

<sup>32</sup> HAI, 2001, *Equal Treatment, Equal Rights: Ten actions to end age discrimination*

to increased access by older people to their rights for state benefits such as foster care, disability and arrear pensions, grants and identity documents. In Tanzania and Ghana projects have recently started to focus on gender and property rights by addressing widowhood and inheritance issues that particularly affect women.

A good example of HAI's rights-based approach is the *Older Citizens Monitoring* project (OCM), which operates in Bangladesh, Bolivia, Ethiopia, Jamaica, Kenya and Tanzania. The stated objective of the project<sup>33</sup> is to ensure that the commitments to inclusion of disadvantaged older people made at the World Assembly on Ageing are translated into specific public policies and programmes. It aims to equip poor, older citizens with skills and data to monitor policy implementation and service delivery, and to empower them to claim their entitlements for example, to health services. Activities have included the training of older people's monitoring groups; engaging with human rights ombudsmen, local authorities and national governments; and securing entitlements to a range of policies that affect older people, but especially those related to health.

As part of the OCM programme in Bolivia, HAI co-ordinated a review of health services with the Ministry of Health and the National Ageing Programme, while at the same time supporting older women and men to claim their entitlements by supporting them to get the necessary documentation. The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper in Bolivia identified that older people are entitled to certain benefits but there are a number of barriers to obtaining these, particularly lack of information, personal documentation, language and literacy. Documentation is an important issue for older people who were born before birth registration and identity cards were introduced. Members of ethnic groups are particularly affected as they often live in isolated areas, and poverty means that they cannot afford the bus fare or the cost of the identity card. Without an identity card older citizens cannot access the benefits to which they are entitled. Older women are four times more likely than older men to lack documentation in Bolivia. The OCM project works with a separate HAI-run programme to support these identified groups to obtain the necessary documents so they can access benefits. A key indicator of the success of this project is the increased confidence of older women and men to tackle community leaders and local authorities on issues that concern them.

### ***Civil society engagement with government***

A core activity in the HAI rights-based approach has been to support the organising of older peoples' groups to be centrally involved in negotiating policy improvements. For example, this approach has been important in promoting the integration of issues of ageing into PRS processes. The approach has also promoted these issues in the design and formulation of National Plans on Ageing – a feature of HAI's regional work across Africa – and led to close collaboration with the Africa Union to produce its Policy Framework and Plan of Action on Ageing. In advocacy work at the local authority level HAI has documented notable success, including engagement of older people in the PRS processes in Tanzania, Bolivia and Uganda. This brought their partners into dialogue with municipal offices and led to increased access to health and other entitlements for marginalised older people, their dependants and wider families.

Another good example of the rights-based approach is work in Mozambique. A project called *Raising the Barriers on Ageing* works with older people in their communities to

---

<sup>33</sup> HAI, 'Annual Progress Report 2002-3'

influence leaders and policy by raising awareness of older people's rights. The focus is on vulnerability and it is the community that decides who is vulnerable (widows, HIV-positive people and orphans, for example). The work challenges the barriers that inhibit different groups of older people from exercising their rights. This project has shown concrete results from advocacy initiatives in Mozambique.<sup>34</sup> For example:

- The Ministry of Labour, National Institute of Social Security and Ministry Home Affairs have established desks to look into issues of older people.
- The National Institute of Social Action is establishing documentation programmes to reach rural older people after HAI pointed out that support was conditional on poor older people having identity cards.
- Radio Maputo linked up to old people's homes and helped 764 older people in reaching their families: 52 older people (34 women) have either spoken to their family members, been visited or received a letter during the year.

### **Gender and diversity issues**

There is recognition within HAI that ageing has a different impact on men and women's well-being and welfare throughout the life cycle, as a result of gender. HAI policy papers stress the need for development programmes to acknowledge and address the different social and economic roles of both men and women throughout their lives.

*'Gender awareness for HAI means understanding the socially and psychologically determined characteristics of older men and older women, and supporting their rights equally... Our aim is to contribute an ageing perspective to gender debates – and to mainstream a consideration of gender and ageing into wider development activities around poverty, health, violence, rights, emergencies and conflict and HIV/AIDS.'*<sup>35</sup>

HAI uses its position paper on gender and ageing as a means of checking and working on gendered issues, rather than as a specific gender policy for staff and partners to sign up to. The paper emphasises that it is important to examine how gendered experiences throughout the life cycle affect people's experiences of old age, including their status within the household. The intention is that gender issues should be addressed in all projects, and that gender analysis includes the situation of both men and women as a matter of course.

HAI has pushed for the inclusion of a gendered policy in international agreements on ageing (MIPAA) and regional agreements (the African Union Policy Framework and Plan of Action on Ageing). For example, it produced a series of briefs<sup>36</sup> discussing key issues on gender and ageing for the Second World Assembly on Ageing (Madrid, April 2002) and for the UN Commission on the Status of Women. These highlighted gender and age issues in relation to violence, poverty, HIV/AIDS as well as the participation of older women and men in development processes.

HAI programmes are not necessarily labelled as being gender focussed or women specific. However, in some projects women are the main users or beneficiaries because

<sup>34</sup> HAI 'Annual Progress Report 2002-3', and information supplied from policy staff.

<sup>35</sup> HAI, November 2000, 'Gender and Ageing Position Paper'.

<sup>36</sup> HAI, 2002, 'Gender and Ageing Briefs'.

in many societies older women are the most excluded and are less likely to have access to services and benefits. There are some projects addressing specific women's issues and empowering older women to organise and set up their own organisations. For example, as a result of the rights work in Lesotho, older women formed a group working with the Maseru Women's Association. In Bangladesh 225 older women in two project areas have formed 20 Older Women's groups and 132 older women are involved in income generation activities with small grants. In Sudan and Tanzania there are older women's projects focussed on promoting land rights and freedom from violence.<sup>37</sup>

HAI's approach to gender discrimination also targets men. It recognises that older men can be very isolated as age factors can deny them opportunities to participate in community affairs; a lifetime of gender defined roles inhibit them from becoming involved in domestic activities; and in many communities they lack the social support networks that women have built up. Addressing gender discrimination against women, also involves working with men. For example, in Tanzania programme work to address discrimination against women on the grounds of witchcraft, as well as supporting vulnerable older women, includes the training of male para-legals and work with male traditional healers.

Programme work includes addressing diversity issues, although diversity is not a specific focus. Other strands of diversity are often not profiled in the same way as gender issues. For example, in Bolivia, a country with a high proportion of indigenous peoples, HAI's programme highlights gender but not ethnicity as a strand of discrimination, although specific issues for older ethnic people have been identified and they have specific programmes working with older indigenous (Aymara) women.

Other diversity strands, such as disability, have been addressed in regular publications and work on inclusion.<sup>38</sup> The edition on ageing and disability provided the basis for a series of articles on the website to mark International Day of Disabled Persons and supported the integration of disability into programme work.

### ***Social inclusion and participation***

Although not explicitly highlighted, diversity issues are central to HAI's social inclusion approach. For example, in Tanzania considerable effort went into ensuring the revised PRS included inclusive and intergenerational strategies and outcomes for the marginalised poor. In order to ensure older peoples' voices were heard, HAI and partners conducted a three-day workshop inviting older people's representatives to discuss key issues and priorities, such as income poverty, rights, access to health services, HIV/AIDS and basic needs. HAI encouraged older people and their organisations to be involved in the district and village level consultations that were launched by the government across the country. A report was submitted to relevant government departments for consideration and HAI made specific recommendations for goals and strategies to be included in the PRS. The final PRS includes most of these recommendations. It contains specific goals and outcomes relating to both social

<sup>37</sup> HAI, 'Annual Progress Report 2002-3'.

<sup>38</sup> HAI's *Ageways*, Issue 64, January 2004, focussed on disability, and Issue 65, September 2004 focussed on mental health.

protection and social inclusion of older people and older women in particular, along with children, disabled people and people disadvantaged because of their ethnicity.

In 2004, work was undertaken to explore social inclusion and vulnerability, especially in relation to HIV/AIDS. This resulted in a number of policy publications,<sup>39</sup> reports and policy recommendations on HIV/AIDS and older people. For example, over 50 per cent of the 12 million AIDS orphans in Africa are cared for by older people, and HAI is therefore promoting support for older carers who are looking after orphans and vulnerable children. The organisation identified the discrimination and stigma older people experience in accessing support – including education, information, material support – and as a result has developed practical projects to enable it to care for dependants and protect themselves and others from the disease. Advocacy and policy work aims to ensure the inclusion of older carers' issues in national HIV/AIDS programmes, and targets older carers as agents of change in dealing with the pandemic.<sup>40</sup>

Participation is both a method and a philosophy to promote the principles of social inclusion.<sup>41</sup> The position paper on participation stresses that older people's participation is a key to sound development planning. It also recognises that participation can be challenging, that it can be conflictive and can require changing attitudes as well as practice. Internally, HAI promotes the principles of participation in the organisational culture and working practices; for example, in relation to hierarchy, gender, preferences and constraints. Participation is promoted as a means to more effective working. The network structure of the organisation can facilitate participation of partner organisations, but barriers to participation have been identified in the position paper. These include time, cost and resources. At programme level, activities include auditing older people's involvement in programme design and approval, and feeding older people's experiences into the formulation of targets and indicators.

### ***International advocacy***

HAI encourages its partners to be informed and to engage with national and international debates on poverty reduction, rights and how to incorporate older peoples issues. HAI promotes the participation of older people in national poverty debates on the MDGs. As a result of this effort there is ongoing work with UNDP to strengthen the case for age-disaggregated poverty data in the monitoring mechanisms, to assess achievement of poverty reduction and MDGs. In the current international advocacy processes and events in which HAI is involved, it stresses the importance of age disaggregated data, the inclusion of older people in the design and planning of poverty and MDG programmes, and the inclusion of cash transfer in aid programmes to target and reach the poorest.

Since 159 UN member states adopted the MIPAA, HAI has worked to raise awareness about issues facing older people in poverty and to press for action, according to the

---

<sup>39</sup> See for example, Beales, S., 2003, *Obligation and Inclusion: A look at EU development policy and practice*, HAI; and APRODEV, HAI, One World Action, WIDE, 2004, *Transforming the Mainstream*, seminar report on mainstreaming and inclusive approaches in EU development cooperation.

<sup>40</sup> HAI and HIV/AIDS Alliance, 2003, *Forgotten Families: Older people caring for orphan and vulnerable children affected by HIV/AIDS*; and HAI, 2004, *The Cost of Love: Older people in the fight against AIDS in Tanzania*.

<sup>41</sup> 'Participation and Ageing', HAI position paper, November 2000

MIPAA, with regard to the promotion of the rights and entitlements of older people. There are many examples of their advocacy activities that include a diversity perspective. For example:

- Collaboration with the Chronic Poverty Research Centre in the UK has ensured the recognition of old age as a feature of chronic poverty and led to important research collaborations in Africa, India and Bangladesh. It has also highlighted the importance of social protection in combating the conditions of the older chronically poor, and the inclusive and intergenerational policy responses that are required to ensure achievement of national and international development targets.
- Collaboration with a number of NGOs and networks in the EU and in the UK – e.g. the *Grow Up Free from Poverty Campaign*, with Save the Children, Care International, BOND, UK Aid Network and CONCORD – highlights and promotes intergenerational and rights approaches (as a means to deliver effective aid to the poorest) and action on the inclusion of the chronically poor in MDG policy and practice.
- Collaboration has taken place with DfID on work relating to human rights, exclusion and social protection; with the ILO on social protection; and with the Commission on Africa on cash transfers and social protection overall. HAI is a partner in UNDP's evolving work on poverty reduction and social exclusion linked to national MDG and PRS processes.

### ***Successes and challenges in taking forward an inclusive approach***

In HAI, the development of performance indicators is ongoing and encompasses work on monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management. For example, management tools include key performance indicators, which contain gender disaggregated data at a programme level. HAI is aware of some inconsistency in reporting processes, in part because there are separate projects, donor requirements and a range of partners with varying levels of capacity to record and store data. Furthermore, the demands on programme staff to prepare reports for donors can impact on their availability for developing indicators and measuring impact. There are some communication issues in terms of documenting lessons from programme experience. HAI works through local staff and partners, some of whom lack capacity in recording data and writing in English. Documentation is provided in the local language wherever possible, but as in all multilingual organisations the cost and time involved in organising translations of materials can be prohibitive.

The challenge of agreeing priorities and documenting learning from programme work, for both programme development and policy positioning, is an issue under discussion within the organisation, especially in relation to expanding capacity and developing information management within the international offices. Current work to monitor the impact of the OCM project and supporting the analysis of different groups of beneficiaries are examples of joint work between the policy team and programmes. Collaborative impact monitoring is one approach HAI the policy team is exploring as a way forward to document learning, especially in relation to social inclusion and protection issues.

## Minority Rights Group International: Gender and minority rights

### **Introduction**

This case study presents recent advocacy and research work undertaken by Minority Rights Group (MRG) which highlights and brings together two strands of discrimination: gender and minority rights. It also presents information on the process and experience of integrating minority issues into advocacy activities in the UN.<sup>42</sup>

### **Background to MRG**

MRG is an advocacy and research focussed organisation working with, and on behalf of, non-dominant ethnic, religious and linguistic communities. It has 130 partners in 60 countries, working together

*‘to secure the rights of ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities and indigenous peoples worldwide, and to promote cooperation and understanding between communities.’<sup>43</sup>*

MRG publishes reports, training manuals, briefing papers and workshop reports covering a broad range of issues concerning the rights of minorities and indigenous peoples. It also works with partners to run training events on international minority rights standards and advocacy techniques. MRG maintains a presence at international forums – including the UN and the EU – promoting international human rights standards, and advocating for and with minority and indigenous groups. It also organises forums where minorities and indigenous peoples can meet with decision-makers and members of majority communities in order to open constructive dialogue.

### **A rights-based framework**

MRG works within the framework of international legislation and standards and aims to influence decision-makers and communities in order to protect and promote the basic rights of indigenous and tribal peoples, migrant communities and refugees. It recognises that these groups are not homogenous – some members face further marginalisation due to age, class, disability, gender or other issues of diversity. The communities MRG works with are among the poorest and most excluded groups in society and often lack access to political power, face discrimination and human rights abuses, and have ‘development’ policies imposed upon them. MRG’s activities focus on four key approaches:

- promoting the active participation of minorities and indigenous peoples in decisions affecting their lives
- securing the implementation of international standards
- advancing conflict resolution and reconciliation initiatives
- advocating the need for the integration of minority rights into development policies.

---

<sup>42</sup> The information in the case study has been taken from MRG documents and from interviews with Katrina Payne and Angela Haynes, members of staff working on gender and diversity issues.

<sup>43</sup> Quoted on webpage: [www.minorityrights.org](http://www.minorityrights.org)

### ***Gender and diversity within MRG***

MRG has recently given a higher profile to gender issues in its advocacy work. It has a gender policy, developed by a staff working-group and agreed by the council in 1998. The policy is included in MRG's internal handbook and all new staff receive a briefing on gender as part of their induction. MRG also have a multiple discrimination policy.

There is an annual gender review meeting during which all staff look at how well gender has been incorporated into their own areas of work. There is a commitment to running staff training on gender at different levels, and two years ago the organisation ran gender training for all staff at introductory and intermediate levels. MRG is currently discussing whether to introduce diversity training into its staff development activities.

### ***Working with partners on discrimination***

MRG works with groups that have similar aims and objectives to its own, on a thematic and regional basis. It is not a donor but works together on joint advocacy and capacity building with its partners.

MRG runs an annual (global) training programme in Geneva to which it invites partners. This week-long training on minority rights is planned to coincide with practical advocacy activities as MRG also engages in the UN Working Group on Minorities during this period (which meets annually at the end of February). MRG has been able to support partners to carry out follow-up training, dissemination, publications and radio programmes, and to facilitate advocacy at a regional level. In 2003 it ran a training session on minority rights for staff of the European Commission working on human rights and democratisation. It has also run training encouraging the inclusion of minority issues in the policy and practice of development organisations.

MRG is now giving greater emphasis to sub-regional training and aims to have a good balance of participants from a gender and ethnicity perspective. At the global workshops in Geneva it is often the directors of the partner organisations who attend and the majority are men. However, it is possible that more women will attend the sub-regional workshops. In some cases, the structure of partner organisations makes it difficult to get a gender balance in their training workshops. MRG is aware that there are numerous reasons why women do not always put themselves forward for training, so it tries to take these into account in the planning of events. Workshops with partners provide an opportunity to raise gender issues for women and MRG can suggest having sessions on gender and also influence the active participation of women in the capacity building sessions. MRG is finding that gender issues are being raised more frequently by partner organisations. For example, for their next standard training course on how to use the UN system and mechanisms, partners have specifically requested that gender-based rights are included on the agenda.

### ***Advocacy and campaigning***

An example of MRG advocacy activities is its engagement with the EU. MRG was one of the organisations that presented a case study at a workshop to analyse current mainstreaming strategies and inclusive approaches in EU development. The strategy it has adopted for integrating minority rights issues into the work of the EU includes: identifying minorities; ensuring consultations with non-state actors, including minorities; examining the impact of discrimination; and supporting governments to

collect disaggregated data. It also meets with the EC and EU delegations in relation to country specific issues. For example, MRG wrote a briefing paper, in response to the Kenyan Government's Country Strategy Paper, assessing the framework from a minority rights perspective. This was presented to the EU.

The EU has a commitment to gender mainstreaming but not to mainstreaming on other areas of diversity and identity. One of the recommendations in the report of the workshop was that the EU and NGOs should work on explicit inclusion strategies to combat the 'various layers of discrimination that are prevalent in the development context.'<sup>44</sup> The report<sup>45</sup> suggested strategies to close the gap between policy commitment and effective practice. For example, basic social analyses are required at local and national level, as well as the disaggregating of data and findings by age, social difference and gender at national and international levels to avoid a 'one size fits all' approach. It also suggests that development practice should be anchored in the human rights perspective to achieve equity and equality.

A new strategy has recently been agreed within MRG to give greater focus to campaigns on an agreed set of issues. There will be five strands in the campaign:

- anti-discrimination (which will include gender and diversity issues)
- education (curriculum, the portrayal of ethnic minorities, MDGs and the education of minority girls)
- prevention of genocide and conflict
- improvement of international development for minorities
- land rights (which should include a focus on gender, particularly women's land rights, and empowerment).

### ***Gender and minority rights***

In its minority rights reports MRG tries to ensure that issues of gender and age are addressed. It always ask a gender specialist to read new reports before they are published and six months after publication it reviews the impact of reports and identifies issues for future reports or advocacy. In its recent programme activities MRG has identified minority elders and women as especially vulnerable to discrimination and therefore a focus for advocacy activities.<sup>46</sup>

In August 2004, MRG published a new report *Gender, Minorities and Indigenous Peoples*<sup>47</sup> that was launched in Geneva at the UN Committee for Elimination of Racial Discrimination. The report aims to encourage organisations working on minority rights and ethnicity to incorporate gender, and organisation focused on gender rights to incorporate ethnicity issues. The authors of the report highlight the concept of 'intersectional' discrimination, which stresses the importance of identifying the racial

---

<sup>44</sup> APRODEV, HAI, One World Action, WIDE, 2004, *Transforming the Mainstream*, seminar report on mainstreaming and inclusive approaches in EU development cooperation p.34.

<sup>45</sup> A set of detailed actions points on how the EU can strengthen its gender and inclusion policies and practices are included in *Transforming the Mainstream*, *ibid*, p.35.

<sup>46</sup> MRG published two reports on women's rights in 2003: a report of a workshop on gender rights in Albania; and Jackson D. *Twa women, Twa Rights in the Great Lakes Region of Africa*.

<sup>47</sup> Written by Fareda Banda and Christine Chinkin.

elements of gender discrimination as well as the gender elements of race discrimination. Failing to recognise how different discriminations intersect could make women vulnerable to further discrimination. The report stresses that effective advocacy requires an understanding of the interrelation between different forms of discrimination:

*'If this is not recognized minority or indigenous women are rendered invisible in official strategies to combat gender equality and minority or indigenous women are rendered invisible in official policies to tackle racial/ethnic discrimination.'* (p.11)

The report<sup>48</sup> highlights that the intersection of gender and other bases of disadvantage can be a barrier to justice. It also stresses the importance of disaggregating and differentiating between 'minorities', as the term is used for a range of different peoples and circumstances, which generally come under one category. For example, minorities can be self-identified groups on the basis of ethnic origins or traditions, or a range of peoples from different countries who become minorities through migration, conflict and in response to globalisation, who are not always identifiable because of their ethnic or cultural origins.

There is no UN treaty specifically on minority rights. The observance of these rights are monitored by the Committee on the Elimination of Race Discrimination and a UN Working Group on Minorities, which was set up by the Commission on Human Rights to promote the UN Declaration on Minorities. The report notes that the international legal instruments relevant to minorities and indigenous rights generally use gender-neutral terms and are based on an assumption that the same protection is automatically provided for men and women. However, a gender focus might bring out customary or religious practices that discriminate against groups of women and girls and that do not affect men. Equally in CEDAW there is no separate reference to the particular discrimination faced by minorities or indigenous women because of their identity. Each of the separate UN Committees has developed comments and recommendations on specific provisions of their Convention to address these omissions.

More recently, the declaration from the World Conference against Racism (2001) recognises that victims of discrimination can suffer multiple or aggravated forms of discrimination. The Beijing Platform for Action, published in 1995 and reaffirmed in 2000, recognises that not all women are the same, and explicitly states that:

*'many women face additional barriers to the enjoyment of their human rights because of such factors as their race, language, ethnicity, culture, religion, disability or socio-economic class or because they are migrants, displaced people or refugees'.*<sup>49</sup>

The Beijing Platform for Action also includes a separate critical area of concern in relation to the girl child.

Traditionally, human rights law is more male dominated. MRG is therefore trying to break new ground on specific issues in its Legal Cases Programme, for example on land rights. The MRG report highlights that the international human rights regime is

<sup>48</sup> Ibid. p.8

<sup>49</sup> UN, 1996, *Beijing Platform for Action*, paragraph 226, p.125

beginning to recognise the incidence of multiple discrimination and how these can operate independently ‘but intersect and reinforce each other with cumulative adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights’.<sup>50</sup>

The report will be used for advocacy activities in 2005, for example during the UN review of the Beijing Platform for Action (‘Beijing +10’) and other activities. The findings of the report were presented at a special workshop for members of the UN Committee on Elimination of Discrimination Against Women in January 2005. During the workshop, the authors of the report made some important points on the intersection of discrimination for minority and indigenous women. Such women are discriminated against two fold due to their status as members of a minority and as women (for example in relation to inheritance laws). Minority women who claim their rights are open to accusations from their communities that they are rejecting their culture and want assimilation into the majority group. The majority group views those women, who do not actively accept the majority view, as oppressed. There is no recognition that women may wish to both improve their rights and defend their culture. For this reason promoting non-discrimination without addressing gender is not an appropriate model, especially regarding reproductive rights that might require different approaches. Women have multiple (or intersecting) identities and these must be taken into account in order to ensure the rights of minority and indigenous women.

The workshop with the CEDAW Committee showed the potential for discussing discrimination against indigenous minority women at the highest level. The authors of the MRG report and representatives of minority women’s organisations were able to raise a range of concerns with Committee members. For example, a representative of a women’s organisation in Kenya raised the issue of marginalisation of minority and indigenous women within mainstream development efforts, particularly education, access to land and land rights. The representative from Thailand outlined the barriers to citizenship and how this negatively affects all aspects of minority women’s lives. Many minority and indigenous women face gender-specific difficulties in applying for Thai citizenship, without which they face numerous problems. Citizenship for all minorities and indigenous people is very important in guaranteeing their rights. Given the particular problems facing minority and indigenous women, citizenship is an especially pressing issue. There are also important issues raised for minority groups in Europe: for example, the dilemma for Roma women in Europe of preserving their identity and ensuring the participation in the majority society; and the issue of the veil in France, given the recent change in legislation.

A representative at the workshop highlighted the difficulty of conveying the concept of gender and gendered approaches within indigenous communities. She explained that lack of knowledge about and access to CEDAW is a significant barrier to indigenous and minority women’s use of human rights instruments. It was necessary for the Committee to improve dissemination of information about and documents produced by CEDAW in more languages. The workshop provided an opportunity for members of CEDAW to ask the opinion of the panel on the best methodology for examining state reports, and on the types of questions (with regard to gender and minorities) to ask delegations when they appear before the Committee. It was suggested that the Committee’s General Comment 25 could be used as a framework as it highlights that

---

<sup>50</sup> Banda F. and Chinkin C., 2004, *Gender, Minorities and Indigenous People*, p.11.

states may need to take temporary special measures to eliminate the negative effects of multiple forms of discrimination. Another improvement would be for the Committee to hold longer sessions, allowing more time to be spent with the delegations in order to ensure that all questions and relevant issues are raised.

The report has already been translated into eight languages by partner organisations. South-east European countries (e.g. Bulgaria and Romania) have shown a particular interest on this issue. It has generated a lot of enthusiasm within MRG which is now discussing next steps with partner organisations. For example, it is planning to work with partners on shadow CEDAW reports, as these arise (signatories to the Convention report on progress to the Committee every four years). MRG is trying to bring the UN process closer to partners by engaging them with their own governments and the commitments they have entered into by signing CEDAW.

## Single Parent Action Network: Diversity and participation course<sup>51</sup>

### **Background**

Single Parent Action Network (SPAN) UK is a broad umbrella organisation seeking to represent the diversity of one parent families across England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Membership includes small self-help groups, individual single parents, large charitable organisations and all kinds of one parent family support groups. Members may be divorced, separated, never married, heterosexual, gay, lesbian and from many different backgrounds and cultures. SPAN UK is run by a National Co-ordinating Committee of volunteer single parents who represent self-help groups across the UK.

SPAN aims to give a voice to one parent families living in poverty and isolation and to empower them to take control of their lives. It supports the setting up and development of single parent self-help groups. It also works with a range of anti-poverty partnerships, including those with Oxfam UK and the UK Coalition Against Poverty, to raise awareness of poverty, improve childcare and campaign on issues that affect the lives of one parent families.

The focus of this case study is a recent SPAN initiative: a diversity and participation course offered to SPAN members. One of the reasons for including this example among our case studies is to provoke discussion on the strategic importance within a broader diversity approach of *strengthening diversity and participation within community groups themselves*. For example, how far would development interventions aimed at encouraging community-based organisations to both reflect on their own diversity (or absence thereof) and develop more inclusive approaches within their organisations serve as an effective entry point for addressing gender and diversity? In many contexts, participatory approaches are used to ensure that projects managed by international development agencies are as inclusive as possible of different groups within a community. But few appear to address head on issues of diversity within community-based organisations themselves. This is one of the strengths of the SPAN course.

### **SPAN's approach to diversity**

As noted above, the purpose of SPAN is to represent the diversity of one parent families, and there is a conscious effort to seek out and support single parents from the most marginalised and disadvantaged communities in the UK. This includes initiatives targeting single parents in isolated rural areas, deprived urban settings, in black and minority ethnic communities, as well as refugee and asylum seekers. Regarding the latter group, there is awareness in SPAN's work of the need to identify and address the specific ways in which women refugees and asylum seekers, and their children, are vulnerable to discrimination because of their status (with regard to shelter, the one-year

---

<sup>51</sup> We are grateful to Sue Cohen, SPAN Coordinator and Shannon Smith, SPAN Network Development Officer, for the information they provided and for comments on earlier drafts.

marriage rule,<sup>52</sup> poor diet, work in the grey economy, language diversity, lack of financial independence).<sup>53</sup>

Concerns about being inclusive are also evident in SPAN's governance structure. Currently, the National Co-ordinating Committee has six places reserved for black members and six for white members with the aim of ensuring 'that equality and diversity are deeply embedded in SPAN's structural decision-making processes'.<sup>54</sup> Discussions revealed that there is awareness within SPAN of the need to widen out diversity of decision-making processes and staffing to reflect, for example, the participation of disabled people as well as single fathers, whose specific needs have often remained invisible to policy makers.

### ***Diversity and participation course***

The diversity and participation course seeks to explore commonalities and differences among diverse single parents; challenge stereotypes; and explore individuals' understanding of their own diversity and that of other cultures and ethnic groups within their local communities. At the same time, it seeks to *translate thinking about diversity into practice*. It does this by working with participants to support awareness of how diversity benefits their groups and to develop strategies and skills to widen participation of other single parents living in their local communities. The rationale behind the training is a strong belief that addressing diversity is a key factor in the sustainability of self-help groups.

It should be noted that SPAN's diversity and participation course has only recently completed the pilot stage. There has been no formal assessment of the pilot sessions, but perceptions of the course's success can be measured in the decision to launch the course as part of the programme of SPAN's Model Action Study Centre in Bristol. In addition to training focused on personal development and raising self-esteem, SPAN offers (on-line or long-distance) courses to single parents on Managing Your Self Help Group, and Making Changes. The latter is designed to develop the skills and understanding to influence decision-makers in local communities. As discussed in more detail below, the diversity and participation course will be evaluated through the Diversity and Participation Research Project. One of the aims of the project is to assess the impact of the SPAN course on changing social attitudes of participants and empowering new actions and interventions to promote social cohesion.

The content of the SPAN course is in some ways similar to other training sessions on equality and diversity offered to staff by many organisations, including development NGOs. However, the way the course is designed (change at the individual level as well as at the group level) and the target of the course (members of community-level self-help groups) sets this type of training apart from that commonly offered to professionals, who then support communities through delivery of services or development programmes.

---

<sup>52</sup> This applies to women who have married a British citizen. Women must stay in the marriage for one year, even if they are facing domestic violence, etc. If they leave before this period they become illegal immigrants, and may be deported.

<sup>53</sup> *Spangle*, No.13, November 2004.

<sup>54</sup> *SPAN UK Information Sheet*, n.d.

**Planning the training course**

Considerable emphasis was placed on planning the training, particularly on logistical support. It was felt that the participatory aspect needed to be built into the course to ensure ownership from the very start. This involved initial meetings with each group to assess what needed to happen to enable members to participate freely and to pre-empt any concerns that might impact on their learning experiences. In addition to putting in place support for, or covering, the costs of childcare, transport and subsistence, the initial needs assessment provided opportunities for influencing on the content of the course.

**Content of the training course**

The course explores cultural, religious and ethnic diversity within the group of lone parents, looking at historical and new migration to the UK, and the impact on the cultural and ethnic diversity of the communities in which participants live. The course is made up of five modules: single parenthood in society (shared identity/differences); majority and minority culture; stereotypes; cultural values; and diversity in multi-cultural SPAN. The specific content of each training offered so far was designed according to the needs and concerns identified by each group.

Overall, the course is informed by approaches to adult learning as well as methods for supporting change in attitudes and behaviours at the individual level. While some of the exercises and approaches are similar to those found in equality and diversity training – particularly those for exploring stereotypes, discrimination and inequality – the course goes beyond a focus on change at the individual level to look at implications for the group. Participants discuss the impact of migration and cultural and ethnic diversity on their local communities and what groups can do to break down barriers, challenge racism and stereotypes and increase community cohesion.

Some of the exercises are designed to support the participants to examine their single parent groups, and to identify the issues they need to work on to widen participation. For example, exercises for thinking about the identity of the group are designed to address questions such as ‘what do we look like as a group’ and ‘what would we do if someone different came along?’. Such exercises are supplemented by a *Tool Kit on Practical Ways to Help with Diversity and Participation*. These tools are targeted at the self-help groups and include the following strategies: developing an equal opportunities policy; organising exchanges with diverse groups in the community; holding diversity events and activities, such as ‘world cuisine’ days; producing information packs for the self-help groups about diversity in the local community. Discussions and exercises also address issues related to marketing and communication strategies of the single parent groups, and how these could be strengthened to promote diversity and inclusion (e.g. identifying and reaching key target groups; disability access; providing materials in different media and languages; providing crèches; timing of meetings).

The pilot sessions were facilitated by a trainer from SPAN but the longer-term vision is for peer training – seen to be a key factor in ensuring the sustainability of the training programme. There has also been discussion of possibilities for providing diversity and participation training to anyone who has a remit for working with single parents (e.g. health and education services, social services, further education colleges, other voluntary groups). The aim is to help members of these communities overcome

stereotypes about single parents and to understand that different groups of single parents may have specific issues that need to be addressed in addition to their common experience of potential/actual poverty and discrimination as lone parents.

### ***Pilots in the four nations***

Throughout 2004 there were four pilot sessions carried out in each of the four nations (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales). The courses were usually held over two days and involved about ten participants. The training in Scotland brought together three lone parent groups from the region: The Glasgow group (Umoja), supporting African lone parent women asylum seekers and refugees; and groups from Falkirk (Parents Alone Lending Support) and Edinburgh (One Parent Families Scotland), comprising mainly white single parent women. An effort had been made to involve a group of single fathers but this did not materialise. In Northern Ireland, the training involved one self-help group of white, Catholic women. The Wales group was made up of white single parent women. The Bristol and South West training involved two groups that included white, black and Asian women.

Anecdotal feedback from the training suggested that participants wanted to learn more about each other and to understand how much they had in common as single parents, and/or how the issues and challenges they faced differed depending on their specific identities. Clearly, the exploration of identity considered not only issues related to minority culture and ethnic identity but other differences, as well (e.g. socio-economic status, geographical location, period of residence in UK, number of children, age of children, age of parent, gender, etc.). Such exploration also considered the impact of these differences on experiences and needs of single parents. The training with the self-help groups was described by SPAN as ‘the beginning of encouraging wider participation in their communities and with each other and learning about other single parent cultures’.<sup>55</sup> To give one example, white single parents living in poverty in St. Mellons (a very deprived area of Cardiff) and who had little or no experience of visible black and ethnic minorities, were able to explore their own assumptions, particularly around Somalian people. As a result of the course, members of the St. Mellons group visited Beat Route, a group supporting black women in Bute Town, an inner city area that they had previously been afraid of visiting. These two groups are now developing a Link-Up Network, drawing in other local projects as well as undertaking joint work on domestic violence.<sup>56</sup>

The above example illustrates an important point about the focus of the diversity and participation course. The course aims to support participants in exploring diversity and discrimination from the basis of a common oppression which unites them – single parenthood – while at the same time enabling marginalised people to relate to the diverse oppression experienced by other individuals and groups. Through challenging attitudes and stereotypes about other groups, participants are not only able to better understand their shared interests as lone parents but also to develop shared actions, such as those described above. In addition to working together to challenge the disadvantage/discrimination as lone parents, these shared actions can also promote social inclusion and community cohesion.

---

<sup>55</sup> *Spangle*, No.12, July 2004.

<sup>56</sup> This example is cited in the proposal for the SPAN UK Diversity and Participation Project, very kindly shared by the SPAN UK Co-ordinator.

***Diversity and Participation Research Project***

SPAN UK is currently seeking funding for a Diversity and Participation Research Project that has been developed as a result of piloting the diversity and participation course.<sup>57</sup> One of the aims is to see whether, and in what ways, participation on the course changes social attitudes and stereotypes about other groups and empowers new activities and actions by lone parent groups that further social interaction, inclusion and cohesion. The methodology of the research will be qualitative, with the central aim to record the ‘natural discourses’ of the course participants in order to determine whether the course inputs and processes have altered this discourse. The research will evaluate the courses as ‘social interventions’ which may ‘interrupt the discourses of racism’, and will monitor the possibilities of new actions and shared projects.

Specifically, the research will centre on investigating and comparing the experiences, perspectives and strategies of new migrant and long-term resident one parent families with regard to community involvement, immigration and diversity. The project will explore the extent to which any new community activities and networks, developed as a result of the course, can make settlement of new migrant one parent families a more positive experience – for both new migrant and long-term resident families in the UK. The findings will inform the development of more effective, appropriate actions, policy and practice with regard, in particular, to the settlement of new migrants and, more broadly, to the national policy agendas on social inclusion.

---

<sup>57</sup> The information in this section is from the SPAN UK Diversity and Participation Research Project proposal.

## What are the lessons from gender mainstreaming for disability mainstreaming?

### **Introduction**

This case study draws on a recent piece of work reflecting on lessons from gender mainstreaming that are of relevance for disability mainstreaming.<sup>58</sup> The exercise formed one part of a research component on ‘mainstreaming disability in development’ being carried out by ODG/DEV<sup>59</sup>, University of East Anglia, for the DfID-funded, Disability Knowledge and Research (KaR) Project. Although the entry point was a focus on disability mainstreaming, there may be issues raised of interest to other areas of diversity as well.

The ODG/DEV paper took as its starting point the assumption that calls for the ‘mainstreaming of disability’ in development are based, if only implicitly, on perceptions about the experience of gender mainstreaming. The paper explores recent recommendations that have been made for mainstreaming disability and compares these recommendations with what is currently seen to be ‘good practice’ on gender mainstreaming.

There is no official definition of ‘disability mainstreaming’ to compare with that on gender mainstreaming put forward by the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and widely used in the development community:

*‘Mainstreaming a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies and 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.’<sup>60</sup>*

In reading the above, the observation was made that one could easily replace ‘gender’ with ‘disability’ and ‘men and women’ with ‘disabled people’. For the purposes of the paper, the ECOSOC definition was seen as equally pertinent to mainstreaming concerns and experiences of disabled people. With this in mind, the paper explored approaches that have been part of the gender mainstreaming ‘repertoire’. Drawing on the experience of gender mainstreaming, the paper pulls out lessons that are likely to be of particular relevance for developing a coherent strategy for disability mainstreaming across a development organisation. These lessons are presented in the section below while the final section widens out the discussion to reflect on mainstreaming single-strand issues in developing policy and practice, in general.

<sup>58</sup> Miller, C. and Albert, B., 2005, ‘Mainstreaming Disability in Development: Lessons from gender mainstreaming’, draft version, Disability KaR Programme, ODG/DEV, January

<sup>59</sup> Overseas Development Group/School for Development Studies.

<sup>60</sup> ECOSOC, 1997, *Gender Mainstreaming in the United Nations System*, E.1997.L.10. Para.4, Adopted by ECOSOC July 1997, UN, New York.

### ***Some lessons from gender mainstreaming***

This section provides a schematic outline of the main lessons for disability mainstreaming that can be drawn from the experience of gender mainstreaming.

#### ***Lesson 1: the need for a clear mandate and implementation strategy on disability and development***

For many development organisations, statements of commitment to disability equality are rarely backed up by an institutional policy or a clear mandate on disability. Where such policies do exist, they often remain trapped on paper. The disability mainstreaming paper explores the similar challenges that have been experienced by gender advocates and signals the importance now attached to the development of a gender policy (which makes the connections between gender equality/women's rights and the organisation's development objectives), backed up by a time-bound implementation strategy with measurable targets and outcomes.

#### ***Lesson 2: robust institutional structures to promote a disability equality agenda***

One of the principles underpinning gender mainstreaming is the notion that gender is 'everybody's responsibility'. However, one of the main lessons from gender mainstreaming so far is that unless there are dedicated structures, staff and resources, there is a danger that 'no one takes responsibility'. There is greater awareness of the need for both mechanisms to integrate gender throughout an organisation and for specialist units/staff to promote attention to gender. In fact, the experience of gender mainstreaming suggests that gender tends to 'get lost' unless there are dedicated staff members with responsibility for ensuring that gender issues are addressed, backed up by a clear policy on gender equality and an implementation strategy with time-bound targets.

At the same time, the assumption that mainstreaming does away with the need for targeted interventions to address gender inequality has been challenged. It is now acknowledged that mainstreaming requires a twin-tracked approach: that is, efforts to integrate gender concerns across all programmes/sectors as well as the need for specific gender-focused initiatives. While some development organisations have recognised the need to take a twin-tracked approach to disability mainstreaming, few have developed institutional structures or appointed dedicated staff to work on disability equality issues, though there are some isolated examples.

#### ***Lesson 3: an organisational culture that is supportive of disability equality and staff that have the skills needed to mainstream disability***

Over the past decade, there has been considerable emphasis on the inter-relationship between internal organisational values, policies and practices, and the effectiveness of external programmatic interventions in support of gender equality – or 'walking the talk' as it is often called. The extent to which gender equality is understood and accepted as a core value of an organisation is seen to be a key factor in implementing change more widely. Much effort has gone into identifying strategies that support organisational change (gender equitable human resources policies and practices, performance management systems, gender sensitisation training) as part of the overall approach to gender mainstreaming.

The disability mainstreaming paper considers whether similar strategies are required

from a disability perspective, particularly in relation to understandings of the social model of disability – which if anything is more complex than the concept of gender. Specifically, the paper raises questions about what might be needed in terms of disability equality training, building on lessons from gender training – for example the move away from a ‘one size fits all’ approach to much more targeted initiatives around specific areas (e.g. attitude and behaviour change, technical skills, sector-specific training, advocacy skills, etc.).

***Lesson 4: the need for policy relevant research and information***

One of the goals of feminist advocacy targeting development institutions over the past three decades has been to make women visible to policy makers through promoting rigorous analysis and research on women/gender and development. Central here has been the process of identifying appropriate entry points from international, national, sectoral or organisational policy commitments to gender, to generate new research findings or analyses of sex disaggregated data. Sex-disaggregated data and gender analysis are central to a gender mainstreaming strategy.

It is acknowledged that current information and research on disability and development is inadequate. One of the main objectives of the wider KaR research on mainstreaming disability is to develop data and analysis of the links between disability and poverty. In particular the research will explore how to collect disability-disaggregated data and what disability analysis might entail. While research and statistics are important, the disability mainstreaming paper argues they are only one part of an overall mainstreaming strategy. Research reports and data are likely to remain on the shelf unless there is a clear mandate for that information to be used and there are people with the responsibility for pushing the disability agenda.

***Lesson 5: practical, relevant guidelines and tools to mainstream disability***

While the call for more guidelines and tools has sometimes been an excuse for inaction, some good practice has emerged from the experience of gender mainstreaming. One lesson is that there are different tools for different jobs. Over the past decade, for example, there has been an explosion of sector-specific gender guidelines, as well as tools for gender and participation, for gender-sensitive programme cycle management, for monitoring and evaluation, and for gender audits of an organisation. There is greater recognition that guidelines and tools are more likely to be used if they are not overly complex and are developed in a collaborative manner with those who will use them.

The paper did not explore in any detail the few existing guidelines and tools for mainstreaming disability (e.g. checklists on inclusion in programming), though it is possible to observe that in general they are not that dissimilar from those available for gender. How far other gender guidelines and tools might be developed and adapted to address disability issues was beyond the scope of the paper, though certainly worth exploring further. Of course, this would involve pinpointing the common experience of discrimination and areas of divergence. With regard to the latter, one of the key areas of difference identified in the paper was the issue of physical and communicative access, which is not addressed adequately by gender analytical frameworks, guidelines and tools.

***Lesson 6: involving disabled people and disabled people's organisations at all levels***

The experience of gender mainstreaming suggests that it is important to be clear about the purpose of participation, consultation or inclusion. Counting the numbers of a marginalised group who have been consulted or involved in development interventions is an important starting point, but cannot substitute for concrete actions to address the priorities and needs they identify. The disability mainstreaming paper also considers the importance of not assuming that disabled people are a homogeneous group – one of the criticisms that has been levelled at the way gender mainstreaming has been implemented. Like women, disabled people are a heterogeneous group, not only in terms of having different impairments, but also across the range of identities (gender, age, race, class, income, education, religion, location, etc.). It is crucial that different voices are heard and that no section of the disability community is marginalised within that community. The paper raises the question of the usefulness of intersectional analysis to address the multiple identities of disabled people.

The paper also explores the concept of ‘bottom-up mainstreaming’ guided and supported by initiatives at the centre.

*‘Such an approach is likely to be successful because it utilises the strengths and experience of NGOs and CSOs, thus ensuring that interventions are culturally and contextually relevant and sustainable because they build local capacity’.*<sup>61</sup>

***Lesson 7: the need for ‘upstreaming’ disability issues in response to new aid modalities***

The overall shift in official development aid towards non-project assistance in the form of sector-wide approaches or other forms of direct budgetary support to national governments connected to Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers has raised new challenges for mainstreaming. The shift to non-project development assistance increases the importance of effective policy dialogue between donors and partner governments, particularly about cross-cutting issues such as gender. Thus far, however, gender issues have tended to be sidelined in the new aid paradigm.

Current responses to the apparent failures of gender mainstreaming suggest a number of points which are relevant for those concerned with disability. For example, in the case of both the EU and DfID, emphasis has been placed on the need for better institutionalisation of gender (e.g. policy/strategy, structures, staffing, training, shared learning) for effective gender mainstreaming into key development policy instruments and processes. Strategies to strengthen civil society groups in pushing for policy change are also crucial, and support to gender budgeting processes is given as a good practice example in this area.

***Lesson 8: the need for appropriate tools for monitoring progress and outcomes***

While gender mainstreaming strategies have called for effective monitoring tools, in general insufficient attention has been paid to monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. Nonetheless, some ‘good practice’ has been identified. One is the

---

<sup>61</sup> See Thomas, P., 2004, *DFID and Disability: A Mapping of the Department for International Development and Development and Disability Issues*, June, p.8.

importance of distinguishing between the process and outcomes, and of developing appropriate indicators for each. For example, under pressure to show results, indicators used to measure progress in gender mainstreaming have often placed too much emphasis on the institutional structures and practices put in place to support mainstreaming (e.g. gender policies, gender staff, number of tools and guidelines, demand for sex-disaggregated data and gender analytical information, etc.). The former are important, as indicators that gender issues are being taken seriously. But there is a danger that the means get confused with the ends – that we lose sight of ‘the prize’. It is important, therefore, to be specific about what success will look like in the longer term and develop appropriate tools and indicators to capture measurable changes in people’s lives.

The paper notes that the most promising approaches to monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment emerging in recent years are those that rely heavily on participatory methodologies. These have been important for identifying indicators of change, in women’s agency and power, that would not have been identified by development planners on their own. Despite calls for participatory evaluation of disability projects and in mainstream government policies, it is not clear whether this is happening in practice, and the paper suggests that disability equality advocates need to be included in wider discussions about monitoring and evaluation and impact assessment.

In the disability mainstreaming paper, there is a much more detailed discussion around each theme, the aim of which is to highlight some of the challenges gender advocates have faced and to identify emerging ‘good practice’ for each area. The paper uses this analysis to strengthen existing recommendations on disability mainstreaming (with specific emphasis on DfID)<sup>62</sup> by building on the experience of gender mainstreaming.

### ***Mainstreaming – a common strategy for inclusion?***

From the above it should be clear that the lessons for mainstreaming disability are primarily about strategies for making disabled people more visible to policy makers and planners at all levels and across all sectors. There are likely to be parallels with other single-strand issues.

One of the challenges for development organisations, of course, is that efforts to mainstream single-strand issues are mainly happening in parallel with each other. This raises a number of practical challenges for such organisations if they are to address evenly all single-strand issues. There has already been some concern about ‘policy overload’ with regard to calls for specific policies on each single-strand issue (e.g. gender, race and ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation). No doubt similar reservations will be raised with regard to staffing, training, the development of tools and guidelines and so on, for all issues of difference. In this regard, it was noted in the [GAD Network Think Piece](#) that some organisations have recognised the symbolic importance that separate policies can have for different groups and have therefore drafted disability policies, in addition to those on gender equality. The Greater London Authority, for example, has developed a series of separate equality schemes to reflect diverse groups

---

<sup>62</sup> The irony was not lost on the authors of the report that a similar and much more in-depth study was happening contemporaneously on the experience of mainstreaming gender in DfID’s work, nor that the conclusions of previous evaluations (including that by the GAD Network) have indicated weak institutionalisation of gender in DfID.

of the population (women; disabled people; black people and people from minority ethnic communities; older people; young people and children; lesbians; gay men and bisexuals; trans people; and people of different faith groups).

At the same time, some organisations have begun to talk about ‘diversity mainstreaming’ or ‘mainstreaming of excluded groups’. They have also been thinking about ways to address single-strand issues in a more unified way by grouping them together under the umbrella of diversity and/or through a social inclusion approach (see overview to this paper, as well as GAD Network Think Piece). The report on a recent workshop on mainstreaming and inclusive approaches in EU development policy argues that issues and sectors have been too compartmentalised and that there is a need to look for common interests and identify links between gender and other cross-cutting issues.<sup>63</sup> The exploration of trade issues, for example, elicited the observation that ‘we are all in the same boat’ and that there was a need to focus on collective work for more impact.

It was also noted that ‘the EU Lisbon summit in 2000 decided, at EU level, not to work with target groups but rather to take a wider approach to social inclusion and non-discrimination that “de facto” mainstreamed all groups’. As the report makes clear where groups are not yet recognised or visible – the example given is older people – such an approach is unlikely to have a positive impact on enhancing their visibility, in the absence of specific inclusion strategies for older people. A similar observation has been made with regard to DfID’s work on social inclusion. A recent mapping study on disability in DfID illustrated that disability issues remained largely invisible and pointed to the need for a concerted effort to explore the relationship and relevance of disability issues in the context of social inclusion, human rights and the MDGs.<sup>64</sup> Another recent study on social inclusion prepared for DfID pointed to the importance of clarifying the relationship between a social exclusion framework and DfID’s rights-based approach and gender mainstreaming.<sup>65</sup>

All of the above brings to the fore the apparent tension between moves towards more holistic approaches within development thinking and practice (e.g. rights-based approaches, social inclusion) and efforts to ensure that single-strand areas (e.g. gender, disability, age, ethnicity) receive adequate attention. In theory, these approaches should be mutually inclusive. In practice, however, it is not so easy to keep single-strand issues in focus when more holistic approaches are adopted. Nor has there been sufficient analysis of what is common or what differentiates the experience of discrimination or social exclusion for each group.<sup>66</sup> The GAD Network Think Piece indicates that, while recognising some of the advantages, gender advocates have reservations about the implications that an ‘umbrella’ diversity approach or diversity mainstreaming would have for keeping gender issues in focus. Similar reservations are made regarding disability in the disability mainstreaming paper. Indeed, as long as marginalised and excluded people are invisible to policy makers, making them visible through targeted mainstreaming strategies like those described above are likely remain a key priority. This is a particular challenge in the context of current aid modalities where it appears

---

<sup>63</sup> APRODEV, HAI, One World Action, WIDE, 2004, *Transforming the Mainstream*, p.7.

<sup>64</sup> Thomas, P., 2004, *DFID and Disability: A Mapping of the Department for International Development and Disability Issues*, June. Disability Issues in DFID,

<sup>65</sup> Beall, J. and Piron, L.H., 2004, *DFID Social Exclusion Review*, LSE and ODI.

<sup>66</sup> The paper by Beall and Piron provides an important starting point for thinking through some of these issues.

even more difficult to keep specific target groups in focus or to produce disaggregated data (e.g. by gender, ethnicity, disability, age, etc).

It is also worth pointing out that ten years after gender mainstreaming was adopted at the Beijing Conference as an official global strategy for promoting gender equality there are still uncertainties about its effectiveness. As noted above, there are ongoing concerns that mainstreaming has been interpreted and implemented in a way that renders women, or any other group for that matter, invisible. For some gender activists, gender mainstreaming has been reduced to a de-politicised, technocratic exercise of integrating gender (through checklists and guidelines) into existing agendas and already formulated policies, with little or no impact on transforming mainstream policies – despite evidence that these policies may have adverse impacts on women’s equality. There are also significant questions raised about how far there has been any measurable improvement in women’s lives as a result of gender mainstreaming strategies. On this front, mainstreaming advocates are being increasingly challenged to establish the links between gender-related interventions and impacts (e.g. changes in gender roles or control of resources).<sup>67</sup>

While expectations have outstripped achievements, activists, researchers and practitioners nevertheless continue to promote gender mainstreaming as a strategy for achieving gender equality. This recent statement from the Director of the UN Division for the Advancement of Women captures some of the reasons behind the continued commitment to gender mainstreaming:

*‘Like any other strategy, gender mainstreaming can only be as good as the efforts made to implement it. There is clearly a need to invest greater resources to ensure enhanced understanding of the strategy and the ways in which it should be implemented. A lot of what is today called gender mainstreaming – and is criticised for failing to achieve the intended goals – is in reality not gender mainstreaming. It is important to be clear about what gender mainstreaming involves – particularly awareness that any process which makes gender perspectives invisible is not gender mainstreaming.’<sup>68</sup>*

The ongoing assessment of the gender mainstreaming strategy formed part of the review and appraisal of the implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action, which took place in March 2005 at the forty-ninth session of the Commission on the Status of Women.<sup>69</sup> The conclusions will no doubt be of great interest to all those involved in the struggle of making real people visible to policy makers.

---

<sup>67</sup> See discussion of the problem of the ‘missing middle’ described in DAC Review, Hunt, J and Brouwers, R, 2003, *Gender and Evaluation*, and Watkins, F., 2004, *DfID’s Experience of Gender Mainstreaming: 1995 to 2004*, Evaluation of DFID Development Assistance: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment.

<sup>68</sup> Hannon, C., 2004, ‘Gender mainstreaming: A key strategy for promoting gender equality at the national level’, presentation by Director of Division for Advancement of Women, at panel on ‘Moving Beijing Forward: Strategies and approaches for creating an enabling environment’, at UN-ESCAP High-level Intergovernmental Meeting, 7-10 September 2004. Available at: [www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/news/speech2004/CH-ESCAPpanelSep.pdf](http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/news/speech2004/CH-ESCAPpanelSep.pdf)

<sup>69</sup> Information on gender mainstreaming will be part of the national government reports as well as shadow reports prepared by NGOs.