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Executive Summary

Key Recommendations:

1. Integrate the expected outcomes, results and indicators for Priority Gender Equality into the 37 C/4 and the 37 C/5 documents and fully align the GEAP with these two documents. Demonstrate the link between Priority Gender Equality and Priority Africa.

2. Clearly identify each sector’s niche and flagship with regards to gender-specific programming.

3. Establish a coherent set of measures to strengthen gender mainstreaming in policies and programmes. This should include a mapping and better use of available expertise in sectors, a capacity-building plan for staff, an accountability mechanism, and tracking of financial resources spent on Priority Gender Equality.

4. Strengthen and better utilize the capacities of the Gender Focal Point (GFP) Network to help integrate Gender Equality in the work of sectors, with ODG/GE acting in an advisory and support function. Integrate existing gender expertise (degree level and extensive working experience) from the sectors in the GFP Network. Make sure that GFPs’ additional responsibilities are considered integral parts of their respective jobs and not additional tasks.

5. Develop a coherent set of relevant, specific and measurable indicators (at all results levels) for sectors’ contributions to Priority Gender Equality.

6. Integrate the competencies and capacities of UNESCO’s larger network (Chairs, National Commissions, Clubs etc.) and partners in the Organization’s overall efforts to implement Priority Gender Equality.

Introduction

The Executive Board, at its 190th session, called for an Evaluation of Priority Gender Equality and decided “to await the results of the forthcoming evaluation of Gender Equality, which will determine the operational strategy for the medium-term period” (see 190 EX/decisions Prov, page 29). In response to this request, and taking limited budgetary resources into account, IOS initiated the following two activities:

- A Participatory Gender Audit (PGA), which is a “social audit” of priority Gender Equality. The PGA was conducted by a team of four facilitators from the International Labour Organization (ILO), who worked on the exercise from November 2012 to February 2013 and spent two weeks at UNESCO HQ. This was of no cost to the Organization.

- A Review of Priority Gender Equality. This exercise was conducted by IOS in cooperation with an external consultant. It reflects the findings of earlier IOS evaluations where the implementation of UNESCO’s Priority Gender Equality was addressed. IOS mobilized extrabudgetary funds to cover related costs. The report will be circulated to Gender Equality experts, including representatives from Academia.

The present summary draws on these initiatives. However it does not necessarily mirror the findings and recommendations of the ILO PGA, which at times differ from this synthesis.

Purpose

The purpose of the review was to assess the progress achieved so far with regard to UNESCO’s Priority Gender Equality and to provide conclusions and recommendations on the way forward, thereby informing the preparation of the new C/4 eight-year Medium-Term Strategy that is to be presented to
the General Conference in autumn 2013. It aims to answer the following three major evaluation questions:

1. How relevant is UNESCO’s two-pronged approach to promoting Gender Equality consisting of gender-specific programming and gender mainstreaming?
2. What results have been achieved so far and what factors have contributed to their achievement or non-achievement?
3. What are UNESCO’s comparative advantages in the promotion of Gender Equality, and how should the Organization focus its work in the future?

Methodology and Process

The combined methodologies included desk studies, focus group discussions, interviews with staff at headquarters and in the field, interviews with external partners, workshops. It was also informed by previous evaluations managed and / or conducted by IOS. Valuable input was also provided by a UNESCO Chair in Gender Research.

The review was furthermore inspired by a study undertaken by the African Development Bank\(^1\) which reviewed 26 thematic gender evaluations conducted by bilateral and multilateral organizations over a period of 20 years. The overall conclusions of the study are also relevant for UNESCO. The study found that promoting Gender Equality is not yet integrated into the mainstream operations and organizational culture of development organizations and that getting new concepts and practices into the mainstream of an organization demands a significant cultural change and concerted and consistent action in the following six areas:

1. *An organization’s leadership must consistently lead and support the mainstreaming of Gender Equality and policy. This must start at the top.*
2. *Systems of accountability and incentives must have enough “bite” so staff cannot evade responsibility for delivering Gender Equality results.*
3. *Gender Equality work must be properly funded and there must be sufficient trained senior staff to gain traction over an organization.*
4. *New procedures and practices must be well designed, given a big push at the outset and the momentum maintained.*
5. *There needs to be a consistent approach to recording results and disseminating lessons.*
6. *The test of whether Gender Equality has been embedded in the mainstream of an organization is the degree to which it is seen as contributing to rather than competing with the drive for more effective aid and other priorities.*

Main achievements and challenges

Key achievements

- The review confirmed that UNESCO’s dual approach to support its global Priority Gender Equality, consisting of gender mainstreaming and gender specific programming, is relevant and in line with international practice.

- Most of the sectors have implemented a number of visible and relevant gender-specific activities such as SC’s work with women engineers and scientists in Africa; CI’s efforts related to the development of gender-sensitive indicators for the media and of gender-sensitive media policies and practices; and ED’s work on Education, HIV and Gender Equality.

\(^1\)See Evaluation Insights, Number 3, November 2011, Operations Evaluation Department, African Development Bank: Mainstreaming Gender Equality. Emerging Evaluation Lessons; and the full working paper titled Mainstreaming Gender Equality: A Road to Results or a Road to Nowhere? An Evaluation Synthesis, ADG Group, OPEV 2011.
- UNESCO has established a global Gender Focal Point Network including staff members from all central services and sectors (HQ and field) as well as Category I Institutes. This network, consisting of over 100 staff members, was reinitiated and further institutionalized in early 2011. It has the potential to provide significant support on gender mainstreaming and gender-specific programming to all parts of the Organization.

- ODG/GE has carried out effective Gender Equality capacity-building, which has been mandatory for all staff since 2005, and organizational learning initiatives, such as Gender Equality clinics, that supplement traditional training workshops and e-learning. These need to be further developed in light of experience. Other UN Agencies have requested UNESCO to share some of its training methodologies and are now adapting them to their own needs.

- At the international level, UNESCO actively cooperates with several UN Agencies both in the context of inter-agency task forces and networks on Gender Equality and women’s empowerment and for some of UNESCO’s gender-specific programmes. Partners include UNWOMEN, UNICEF, UNDP, UNAIDS and others. UNESCO also participated in and contributed to several high-level events such as the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio +20), the Annual Reports of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), ECOSOC etc.

- UNESCO has many gender-sensitive human resources policies in place and HRM reports periodically to the Executive Board on gender parity in the Secretariat.

**Key challenges**

**The Strategic Framework**

- While high visibility is given to the Priority in UNESCO’s current Medium-Term Strategy 34 C/4 (2008 – 2013) and Programme and Budget 36 C/5 (2012 – 2013), and in the Priority Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) (2008 – 2013), it is unevenly addressed in both documents and not clearly interpreted. Neither the C/4 strategy nor the C/5 planning documents demonstrate consistent mainstreaming of Gender Equality. While UNESCO’s commitment to Gender Equality is mentioned repeatedly in the text of the C/4, the degree of gender mainstreaming in its Strategic Programme Objectives (SPOs) and Expected Outcomes is minimal. The C/5 shows that considerable efforts were made by some of the programmes, such as ED, to integrate Gender Equality concerns in their respective Main Lines of Action (MLAs), Expected Results and indicators, but this is not the case for all of them. The GEAP does include a number of specific outcomes related to Priority Gender Equality for each sector. It is not always clear, however, how these are linked to the expected results in the C/5 or to the expected outcomes of the C/4. In some cases, they are the same, while in others they are completely different.

- The GEAP is of limited use as an action plan as it lacks the essential features of an action plan such as specific targets, timelines, a limited set of measurable indicators and benchmarks, and cooperation and implementation modalities, principles and responsibilities of reporting on and monitoring and evaluation of the priority, as well as clear links to the objectives of the overall programme and budget (C/5). In the future, outcomes, results and indicators for the Priority should be better integrated into the C/4 and C/5 documents and the GEAP should be fully aligned with these two documents. If need be, an additional short advocacy document on the Priority could be developed for external audiences.

- Another challenge relates to the over 80 GEAP indicators that are a mix of impact, outcome and output indicators. First, it would be possible to measure progress for some of them, but this is virtually impossible for others. Second, there is no data collection system in place to measure progress towards these indicators. And third, the number of indicators is so large that it would probably not be feasible to attempt to collect data for all of them.

- Neither the C/4 nor the C/5 document clearly explains the links between the two Global Priorities, i.e. how Gender Equality should be mainstreamed in the work in Africa and how gender-specific
programming in Africa can contribute to the achievement of the expected results of Priority Gender Equality.

**Gender-specific programming and gender mainstreaming**

- While some sectors have clearly defined their niche with regard to UNESCO’s specific contribution to achieving Gender Equality, this is not the case for all of them.

- Overall, mainstreaming of Gender Equality in UNESCO’s programmes presents many challenges. This is due to a combination of factors, including:
  
  • UNESCO’s senior management is supportive of the global priority, but not equally visible in leading the operational mainstreaming, including holding staff accountable for mainstreaming gender in all policies and programmes, and supporting the GFP Network. The current performance management system is not consistently used for this purpose.
  
  • A lot of programme specialists are not sufficiently equipped to mainstream Gender Equality. This is partly due to the fact that many staff members have never benefited from any hands-on training in mainstreaming offered by the Organization. While training opportunities are not always actively promoted, not all staff members are proactively seeking to fill any knowledge gaps they might have and to look for helpful resources online. There is a need to systematically scale up the capacity-building efforts for gender mainstreaming within organizational units so as to have the maximum impact. Again, related incentives and an accountability mechanism are required. However, one word of caution: "A common mistake is to focus on the easier bureaucratic changes, such as training staff and introducing boxes to be ticked, and avoid tackling the more difficult issues such as the quality of leadership and linking pay and promotion to performance on Gender Equality."²
  
  • The Gender Focal Point (GFP) Network is not yet fully operational or recognized as a source of technical support for mainstreaming at the sectoral level. This has to do with the limited technical capacities of some of the network members and the time they are allowed to spend on activities related to their role as GFPs. Not all the gender expertise (degree level and extensive working experience) that is available in sectors has been integrated into the Network.
  
  • Gender analyses are rarely undertaken by sectors to identify gaps in Gender Equality and therefore opportunities to inform strategic planning of interventions are missed. Mainstreaming efforts are often only made once the design of a policy, programme or publications has already been completed, rather than already building them in right from the start.

- UNESCO has a large network of National Commissions, Chairs, Goodwill Ambassadors, Clubs, Associated Schools etc. The overall policies that guide the cooperation with these various actors state that UNESCO’s objectives and priorities should inspire their work. ODG/GE has been collaborating with some of the Chairs on issues related to Priority Gender Equality. Overall, however, the links with these various partners have not been systematically explored by UNESCO for the purpose of realizing the objectives of Priority Gender Equality.

- Gender-sensitive human resources policies are in place, but the execution of some may need to be revisited in light of the PGA findings. The Ethics Office, which deals with many requests that have a clear gender dimension, does not have sex balance in its team.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

- Mechanisms to assess progress made with regard to Priority Gender Equality are insufficient. Sectors report in SISTER on progress made in their activities towards the achievements of the C/5 expected results. SISTER reporting has been improved over the past couple of years. However, given that the

² Idem.
expected outcomes of the GEAP are not clearly linked to the MLAs and expected results of the overall C/5 document, SISTER reporting does not provide information on progress achieved towards the expected outcomes of the GEAP. It only includes a paragraph about which of the C/5 expected results of the two global priorities an activity contributes to, without requesting detailed information on the progress made. Consequently, there is also no overall mechanism to systematically track the budget spent on Priority Gender Equality.

- Evaluation needs to better integrate Gender Equality in all of its work, including in evaluation Terms of Reference, data collection, data analysis, report writing and follow up on evaluation recommendations.
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### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C/4</td>
<td>Medium Term Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/5</td>
<td>Biannual Workplan and Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Communication and Information Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>Culture Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSP</td>
<td>Bureau of Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Director-General (of UNESCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Education Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXB</td>
<td>Extra-budgetary funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWIS</td>
<td>For Women in Science (L’Oréal – UNESCO Partnership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Gender Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAP</td>
<td>Gender Equality Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODG/GE</td>
<td>Division for Gender Equality, Office of the Director-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFP</td>
<td>Gender Focal Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPGE</td>
<td>Global Priority Gender Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSIM</td>
<td>Global Report on the Status of Women in News Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM</td>
<td>Bureau of Human Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBC</td>
<td>International Bioethics Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFG</td>
<td>International Federation of Journalists and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGBC</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Bioethics Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOS</td>
<td>Internal Oversight Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWMF</td>
<td>International Women's Media Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>Main Line of Action (in C/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>National Commission for UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODG</td>
<td>Office of the Director-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PerfoWeb</td>
<td>UNESCO's Performance Appraisal System for Staff Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA</td>
<td>Participatory Gender Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Regular Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Natural Sciences Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>Social and Human Sciences Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO</td>
<td>Strategic Programme Objective (in C/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF</td>
<td>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIABC</td>
<td>UN Interagency Committee on Bioethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSSD</td>
<td>World Summit for Social Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1: Introduction

Background to the review

1. Programmes and projects on women’s empowerment, women’s rights and Gender Equality have long been part of UNESCO’s agenda. In response to the 2005 World Summit Outcome document, the General Conference of UNESCO decided to increase the efforts by declaring Gender Equality as one of the Organization’s two global priorities for its 2008-2013 Medium-Term Strategy (34C/4). UNESCO developed a two-pronged approach, that focuses both on women’s empowerment (through gender-specific programming) and on gender mainstreaming in policies and programmes within the Organization.

2. The Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP)\(^3\) translates the policy “Priority Gender Equality” into action. It lays out strategic actions, expected outcomes and performance indicators by programme sector, for the duration of the strategy. It emphasizes the importance of accountability, monitoring, evaluation, and it describes the institutional mechanisms in place for the pursuit of Gender Equality. The three expected outcomes are:

- Changes in programmes (“Progressive increase in the number and quality of gender-responsive and gender-transformative programmes and initiatives in all sectors and field office initiatives”)
- Changes in Member States’ realities (“Women’s empowerment and Gender Equality in Member States advanced through policy dialogue and programmes promoted by UNESCO”)
- Changes in the organization (“Commitment to Gender Equality institutionalized in the Secretariat and in programming”).

Review purpose and scope

3. The GEAP is currently in its last biennium. The Executive Board at its 190th session (190 EX/decisions Prov, page 29) asked for an evaluation of results and experiences in order to “determine the operational strategy for the medium-term period”. The purpose of this review is therefore to assess the progress achieved so far with regard to UNESCO’s Priority Gender Equality and to provide recommendations on the way forward, thereby informing the preparation of the new C/4, C/5 and GEAP documents that are to be presented to the General Conference in the fall of 2013. The review attempts to answer the following three questions:

1. How relevant is UNESCO’s two-pronged approach to promoting Gender Equality consisting of gender-specific programming and gender mainstreaming?
2. What results have been achieved so far and what factors have contributed to their achievement or non-achievement?
3. What are UNESCO’s comparative advantages in the promotion of Gender Equality, and how should the Organization focus its work in the future?

4. Parallel to this review, a team from the International Labour Organization (ILO) conducted a Participatory Gender Audit (PGA). The two exercises do not necessarily dovetail on all findings and recommendations Valuable input was also provided to this exercise by a UNESCO Chair in Gender Research.

---

\(^3\)Submitted to the Executive Board in 2008 in document 181 EX/4 Part I Add. 2
Review methods

5. The review process started in November 2012 and this final report was delivered in February 2013. The Internal Oversight Service (IOS) recruited an independent external evaluator, who worked closely with IOS staff. The review builds on desk studies, interviews at UNESCO headquarters and telephone interviews with selected stakeholders (UNESCO field office staff, National Commissions, UN Organizations and other partners). A list of interviewees is enclosed in Annex 2. It also built on 22 evaluations that were managed and / or conducted by IOS over the past 5 years.

6. The review identifies strengths and weaknesses of UNESCO’s approach to addressing the Global Priority Gender Equality. The assessment of objectives and results, and of the choice of indicators and means of verification, builds on a comparison with good practices in the evaluation community and on literature on planning and results-based management. The analysis is also based on information obtained in interviews. The discussion of UNESCO’s comparative advantage is informed by conclusions of past evaluations and by information provided by external stakeholders, such as partners in the private sector, civil society organizations, and other UN agencies.

7. The review also looked at a sample of interventions at country/regional levels. This sample consists of activities from each sector that reflect UNESCO’s work in normative and operational roles and that are funded through regular programme and extra-budgetary resources. The sample is not meant to be representative, but rather to show some of the diversity of UNESCO’s work in the context of the global priority. The review furthermore examined the two main features of UNESCO’s internal organization of the Priority Gender Equality: the Gender Equality Division (ODG/GE) and the network of Gender Focal Points (GFPs).

Limitations, reliability and validity

8. The review was undertaken in a short period of only about six weeks. As it was not possible to visit activities at country level, the evaluators had to rely on information from documents and interviews. Furthermore, many of the expected results with regard to Gender Equality are long-term, and even though this review was conducted at the end of a programming cycle, major changes in Gender Equality will take longer to be realized. It is not feasible to attribute causality through this review exercise. There are still significant lessons to be learnt, and it is possible to identify good practices and to point to challenges and obstacles that need to be overcome. As the number of interviews was limited, there is a risk that not all viewpoints are represented, or that certain information was not made available for the review. This report is meant to be an input into a process of continuous analysis. It is expected that new information will continue to emerge.

9. Many assessments had to be made without any clear baselines, and the discussion on the organizational features of the Priority Gender Equality cannot refer to any benchmarks, such as mechanisms used in other organizations; conclusions are qualitative and have been based on logic and established knowledge in the management sciences. Fortunately, evaluations from other organizations are available that have assessed gender mainstreaming and other strategies, in a more thorough manner. The present review relies much on the findings and conclusions of these evaluations.
Chapter 2: Formulating and reporting on the Global Priority Gender Equality

Background to the Global Priority

10. Establishing the Global Priority Gender Equality (GPGE) was the result of an evolving international understanding on the subject. Gender Equality as a human right and a development goal is enshrined in the 1948 Universal Declaration on Human Rights and in the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). The World Summit for Social Development (WSSD) held in 1995 established a link between Gender Equality and poverty eradication. That same year, 189 governments gathered together and adopted the Beijing Declaration and the Platform for Action at the Fourth World Conference on Women, also recognizing the crucial link between poverty eradication and Gender Equality. Security Council commitments such as Resolution 1325 (2000) on Women, Peace and Security clearly articulated the interaction between Gender Equality and peace and security. At the 2000 UN Millennium Summit, 147 heads of government committed to “promote Gender Equality and the empowerment of women as effective ways to combat poverty, hunger and disease and to stimulate development that is truly sustainable”. This commitment was further reiterated in 2005 and 2010, and most recently, in June 2012 at the Rio+20 Summit.

11. UNESCO’s work on Gender Equality has evolved in parallel to the normative agreements cited above. Activities to promote Gender Equality have evolved as much as the international discourse on women’s empowerment, emancipation, and the concepts of gender and equality. Even though projects, programmes and activities aiming at greater Gender Equality have a long history in the Organization, the stakes were significantly increased in 2008, when in the Medium-Term Strategic Plan for the period 2008 – 2013 (34 C/4) Gender Equality was declared a Global Priority.

Three strategic instruments

12. This chapter explores how the Global Priority has been articulated, communicated and implemented within the Organization, to partners and other stakeholders. While the concept of a Global Priority as such is clear, it is also an abstract formulation that requires explanation. The general intent expressed by the goal ‘Gender Equality’ needed to be translated into directives, instructions and plans in order to be implemented. Three documents provide strategic direction:

• The Medium-Term Strategy, which contains the origin of the Global Priority (34 C/4 for 2008 – 2013);

• The Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP), 2008 – 2013, which is understood to be the results-based road map that aims to translate the policy contained in the C/4 into specific actions (developed following the approval of the 34 C/4), and,

• The Approved Programme and Budget documents 34 C/5, 35 C/5 and 36 C/5, which are the two-year planning instruments whereby strategic intents are translated into short-term goals through a system of rolling plans.

13. These three documents constitute the main elements through which the mandate of the Global Priority is articulated and translated into action. UNESCO has produced other documents as well, such as for example the Human Resources Management (HRM) Gender Parity Action Plan, but the focus of the present review is on the three mentioned above. The review examined whether these documents are coherent in themselves and as a whole and whether they have led to concrete activities and systems to follow up on progress.
Gender Equality in the 34 C/4

14. The Medium-Term Strategy for 2008 – 2013 (34 C/4) was unanimously adopted by the 34th session of the General Conference. The 40-page document devotes 3 pages to the two global priorities (Africa and Gender Equality), thus representing almost 10% of the total number of pages of the document. The two priorities are centrally placed and thus have high visibility. The text:

- Sets out the origin of the mandate in §10 and outlines the two-pronged approach of mainstreaming Gender Equality and pursuing women's empowerment through specific activities;
- Takes note of UNESCO's commitment to actions supportive of Gender Equality in Member States through the mainstreaming of Gender Equality in the programme cycle, as well as internally in the management of the Organization (§ 11); and,
- Demonstrates (in a text box of half a page (box 3)) with figures how women are disadvantaged in income distribution, in literacy and in access to health and career opportunities. It also explains what mainstreaming means.

15. The review notes that:

- In terms of presentation, the two paragraphs and the text box set out the Global Priority, but it is not clear why some information is presented in a box and some in the main text. The basic statement that underlines the importance of Gender Equality is found in the middle of the box. The narrative identifies challenges, connects them to UNESCO’s mandate, and then illustrates a strategy for tackling it. The problem is that the main text does the same, though with less coherence and at times in duplication with the text box. The overall message of this one page of text is thus not as clear and coherent as it could be.
- There are no links between the two strategic priorities: it is not clear how Priority Africa is to be pursued in the Priority Gender Equality and vice versa.
- The text mentions several actions that the Organization will undertake to implement Priority Gender Equality. These include mainstreaming Gender Equality, the development of a results-based action plan, reporting, capacity-building for mainstreaming, and supporting equal career opportunities for staff and appropriate working arrangements to balance work and life. The only concrete goal that is specified in the document is to progressively increase the representation of women in decision-making levels within the Secretariat to reach 50% by 2015.
- Once the concept of Gender Equality has been introduced and set out as a Global Priority, and UNESCO's gender mainstreaming strategy been explained, it disappears from the rest of the C/4 document. Neither the section on global challenges and opportunities for UNESCO's action or the main programmatic features, outlining the strategic programme objectives integrate the notion of Gender Equality.
- The main part of the C/4 document presents the Organization's five overarching objectives (that reflect UNESCO's five programme sectors) and corresponding 14 Strategic Programme Objectives (SPOs). For each overarching objective and SPO, the text presents expected outcomes, which number 72 in total. Out of these outcomes, only two reflect the priority Gender Equality: the 3rd outcome under SPO 4, and the 3rd outcome under SPO 6. An examination of the expected outcomes reveals that it would be possible to reflect Gender Equality in many more if not all them.

16. The review therefore concludes that the GPGE is not sufficiently integrated into all parts of the 34C/4. The next Medium-Term Global Priority (37C/4) should dedicate more attention to both of the Organization’s strategic priorities; outline the links between the two and integrate both of
them into the overarching objectives and SPOs and their respective expected outcomes. In other words, the GPGE should be fully mainstreamed into the 37 C/4 document.

Gender Equality Action Plan

17. The GEAP is comprised of two documents: a longer version\(^4\) and a shorter one\(^5\). While the longer version of the GEAP is used in capacity-building initiatives on Gender Equality, the review found that most staff had knowledge only of the short and glossy document. The short document also features in the e-learning on GPGE.

18. A review of the short document of 12 pages reveals both strengths and weaknesses. The major strengths are found in the overall outline of the document that presents and defines the GPGE, briefly outlines what UNESCO does and can do in each of its programme areas, and introduces partnerships that help promote the priority. The document is a clear and succinct narrative that communicates well, setting out problems in a straightforward and convincing manner. The review of each sector's work is particularly well designed as the general overviews, expected outcomes, and brief examples show what each sector can do in this field.

19. The amount of information on any given page is quite limited. However, as this short version of the GEAP is primarily meant to be an information brochure with easily digestible material for new employees, stakeholders in the wider UNESCO network (National Commissions, Goodwill Ambassadors, UNESCO Chairs), and potential partners outside the Organization, then the document probably serves its purpose.

20. A review of the overall messages in the short version of the GEAP shows that Gender Equality builds on the sense of and mission for women's empowerment. Gender Equality and women's empowerment are certainly the two key goals of members of the UN system. However, as much current literature shows, gender is a highly problematic social construct and many times root causes as well as solutions to inequality must be sought in a different discourse on gender and identities. For an Organization at the forefront of thinking on development, gender, social justice and capacities, UNESCO's future vision of change should take such conceptual developments into account. The illustrations and pictures on the cover and throughout the document also reflect the understanding that a lot of UNESCO’s staff have of Gender Equality, which is that it concerns women only.

21. The longer version of the GEAP builds on the 34 C/4, as is to be expected. However, in many instances it is a mere repetition of the C/4. The first four pages that set out the problem, relate to UNESCO’s mandate and explain its response, are almost the same as the C/4 text. The explanation of what mainstreaming is replicates the C/4 text. As mainstreaming is actually a rather complicated process, the longer version of the GEAP should elaborate further on what it is and how it is to be done. An action plan should take the strategy further and provide more concrete guidance and instructions.

22. The GEAP presents 44 gender-specific expected outcomes for each of the five programme sectors.\(^6\) This is an effective mechanism for showing what sectors should be working towards in achieving the GPGE. However, the expected outcomes presented in the GEAP are completely different from those presented in the 34 C/4. It is therefore not clear how the 44 expected outcomes in the GEAP relate to the 72 expected outcomes of the C/4, whether they elaborate, qualify or supersede these. The GEAP also lists more than 80 performance indicators that correspond to the 44 expected outcomes. These indicators are a mixture of what would be considered impact, outcome and output level results, and some even take the form of activities. Both the C/4 and C/5 have numerous indicators, occasionally the same as those of the GEAP, but often not. (It should be noted here that the GEAP was prepared after the C/4 based on input

---

\(^5\) UNESCO Priority Gender Equality Action Plan for 2008-2013  
\(^6\) The GEAP expected outcomes were formulated by the UNESCO Programme Sectors and reviewed by BSP.
received from sectors. This does not, however, explain the lack of alignment and coordination between these documents.)

**Box 3.1: Examples of outcome indicators from GEAP**

1. The extent to which policy commitments to women’s empowerment and Gender Equality are reflected in organizational strategies, programming and budget documents, and sectoral policy documents, such as UNESS, GAP for EFA, EDUCAIDS, HRBA Strategy, World Reports

2. Number of countries where new and/or revised teacher education and training policies reflect a tangible gender dimension

3. Sex-disaggregated data on participation in parliamentary fora on science, technology and innovation at national, regional and international levels

4. Number of women philosophers participating in various activities of the philosophy programme, or in partnership with other international philosophy networks or events, such as the World Philosophy Day, the World Congress of Philosophy, etc

5. Research study on the link between cultural diversity, human rights and Gender Equality produced

6. National information and communication policies developed encompassing a Gender Equality perspective

23. It has often mentioned in evaluations of UNESCO’s programmes that the Organization tends to work in ‘silos’. The text of the GEAP, both in the long and short version, reinforces this message as each sector is presented on its own. No suggestion is made that intersectoral activities are expected or desired. As one of UNESCO’s comparative advantages lies in its potential for intersectoral work, an Action Plan for an organization-wide priority would have been the perfect place to for such work to be reflected.

**Gender Equality in the 36 C/5**

24. The present analysis focuses on the 36 C/5, which is the last Programme and Budget document in the 34 C/4 period. The Director-General’s Introduction (pages i - v) reaffirms UNESCO’s commitment to its two global priorities Africa and Gender Equality. Under Gender Equality, she reasserts the two-pronged approach (gender-specific initiatives and gender mainstreaming) and states that the priority Gender Equality is “integrated into the strategies for each Biennial Sectoral Priority (BSPs) and reflected, as appropriate, in the results chain for the various Main Lines of Action (MLAs), reflecting the objectives and expected results for each Major Programme in the Gender Equality Action Plan, 2008-2013”.7

25. The GPGE is also visibly expressed for each programme sector. At the beginning of each chapter, a special box explains how the sector intends to pursue Gender Equality. The programme of each sector is organized around a set of BSPs and corresponding MLAs. For some of them, the text shows how the Global Priority Gender Equality is integrated directly into programme planning. For example, the Education Sector MLA "Accelerating Progress Towards Education for All“ lists the following four expected results:

- National capacities strengthened for policy formulation and planning focusing on promoting the right to quality education and Gender Equality, and drawing on information and communication technologies;
- National capacities strengthened to plan, manage and scale up gender-sensitive, quality literacy and non-formal education policies and programmes;

---
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• National capacities strengthened to develop and implement teacher policies, with particular emphasis on quality and gender issues; and

• Capacities in Member States strengthened and comprehensive and evidence-based policies for technical and vocational education and training developed, and assistance provided for their implementation.

26. As the list shows, the Global Priority is voiced in three of the four expected results, which is a good example of mainstreaming of the priority into programming from the start. However, this is not the case for many MLAs, especially in other sectors. There is no doubt that the C/5 could be further used to make sure that the Global Priority is better reflected throughout the document.

27. Each programme sector’s chapter also mentions an indicative figure of the contribution of the sector’s regular programme budget to the two global priorities. The contributions to the GPGE vary with the Communication and Information Sector indicating that it would spend 28.9% of its regular programme budget on the priority, followed by Education with 24%, then by Natural Sciences with 16.3%, and Social and Human Sciences with 13.1%. Surprisingly, Culture is found at the bottom with only 6.5% of the sector’s budget contributing to the GPGE. These figures are indicative and there is no way to verify whether what sectors had planned to spend was actually spent. Additionally, UNESCO faced severe budget cuts starting from November 2011. This forced sectors to significantly reduce the volume of interventions funded through regular programme resources. The figures therefore have to be taken with caution, knowing that they were indicative estimates made before the budget shortfall, and that the regular programme budget actually spent on Priority Gender Equality was probably much lower.

28. Nevertheless, what the figures show is that what the regular budget was supposed to contribute to Priority Gender Equality was remarkably low. Programmes, in their own rating of interventions, showed that a high share of their activities was not expected to contribute to the GPGE. This raises the question of how Gender Equality can be considered a Global Priority if it is not represented in the majority of the Organization’s interventions?

29. In order for Gender Equality to be a Global Priority in UNESCO, the Organization should be clear about what percentage of the overall budget should be dedicated to it and set a clear benchmark to demonstrate this. For instance, it could be decided that a certain percentage of all interventions should be gender-specific. In regard to mainstreaming, almost the entirety of the Organization’s activities would need to show evidence of gender mainstreaming in order for Gender Equality to be truly considered a Global Priority.

Alignment of UNESCO’s strategic documents on Gender Equality

30. The coherence between the three key strategic documents is a crucial issue. The review has found a confusing plethora of results, outcomes, indicators and benchmarks for indicators in the C/4, the GEAP and the C/5. For most of them it is not clear how they are linked. Indeed, the expected results of the C/5 are not always clearly related to the expected outcomes of the C/4 or to those listed in the GEAP.9 For example, the GEAP lists seven expected outcomes for Communication and Information, while the sector has only three expected results for the GPGE in the C/5. The lack of alignment can also be seen for some of the other programme sectors. This creates much confusion and complicates monitoring of and reporting on progress made in the implementation of the GPGE.

---

8 It should be noted that these figures do not accurately reflect the sectors’ efforts in gender mainstreaming, which would be very difficult to earmark at the time of the preparation of the budget. Furthermore, these figures do not include any resources spent on gender-specific projects and programmes or mainstreaming in projects and programmes funded by extrabudgetary resources. Such initiatives have taken on an increased importance in the current biennium in view of the Organization’s financial situation.

9 The GEAP was developed in the year following the adoption of the C/4 and its Expected Outcomes. Again, the formulation of C/5 Expected Results was undertaken by the programme sectors and reviewed by BSP.
31. In the future, outcomes, results and indicators for the Priority should be better integrated into the C/4 and C/5 documents and the GEAP should be fully aligned with these two documents. Clear responsibility for the alignment and coordination between these documents needs to be assigned. Right now, there seems to be no shared understanding of which organizational entity is in charge of that.

**Reporting on Gender Equality**

32. Reporting on the GPGE was found to be a major challenge at many levels. Sectors are required to report on C/5 Expected Results in the System of Information on Strategies, Tasks and the Evaluation of Results (SISTER) on a biannual basis. The GEAP Outcomes are defined for a period of six years, and progress made towards GEAP outcomes is not reported in SISTER, unless GEAP Outcomes are identical to C/5 Expected Results, which for most sectors is not the case. SISTER asks programme managers to include some information on how their activity contributes to the GPGE. A review of a sample of SISTER reports shows that the information provided is limited and usually says very little about progress actually made. Furthermore, there is no overall quality control or verification of that information.

33. In addition, even if GEAP Outcomes and indicators were better aligned with the C/5 and reported on in SISTER, they are stated at different levels, ranging from outputs to outcomes to impact. Some could be quantified and assessed. Others are impossible to measure and would not easily lend themselves to any analysis of progress or results relating to the GPGE. This would add further challenges to the existing reporting mechanism.

34. The lack of reporting on the GPGE has many drawbacks for the Organization. Not only is it impossible to demonstrate progress made and results achieved, but it is also not possible to track how many resources are actually spent on GPGE. This point is further discussed in Chapter 5 of this report.

**Concluding remarks**

35. The review of the three planning instruments shows achievements as well as issues that need to be addressed. The strengths lie in; (1) that the GPGE has visibility and prominence, (2) the documents contain many examples of results to be achieved, and (3) each of the five sectors indicates specific contributions to the priority.

36. However, the three documents also lack coherence, which affects programme formulation, monitoring and reporting. A Global Priority needs to be articulated clearly and with precision, and as simply as possible for the sake of understanding and accountability. The C/4 and C/5 documents ought to include a coherent and limited set of expected outcomes, expected results and indicators related to Priority Gender Equality. The content of the GEAP should be fully aligned with these two documents and not present additional results and indicators that are impossible to track. The GEAP should furthermore clearly articulate how Priority Gender Equality is to be implemented and provide specific time-frames for each expected result. The budget and reporting systems must be reformed to make sure that it is possible to calculate and analyze the financial allocations to the GPGE and the level of expenditures. The new C/4 and C/5 also need to address the link between the two strategic priorities and the possibilities of intersectoral work to realize results.
Chapter 3: Organizational Structures and Processes

Introduction

37. This chapter examines the structures and mechanisms in place to support the implementation of the GPGE, such as the Gender Equality Division (ODG/GE), the network of Gender Focal Points (GFPs), and capacity-building in Gender Equality.

38. Prior to addressing these issues, it is important to mention that in the context of recent reform efforts, a Task Force on Gender Equality was established in January 2010, as one of the first priorities on the new Director-General. It published a report\textsuperscript{10} in February 2010, which contains a total of 62 recommendations on various subjects, most of which are still valid. The review noted progress in the implementation of some of these recommendations, but considers that many of them are still valid and more work needed to realize opportunities for change.

Division for Gender Equality

39. The Division for Gender Equality (ODG/GE) is the main organizational unit with the responsibility of coordinating and monitoring the Organization’s action to benefit Gender Equality. According to the 36 C/5\textsuperscript{11}, its principal responsibilities include promoting, facilitating and monitoring the implementation of Priority Gender Equality, ensuring that it is accorded priority at all stages of programme design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for both regular and extrabudgetary activities. ODG/GE is also expected to carry out monitoring against the GEAP. The Division is furthermore asked to contribute to UNESCO's actions in this area within the UN System, and through cooperation with other multilateral and bilateral organizations, academia, civil society and the private sector. The review found that these functions are well in line with what could be expected of a specialized headquarters unit.

40. The review also noted, however, that monitoring responsibility with regard to programme activities benefiting Africa and Gender Equality as the two global priorities of the Organization is also assigned to BSP, which is called to conduct this task in close cooperation with the Africa Department and ODG/GE.\textsuperscript{12} BSP also has the overall responsibility of monitoring the implementation of the C/4 and the overall C/5. As this review has argued, the future GEAP needs to be fully aligned with these two documents, which means that all expected outcomes and results related to GPGE should be included as an integral part of the overall C/4 and C/5. This also means that their achievement will be monitored and reported on together with all the other outcomes and results foreseen in these two documents. This raises the question of which organizational unit would then have the primary responsibility for monitoring implementation of the GEAP and of how it should collaborate with other concerned entities. It has become obvious during the present review that the division of these monitoring responsibilities between BSP and ODG/GE need to be clarified, and the modalities of cooperation better defined. ODG/GE now consists of the head of the Division, four programme officers and an assistant. Given the overall human resources of UNESCO, and compared with other Agencies’ Gender Equality offices, the review considers the responsibilities and the human resources allocated to the ODG/GE to be adequate for the Division to contribute to results in line with the GPGE. However, the review also found that the unit could work more effectively. Differences exist among staff members in their understanding of tasks and priority setting. The unit therefore does not seem to function according to its full potential, with consequent implications for how effectively Gender Equality is being championed in UNESCO.

\textsuperscript{10} Delivering the UNESCO Priority for Gender Equality: Increasing impact, effectiveness and visibility; DG/Note/10/01 of 8 January 2010

\textsuperscript{11} 36C/5, pp 266 – 271.

\textsuperscript{12} 36C/5, pp 271 – 276.
Another issue examined by the review relates to the optimal positioning of UNESCO's Gender Equality Division within the Organization. UNESCO has had a unit dedicated to the promotion of the status of women and of Gender Equality for more than fifteen years. Between 2000 and 2010, the Division was located in the Bureau of Strategic Planning (BSP), which is in charge of programme planning (C4 and C5 formulation) in the Organization. In May 2010, at the initiative of the new Director-General, the Division was transferred to the Executive Office of the Director-General (ODG). The primary reason for the transfer was to ensure visibility of the GPGE in line with the recommendation of the Task Force (DG/Note/10/17).

While the ODG/GE's move from BSP to ODG was contested, it is clear that there are advantages and disadvantages with both locations. The position in the Office of the Director-General facilitates closer coordination with the Organization's top management and increases its status within the wider UNESCO network, thereby demonstrating increased visibility. These are three significant advantages. It could be argued that the Division's proximity to the planning process in BSP enabled the Gender Equality Unit to have a stronger voice in the preliminary phases of the programme planning cycle, when gender mainstreaming should take root. However, as the evaluations quoted in chapter 4 show, this did not happen when the unit was in BSP from 2002 to 2010. Ensuring that the Gender Equality concerns are really integrated into planning should be a priority for the Organization; therefore, more effective ways of cooperation between ODG/GE and BSP are needed to ensure that this can happen and that GPGE related C/5 Expected Results and GEAP outcomes (that are to be in line with these) are consistently monitored.

ODG/GE input into the planning cycle is currently integrated during consultations with BSP. ODG/GE is asked to comment on Sector workplans. However, it often receives the workplans late, as these are already past the preliminary planning stage, and with a short deadline for comments. Indeed, the most important input to Gender Equality mainstreaming should come very early in the planning process, before the programmes/workplans are actually designed. An accessible 'help desk' function has been set up by ODG/GE to assist sectors with this.

Overall, the review found that ODG/GE's ability to carry out its other functions, such as coordinating the Gender Focal Point network, managing organizational capacity development, and interacting with HRM to monitor the Organization’s performance on gender parity targets with regard to the staff of the Secretariat, are facilitated by its location in the ODG, rather than within BSP. The review concludes that the structural change initiated in 2010 brings more benefits to ODG/GE and that it should be maintained in the ODG.

Gender Focal Points

UNESCO's Gender Focal Point (GFP) network was created many years ago. It is one of the main mechanisms for strengthening the delivery of GPGE. In 2011 the Director-General issued a note which called for the strengthening of the GFP network. The note identifies the process of selecting GFPS, outlines which organizational entities are to be included, and at which level the GFPS are to operate. Terms of Reference annexed to the note also outline the roles and responsibilities of the GFPS. The note is clear and to the point and would have been a big help had it been published at the same time as the launch of the GEAP in 2008.

The GFP network is currently made up of 113 members at headquarters and in the field, which seems to be an adequate number. Candidates to the GFP network should comply with a list of qualifications annexed to the DG Note. These include having a strong commitment to the empowerment of women and girls, as well as to the goal of Gender Equality and knowledge/understanding of the following:

- promotion of women's rights, women's empowerment and Gender Equality;
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• Gender Equality in UNESCO’s domains in general, as well as in the sector, field office or institute contexts, in particular; and,

• work undertaken by the Division for Gender Equality to promote women’s empowerment, women’s rights and Gender Equality.

47. Finally, they are expected to have strong analytical and operational capacity, basic knowledge of Gender Equality methodologies and a willingness to strengthen their own capacity in this area. Education or work experience in gender mainstreaming is considered an asset, but was not compulsory.

48. The qualifications above appear to be ambitious, but comprehensive and the review found no reason to question them. Both women and men were encouraged to apply. Sectors were asked to nominate candidates and to submit their CVs to ODG/GE, but their final selection was made by the concerned ADGs or directors/heads of bureaux and institutes in consultation with ODG/GE. Several inconsistencies were observed in the selection process, which include qualified candidates being turned down, while other, less qualified candidates were included in the network. This has created quite some confusion and discontent among staff.

49. The main role and function of GFPs is to support the division/office/institute where they work in the implementation of UNESCO’s Priority Gender Equality and the Gender Equality Action Plan. More specifically, among other things, the GFPs are requested to inform and assist colleagues at all levels (including senior management) in monitoring efforts to achieve Gender Equality and in the development of policies and programmes that are gender responsive and gender transformative. They shall contribute to gender mainstreaming and the development of proposals for gender-specific initiatives in their area of expertise. Finally, they shall also act as catalysts for change within the Secretariat. In November 2011, the ODG/GE organized a workshop outside Paris uniting all GFPs for several days of training and discussion. The event was appreciated and appears to have strengthened the commitment of the participants.

50. While the GFP network has the potential of being a critical resource for coordination and support for the GPGE, the review found that many challenges needed to be overcome in order for the network to realize its full potential. First, GFP’s responsibilities are not always included in their job descriptions and even when they are, they are perceived to be additional tasks. According to interviews with GFPs, some receive strong support from their supervisors and can allocate time for their additional tasks, but others cannot, are not allowed to, or don’t set the same priorities. The effectiveness of the role a GFP can play therefore depends on personal commitment, as well as that of his/her supervisor.

51. Second, there are currently no incentives for GFPs to fulfill the roles assigned to them in the DG note. GFP tasks are not always included in UNESCO’s Performance Appraisal System for Staff Members (PerfoWeb). Following the GFPs’ appointment, their work as GFPs and contribution to the network has so far not been reviewed. Third, while there are some very active GFPs that play an important role in supporting GPGE within their sectors, there is simply no way of knowing how many GFPs are doing that. The lack of information on the activity of the GFP network is a major setback.

52. Finally, as was revealed during the ILO PGA, there is gender expertise in UNESCO’s programme sectors that is not officially recognized as part of the GFP network. It would be important to include all staff members with gender expertise and commitment in the network, so that all available resources could be used in the most effective way for Priority Gender Equality. HRM could contribute to this endeavour by ensuring that gender expertise is included as an asset in new vacancy announcements.
The Division for Gender Equality has been implementing a “Capacity Development and Training Programme for Gender Mainstreaming” for UNESCO staff since September 2005. This training was made mandatory for all permanent staff from the P1 to the D2 level in November 2005.14 There has been documented training in all Sectors and in several field offices, but the ambition to have all staff trained by 2013 does not seem to be realized. A typical Gender Equality Training includes an introduction, a review of concepts and goals, presentations of the GEAP and the Organization’s mainstreaming strategy. It then continues with a working session on how to apply mainstreaming in work plans, and ends with a presentation of tools and guidelines for daily work. The content of the training seems appropriate, but in most sessions relatively little time is allocated to the practical task of gender mainstreaming, or to the development of gender specific activities. The workshops seem to provide a good starting point with their emphasis on introduction and motivation, but they are not, cannot and should not be seen as sufficient in terms of capacity-building for gender mainstreaming.

ODG/GE distributes evaluation forms after each workshop. The data collected was used to generate descriptive statistics, but the information provided does not appear to be systematically analysed and used to improve future sessions. While the comments provided by participants on the workshops show that they were overall satisfied with the training and that they considered it to be relevant, they also provided many comments on how to improve them.

In addition to organized training sessions, ODG/GE launched the UNESCO Gender Equality eLearning Programme Version 1 in September 2005 as part of UNESCO’s “Capacity Development and Training in Gender Mainstreaming Programme”. The eLearning Programme was designed with three objectives. Upon completion, UNESCO staff should be able to: (1) understand UNESCO’s approach and commitment to Gender Equality; (2) be able to mainstream gender in their daily work, and (3) be able to support changes in attitudes and behaviour in support of the Global Priority Gender Equality at all levels – national, regional, and international.

While overly ambitious, these objectives are certainly relevant. However, the review found that only the first of the three objectives can really be achieved upon completion of the current eLearning Programme due to the following shortcomings:

- Technically, the modules are difficult to navigate with windows closing too slowly or too fast and often not leaving enough time for the user to fully grasp the information provided;
- A number of links either don’t function or are outdated;
- Gender mainstreaming modules are overly simplistic, focusing too much on language and not providing in-depth practical examples;
- Some of the information provided is not up to date;
- Most modules target only programme sector staff and do not seem to concern central services, therefore leaving out a large proportion of the Organization;
- The quizzes and tests throughout the modules are also overly simplistic and do not provide the user who gives a wrong answer with the correct one.

If several technical and content improvements are made, the eLearning programme could become a useful tool for introducing Gender Equality concepts and mechanisms to all staff. It should,  

---

14 A large number of the Organization’s temporary staff (on a wide variety of contracts) have not had Gender Equality Training.
15 It should be noted that the capacity-building programme was constrained by the financial situation of the Organization as of November 2011.
16 For example, the Gender Mainstreaming Training IIEP, Paris, February 2011; or the Gender Equality Training for SHS, Paris, January 2012.
however, not be expected that such an eLearning Programme, even if improved, could really fulfill the training programme’s second objective to enable UNESCO staff to mainstream gender in their daily work. As mainstreaming is best learned by doing, ODG/GE could consider shortening the eLearning modules to cover basic theory and concepts and then have follow-up workshops to cover mainstreaming. Similar initiatives are already taking place. Should the eLearning Programme remain to be mandatory, a mechanism needs to be put in place to ensure that staff members actually follow the course. Right now, it is not clear how many staff members have completed it, as no information on this is available.

58. During 2012 the ODG/GE launched a new initiative with a more tailor-made and flexible approach to capacity development in the form of Gender Equality Clinics and Brown Bag Lunches. The Clinics are meant to assist colleagues in mainstreaming Gender Equality into work plans, project proposals and other key documents. Ten sessions have taken place since April 2012, involving staff from Headquarters, Field Offices and Institutes (CLT, SC, CI, IBE, and Field offices in Amman, Apia, Harare, Lima and Quito). The Brown Bag Lunches are informal lunch-time conferences that aim to facilitate exchange between Gender Focal Points, and to offer learning opportunities on recent developments or relevant work for all interested colleagues. The sessions aim to maximize horizontal exchanges and dialogue, and video/teleconference facilities are used to encourage the participation of Field Office staff. The three sessions organized in the first half of 2012 focused on "Mainstreaming Gender Equality in Work Plans", "RIO+20: Outcomes from a Gender Equality Perspective" and "Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI)", with the participation of OECD colleagues as presenters.\textsuperscript{18}

59. The capacity-building for priority Gender Equality has expanded and evolved significantly since 2005. Over the past year, new, more interactive and tailor-made approaches were developed. This is a very positive development. It will, of course, also be important to continue to monitor participants’ satisfaction with the training and the effects of the capacity-building efforts. Training needs change, and many UNESCO staff would benefit from training or knowledge sharing at a more advanced level.

60. Overall, the review showed that the scale and significance of the gender expertise that is needed for full implementation of the GPGE and the challenges related to developing this level of expertise are under-estimated by UNESCO. The above mentioned initiatives, once improved and expanded, will certainly contribute to advancing GPGE. They might not, however, suffice to address some of the larger, more complicated issues involved. For instance, the complexities around the meaning of ‘Gender Equality’ are not sufficiently discussed and need to be more clearly articulated. Problems exist with regard to the identification of results and outcomes and of measurable indicators. There is need for a theory of gender inequality, i.e. of the causal pathways that link actions to results and outcomes. The case studies furthermore show that very little progress has been made with regard to mainstreaming.

61. All this points to the fact that gender expertise is insufficient in the organization and that the level of skills needed goes beyond what one could acquire during the courses offered to staff and the e-learning. While the capacity development initiatives are certainly steps in the right direction, there is need to not only intensify and strengthen such efforts, but also to ensure that in the long run the depth of knowledge available in HQ and in the field is similar to that of other professional fields. UNESCO should conduct a mapping exercise of existing expertise, and based on that develop a long-term capacity-building plan that would help the organization be more strategic in how it addresses capacity gaps and builds the expertise required to meet present and future challenges related to GPGE.

The Challenges of accountability

62. One of the key lessons learned on mainstreaming Gender Equality in development agencies is that there must be systems of accountability, with incentives and sanctions. These systems must have ‘bite’ enough so there’s no possibility that either staff or managers can evade the responsibility to deliver Gender Equality results. The first step in such a system of accountability lies in the formulation of targets, objectives, results and indicators of performance. The problems with the current system of Expected Results and indicators for Priority Gender Equality were discussed in the previous chapter. Activity-level (and financial) reporting in the Organization focuses on the C5 Expected Results in SISTER. As the current GEAP’s Expected Outcomes are not fully included in the C/5, they are also not automatically part of all monitoring efforts nor are they reported on in SISTER. Consequently, as it is currently not possible to systematically document activity-level results related to the GEAP, it is also difficult to establish accountability.

63. Systems of incentives could still be put in place, for example by rewarding successful mainstreaming initiatives or by sharing particularly interesting and successful gender-specific programmes as good practices with all staff. The review has not seen any examples of such reward systems, and there is no particular budget line providing easier access to gender specific projects either. They appear to compete with other project ideas, and while some are awarded RP funding, others fail. There is also no favoured access to extra-budgetary funding, although some donor agencies might be particularly interested in supporting gender-specific programmes.

64. The review has also not seen any examples of holding staff accountable for failing to contribute to the GPGE. This, of course, would also be difficult, given that results achieved with regard to the GEAP are not systematically measured. It was noted that the share of resources that sectors dedicate to the GPGE varies, but this does not seem to have any consequences, neither positive nor negative. Many of the people interviewed underline that staff, including managers, would welcome both incentives and sanctions, and that they should be integrated in current systems of performance assessment. This would also be in line with the GEAP, which has a section on accountability that says that the implementation of GPGE is the responsibility of all staff.

Concluding remarks

65. The new Director-General focused attention on Gender Equality upon taking office in 2010. A Task Force was appointed and the Gender Equality Division was relocated and given higher visibility. The network of Gender Focal Points has been given a clear mandate and has 113 members. Capacity development has been strengthened and a number of initiatives to supplement traditional workshops have been launched. These changes indicate that since 2010 there is a new level of effort, commitment and momentum added to the GPGE.

66. UNESCO is still far from reaching all staff members with relevant and effective tools and instruments for gender mainstreaming. There is a need to develop gender mainstreaming capacities in the Organization. This task cannot be left to ODG/GE alone. The Gender Focal Point network should be strengthened and supported to help the Organization implement GPGE in sectors and central services. GFPs need to be given the opportunity, encouragement and support from their supervisors to contribute. Staff members at all levels, especially the higher ones, ought to be held accountable for their contribution to GPGE.

67. An organization-wide long-term capacity-building plan should be developed based on the mapping of available gender expertise. This plan should clearly outline what kind of expertise will

---

20 The Report of the Director-General on UNESCO Actions Promoting Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality that is presented to the General Conference every two years since 2009, presents an overall assessment of progress made towards meeting GEAP outcomes. It does not provide detailed information against GPGE related indicators.
21 Part I, Add 2 – page 16
be needed in the future, what kind of expertise is currently missing in the Organization, what measures will be taken to address these gaps, how they will be taken, who should benefit and by when.

68. A significant challenge concerns the accountability mechanisms in relation to the GPGE. The notion of accountability is expressed in the GEAP, but does not have sufficient clout to ascertain that all staff members deliver results in line with the Global Priority. Accountability must build on a clear and unambiguous expression of results, but so far the systems to measure and report on results related to the GEAP cannot be translated into a comparative performance assessment in the organization. The review has also not been able to identify any general, organization-wide incentives for initiatives that contribute to Priority Gender Equality.
Chapter 4: The Evaluation Function and Gender Equality

Introduction

69. This chapter discusses how the Global Priority Gender Equality is managed in the evaluation function. Between 2008 and 2012 (5 years) a total of 22 evaluations were commissioned, implemented and published by the Internal Oversight Service (IOS) on UNESCO’s website. The 22 evaluations cover a wide range of activities. They include synthesis evaluations of UNESCO’s work on the Strategic Programme Objectives; evaluations of specific collaboration patterns, such as an evaluation of UNESCO prizes, an evaluation of cooperation with National Commissions, and of Capacity-building Programmes in respect of Education for All; as well as evaluations of specific programmes and funds, such as the Evaluation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity. Table 4.1 lists the 22 evaluations. None of them has a specific gender focus and none of them is focused on a gender specific activity.

Evaluation teams

70. With regard to the right sex balance within the evaluation teams, it is reasonable to look for an equitable sex ratio as one would do in any other variable relating to personnel, management and human resources. The review shows that sex ratio amongst the authors of these 22 reports has indeed been balanced. Five of the reports do not mention the names of the evaluators, only that they were done by IOS. The remaining 17 evaluations were undertaken by evaluation teams composed of a total of 54 evaluators, 27 of who were males and 27 females. This, of course, says nothing about the gender expertise of the individual experts.

Evaluation questions

71. The next issue the present review looked at is whether the evaluations were geared to assess the activities with a gender lens. Evaluation Terms of Reference should, for instance, require evaluation teams to collect sex disaggregated data, assess to what extent both women and men were involved in the implementation of the evaluated activities, and how the evaluated activities affected men and women, boys and girls, differentially, and in particular, if they had any imbalances or any adverse effects – or side effects - for either sex.

72. The analysis of these 22 reports shows that twelve of the Terms of Reference required the evaluation teams to look at Gender Equality (Table 4.1). The evaluations of Strategic Programme Objectives (SPO) all had a similar Terms of Reference, which among other tasks asked the evaluators to analyze to what extent the activities took into consideration and had attained results in terms of the Strategic Priorities (both Africa and Gender Equality). The Terms of Reference were general, and did not go into details by, for example, requesting that evaluators collect for gender specific data or evaluate results on gender specific objectives. Under such circumstances this depends very much on the evaluation teams what focus and depth they give to Gender Equality in their analysis.

Extent of analysis

73. As Table 4.1 shows, eleven out of the 22 evaluation reports present an analysis of Gender Equality. In most cases it occupies a section of a chapter that bears 'Gender Equality' in the title, and most of the time that chapter immediately follows a section on the other Global Priority, Africa. In no case do the evaluations merge an analysis of the two strategic priorities. The evaluation reports vary between short reports of 30 pages and long reports of 60 – 70 pages. The number of pages devoted to the analysis of progress made towards Gender Equality seldom goes beyond two pages. Most of the time the subject is treated on 1 page (if it is treated at all). In quantitative terms the
analysis of Gender Equality gets around 3% of the attention in the text of the reports where this is requested.

Table 4.1: Terms of Reference, Analysis, Conclusions and Recommendations in Respect of Gender in evaluation reports 2008 - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Gender Equality in ToR</th>
<th>Gender Equality Analysis</th>
<th>Gender Equality Conclusions</th>
<th>Impact on Gender Equality</th>
<th>Process Aspects of Gender Equality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the Capacity-building for EFA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of UNESCO Santiago’s Regional Network of School Leadership Development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the Literacy Assessment and Monitoring Programme</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the Latin American Laboratory for the Evaluation of Educational Quality</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of SPO 1 and 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Learning and Development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of SPO 6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of SPO 4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of SPO 11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of SPO 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of SPO 12 and 13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent External Evaluation of UNESCO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of SPO 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of SPO 9 and 10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of UNESCO Liaison Offices</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the Cooperation of UNESCO’s Secretariat with the National Commissions for UNESCO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of UNESCO Culture Sector’s work on intercultural dialogue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of UNESCO Prizes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the IOCARIBE Secretariat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of UNESCO Priority Africa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the Pilot Phase of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74. None of the evaluation reports make use of sex disaggregated data for the full range of analysis, even though there are a few that comment on sex ratios in respect of interventions. Gender Equality is never mainstreamed in the reports, the subject is always covered as a separate item, never integrated in the analysis of other issues.

75. As for the quality of the evaluation texts on Priority Gender Equality, they can be classified into three different categories:

- **Descriptive texts** that inform the reader about activities in relation to GPGE. This is the most common type of text. It may, for example, be mentioned that there has been a training programme targeted at female participants, or the programme has financed a gender sensitive training, or that it might have developed a study of gender. Eleven of the evaluations contained such descriptive texts of one or more activities relating to Gender Equality.
• **Process discussions**, in those cases where the evaluation teams looked at how the evaluated activity works with the GPGE. The focus was on gender mainstreaming, and the evaluations conclude that there are significant problems in making that happen.

• **Impact analysis**, where the evaluations conclude on whether the expected objectives were achieved, whether the evaluated activities actually contributed to GPGE, even if only in a specific local context, or whether the activities had an impact. Three of the evaluations contained a discussion of impact. However, the descriptions of results remain at the outputs/outcomes level only, and there are no examples of a theory of change that had been verified.

76. In sum, the priority Gender Equality is treated in around half the evaluation reports and is primarily descriptive and process oriented. Only 3 of the 22 reports raised issues of impact. The question, of course, is whether the conclusions on impact would hold up to a careful scrutiny of reliability and validity. Without claiming that all impact evaluations have to have an experimental design, the analyses in these three reports could not be considered to be trustworthy analyses of impact.

### Concluding remarks

77. Evaluations undertaken during the period of the GEAP have addressed issues of Gender Equality in some 50% of the reports. Evaluations of all SPOs were required to ask questions on the strategic priorities, and several of the other key evaluations have also addressed the priority. The analytical content varies, but it tends to be descriptive and process oriented, and seldom informative in respect of impact. There is thus little to be found on results of the GPGE in the evaluation reports. The evaluations point to specific issues, experiences and results of Gender Equality activities such as:

• Gender specific activities appear to be few and their share of activities remains small.

• There is little evidence of successfully mainstreaming Gender Equality in activities, although each SPO and each evaluation can point to some examples of good practice.

• There is a lack of continuous reporting on the achievement of goals and targets and the evaluation teams have not been able to use any secondary information, such as indicators from performance management systems.

• The evaluation teams’ analyses focus on process and rarely provide robust evidence of results.

78. The review identified several possible explanations for the lack of attention to the GPGE in evaluation: other evaluation questions are given higher priority; the Terms of Reference for evaluations are not focused enough; the evaluation teams/evaluators lack the necessary skills; there is a lack of sex disaggregated data presented in sectors’ progress reports that could be used by evaluation teams; and the issue itself might not be a feasible evaluation task. In all likelihood all factors play a role, and sometimes it might be one and at other times another. If the evaluation system is to provide comprehensive and trustworthy evidence on results in relation to the Global Priority it needs to be scaled up considerably in terms of; (1) coverage of Gender Equality in the Terms of Reference, (2) collection of sex disaggregated and gender sensitive data, (3) methods of analysis, and (4) targeted recommendations. As information on results is a precondition for accountability, this should be a priority.
Chapter 5: Gender-specific programming and Mainstreaming

Introduction

79. This chapter focuses on the relevance and the results of UNESCO’s interventions at two different levels:

- **Results of gender-specific programming**: UNESCO operates a number of gender specific interventions, which specifically address one or several needs of one particular gender, in most cases those of women and girls. This review attempts to look at the results achieved by some of these interventions.

- **Results of mainstreaming Gender Equality throughout the programming cycle**: As the policy documents make clear, the Global Priority Gender Equality is to be mainstreamed throughout the programming cycle at all programme levels. With regard to gender mainstreaming, the review examined to what extent Gender Equality concerns were integrated throughout the programming cycle.

Gender-specific programming

80. UNESCO’s management information system SISTER includes all gender-specific activities but does not dispose of any function that would allow to count their number, to aggregate information contained in activity reports, or to track the overall budget allocated and spent. This makes it impossible to provide exact information on these variables.

81. A simple word search was therefore undertaken to obtain a very rough indication of the extent of UNESCO’s engagement. Using the words “gender”, “women”, “girls”, “men”, and “boys” to search the titles of activities identified 135 gender-specific activities implemented by Headquarters and Field Offices in the current biennium (36 C/5). This information is to be taken with caution as there is no guarantee that all gender-specific activities were captured. The word search produced the following information:

- 47 activities funded by the regular programme (of which, 12 had “women” in title, 26 had “gender”, 1 had “girls”, 2 had “men”, 1 had “boys”, 2 had “girls” and “women”, 1 had “girls” and “boys”, and 2 had “women” and “men”) with a total operational budget of USD 1,172,129;

- Of the 47 regular programme activities, 1 is being implemented by ODG/GE with a total budget of USD 10,000;

- 88 activities funded by extrabudgetary resources (of which, 31 had “women” in title, 26 had “gender”, 9 had “girls”, 4 had “women” and “girls”, 6 had “women” and “gender”, and 2 had “women” “girls” and “gender”) with a total budget allotment of USD 10,908,429; and,

- Of the 88 extrabudgetary activities, 3 are being implemented by ODG/GE with a total budget of USD 32,132.

82. In addition to the activities mentioned above, ODG GE is also implementing 2 other regular programme gender-specific activities (that don’t have any of the five keywords in their titles) with a total operational budget of USD 70,000 and 1 Additional Appropriation for International Women’s Day with a total budget of USD 17,239.

---

22 36 C/4, 36 C/5, GEAP 2008 – 2013
23 The search was conducted on 13 February 2013. All budget figures reflect the data downloaded on this date. All results containing at least two of the keys words have not been double counted. For regular programme activities the figures cited reflect the Total Operational Budget for 2012-2013. For extrabudgetary projects the figures reflect the Total Allotment for 2012-2013.
Based on the information above, the review found that the budgets for gender-specific regular programme activities range between USD 3,500 to just over USD 100,000. Dividing the total gender-specific regular programme activity budget (USD 1,172,129 + USD 70,000 from ODG GE) by the number of activities (49) reveals that the average budget for a regular programme activity is around USD 25,000. The allotments for gender-specific extrabudgetary activities range between USD 2,000 to over USD 4,000,000. Dividing the total gender-specific allotment budget (USD 10,908,429) by the number of activities (88) reveals that the average allotment for an extrabudgetary activity is approximately USD 124,000.

Overall, the absence of a financial resource tracking mechanism to quantify disbursement of funds that promote Gender Equality and women’s empowerment hampers UNESCO’s ability to demonstrate whether its commitment with regard to GPGE is actually followed-through.

Eight gender-specific interventions were selected by the present review for a closer analysis. The case studies below present findings on the relevance and results of these activities.

**Case 1: Addressing homophobic bullying and gender based violence in the school setting in Central America and the Caribbean (implemented by the UNESCO Santiago Office during 2012-2013, as part of a global programme)**

**Description:** This activity is part of UNESCO's larger programme that focuses on health education and safe learning environments. After convening the first-ever international consultation to address homophobic bullying in educational institutions, in May 2012 UNESCO released the “Good Policy and Practice in HIV and Health Education – Booklet 8: Education Sector Responses to Homophobic Bullying”. Within the larger global programme, the aim of the Santiago Office’s activity is to support processes that document the extent of the problem of bullying in schools, in particular as it relates to gender stereotyping. The project is expected to generate knowledge and document the issues surrounding homophobic bullying and gender-based violence in the school setting in Latin America and the Caribbean and to make this information available to key stakeholders for decision-making in schools and communities.

**Budget:** USD 57,000 from the regular programme and it is expected that another USD 200,000 will be contributed from other sources.

**Partners:** UNESCO is partnering with other UN agencies (UNDP and UNICEF) that are also providing funding.

**Relevance:** As defined in the ED booklet, homophobic bullying is a “gender-specific type of bullying that is based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity”. The project’s focus on the theme is therefore of extreme relevance to UNESCO’s pursuit of Gender Equality. The project conceptualizes gender in novel and interesting ways, focusing on male stereotypes and images of masculinity that lead boys and young men into violence and criminality. It combines several of UNESCO’s roles and is implemented in collaboration with UN partners. It is connected to the overarching programme objectives in C/4 and C/5.

**Results:** UNESCO Santiago supported the translation of the booklet on the Education Sector Responses to Homophobic Bullying into Spanish and began to disseminate the document at a launch in December 2012. It is also supporting a study on the prevalence of homophobic bullying in Peru, Chile and Guatemala in cooperation with UNDP Panama. Additional dissemination of both studies is planned for 2013 as well as consultations with stakeholders such as policy-makers and teachers. The intervention is building on a clearly articulated theory of change demonstrating how knowledge of basic indicators can lead to changing patterns of behaviour in schools (students, teachers) and to changes in gender stereotyping that can later have an impact on the

---

24 Criteria for the selection of the case studies included: representation of all Programme Sectors, Headquarters- and field-managed activities, smaller and larger volume budgets, geographical representation. Sources for the case studies included documents and interviews with programme staff.
wider variables of mental and physical health. The project is designed with indicators of progress and can be expected to show results at the end of the intervention. Though it is a pilot project, it relies on advocacy and partnerships that make it possible to scale up efforts in light of the results and thus lead to wider impact on Gender Equality.

Case 2: Accelerate progress towards scaling up gender-sensitive and quality literacy and non-formal education programmes (implemented by the Division for Basic Learning and Skills Development (ED) during 2012-2013)

91. **Description:** In 2012 some 42 countries were identified as being at risk of not achieving the 2015 goal of a 50% increase in youth and adult literacy rates. The intervention therefore aims to contribute to raising literacy levels of priority countries and coordinate UNESCO’s support to strengthen national capacities for accelerating the pace of scaling up quality literacy programmes. It fits under the Literacy Initiative For Empowerment (LIFE) strategy for 2006-2015, developed by the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning, whose objectives include achieving Gender Equality in education.

92. **Budget:** USD 80,000 from the regular programme, but there is also a possibility of generating extrabudgetary funding and thus to expand activities to more countries, for example to Iraq.

93. **Partners:** Many partners are associated with the activity: UNESCO field offices and institutes, UNECO Literacy prize winners, and EFA affiliated civil society organizations. The interventions were first meant to reach 42 countries, but because of budget cuts this number may be reduced.

94. **Relevance:** Given that girls and women constitute the majority of today’s illiterate population, gender specific literacy programmes are crucial to ensure Gender Equality. This intervention follows a rights-based approach, and the aim is to develop qualitative inputs to literacy education, inputs that address Gender Equality concerns while at the same time promoting literacy. The intervention relates to the MDG and to UNESCO’s overarching objectives in Education that are represented in national United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs); it is also an example of the involvement of a wide network of partners. The project has one gender-specific expected result (of three in total) and one related indicator which is quantitative in nature, just like all the others.

95. **Results:** A High-Level International Round Table on Literacy “Reaching the 2015 Literacy Target: Delivering on the promise” was organized by UNESCO’s Section for Literacy and Non-Formal Education in September 2012 at UNESCO Headquarters. The event was attended by more than 200 representatives from the 42 countries and its key outcome was the adoption of the Paris Communiqué on Scaling up Literacy through which participants agreed to step up their efforts towards and beyond 2015. The activity also provided assistance to national literacy plans, ensuring that they be revised with a specific gender focus. At the time of the review, national literacy plans were received from 10 countries. An examination of these plans indicates that gender aspects were indeed incorporated into all of them.
**Case 3: Enhancing Gender Equality and women's empowerment in and through media (implemented by the Section for Media and Society (CI) during 2012-2013)**

96. **Description:** In partnership with the International Federation of Journalists (IFJ), UNESCO prepared a set of *Gender-Sensitive Indicators for Media (GSIM)*. These indicators address: 1) the role of women in media 2) media policy requirements, 3) capacity-building for professionals and 4) the role of organizations, academic institutions, governments and civil society. Additionally, UNESCO supported a Global Report on the Status of Women in News Media, published with the International Women Media Foundation. The activity aims to engage in dialogue with media organizations to encourage them to establish mechanisms for the application of GSIM and to assess and guide media policies and practices concerning Gender Equality.

97. **Budget:** The total budget is USD 10,000 from the regular programme, plus USD 120,000 from the Emergency Fund.

98. **Partners:** The intervention is undertaken in partnership with the International Federation of Journalists and the International Women's Media Foundation.

99. **Relevance:** The intervention combines UNESCO’s ‘laboratory of ideas’ and ‘standard-setting’ functions. It also brings together a variety of international and local actors. The project’s focus is on equality between men and women working in the media and balance in news reporting on men and women; therefore making this activity very relevant to UNESCO’s gender-specific programming. Gender has not been mainstreamed into the activity’s three expected results, but three out of six indicators reflect gender dimensions.

100. **Results:** The GSIM was published, translated into several languages and endorsed by the Council of the International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC) during an international debate on gender and the media in March 2012. The event was attended by representatives of media organizations from more than 40 counties, including nine major broadcasting unions. In addition, "Women Make the News", a global policy advocacy event aimed at promoting Gender Equality in the media was initiated on International Women’s Day. At the time of the review, the activity reports that 20 public service broadcasters have officially adapted and piloted the GSIM in their policies and partnerships.

**Case 4: Support for Networks of Women Engineers and Scientists in Africa (implemented by the Nairobi Office in 2010-2011)**

101. **Description:** This intervention consisted of support for the activities of the newly established Forum for Women Engineers and Girl Scientists in Africa and those of existing women scientists' associations; girls' science camps; and support for gender mainstreaming in science and technology in Ministries of Education and Science. The project aimed at sensitizing several African Member States to formulate guidelines on how to mainstream gender in science and technology by emphasizing the need for national surveys on women's participation in science technology and innovation in institutions of learning as well as in the countries' workforce.

102. **Budget:** USD 55,000 from the regular programme.

103. **Partners:** Women scientists at engineering faculties in selected African countries.

104. **Relevance:** The intervention is well in line with the overarching objectives expressed for the Science Sector in the 36 C/4 and the GEAP. It builds on UNESCO’s role as a network builder, but does not combine with other roles. Although it was planned that the project would continue with a second and extended phase, funding has not been available. The activity’s three expected outcomes are gender-specific and so are all four indicators.

105. **Results:** Two Scientific Camps of Excellence were organized for girls by Forum-WEGSA in Botswana and Zimbabwe, generating interest among several private sector companies. In addition, baseline studies were conducted and finalized in Kenya and Botswana that aim to
inform policy in both Kenya and Botswana. The main outcome of the activity, however, was that the network for women engineers was created and now has a life of its own, with no further UNESCO support. Even though the activity came to an end, the members of the network continue to interact, maintain a web presence, and undertake activities to encourage girls to take up engineering professions. The most active parts of the network seem to be in Botswana, Swaziland, Zimbabwe and South Africa. The network, however, appears to have a life and sustainability of its own and UNESCO has stopped following its activities once the Organization’s support came to an end.

**Case 5: Enhancing Gender mainstreaming in Science and Engineering courses for increased participation of female students in Nigeria (implemented by the Abuja Office during 2010-2011)**

106. **Description:** As the number of female students taking science subjects in their Senior Secondary School Certificate Examination (SSCE) in Nigeria is in decline, the project aimed to increase awareness among girls of the importance of science subjects. More specifically, the project objectives were to: (1) popularize science and engineering subjects amongst SSCE female students in selected schools, (2) increase the number of female students from selected schools offering science subjects in SSCE and Science/Engineering courses in tertiary institutions, (3) promote gender equity and mainstreaming of science and engineering courses for increased participation of female students, (4) produce more female scientists and professional engineers in the nearest future, (5) build the capacity of science teachers using ICT and other electronic teaching and learning strategies. The project was initiated in six girls’ secondary schools.

107. **Budget:** USD 22,168 from the regular programme.

108. **Partners:** UNESCO worked with the Science Teachers Association of Nigeria (STAN), and the activities related to a large World Bank project on science education. Other partners included the Federal Ministry of Science and Technology, Federal Ministry of Education, Ministry of Women Affairs, Association of Professional Women Engineers (APWEN), UNIFEM, parents associations, industry and labour market representatives.

109. **Relevance:** The intervention is well in line with the overarching objectives expressed for the Education Sector in the 36 C/4 and the GEAP. It builds on UNESCO’s role as a laboratory of ideas, advocacy and network builder. The activity’s five objectives are gender-specific and so are both of its Expected Results and four out of five indicators.

110. **Results:** According to the project implementation report by STAN, the project brought together a team of science subject specialists who produced modules in Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics. Interactive CD modules were then created and 300 copies were distributed to the six schools, one from each geo-political zone. The project targeted female students early on in their education with the aim of increasing their interest in science subjects, therefore leading them to select science subjects in their SSCE examinations and later enrolling in science and engineering courses in higher institutions. In the long term, the project is expected to lead to an increasing number of female workers in the science and engineering sectors in Nigeria. The report concludes that the full impact of the project will be evident in 3 years time when the pioneer female students will have taken their final exams. Looking at the project’s five objectives, it must be concluded that the results fall short of targets, but that the teaching modules and CDs, if well developed, may have an impact on the school curriculum. The implementation report does not give any information on teachers’ capacity-building, laboratory equipment or library support.

**Case 6: UNESCO Report on Gender and Culture (implemented by the Culture Sector during 2012-2013)**

111. **Description:** The activity is meant to result in the production and publication of a UNESCO Report that will map the impact of culture on women’s empowerment and equality. More specifically, the
activity aims to 1) provide a detailed global snapshot, taking stock of the recent progress in promoting Gender Equality and empowerment of women in the cultural sector; 2) establish a data baseline and propose new indicators for future progress assessments; 3) highlight good practices from across the world of policies and measures that promote the empowerment of women in the cultural sector; 4) analyze certain cultural sub-sectors (e.g. design, audiovisual, heritage) in order to identify gender differences across the sector; 5) propose actionable recommendations, plans and policies; and 6) demonstrate the added value of culture for empowerment through a pilot project.

112. **Budget:** USD 14,500 plus an additional USD 300,000 is being sought.

113. **Partners:** Member States and local partners.

114. **Relevance:** The Report’s specific focus on the cultural sector draws on UNESCO's mandate in the field of culture and builds on the recommendations and findings of recent UN reports and UNGA resolutions, the Stockholm Conference Action Plan on Cultural Policies for Development (1998) as well as UNESCO research and reports, including statutory documents and *Our Creative Diversity* (1995). It is thus connected to the overarching objective of the Culture sector and relates to UNESCO's normative work.

115. **Results:** The report is expected to be completed by early 2014. Other key deliverables of the activity include an interactive media platform, and two operational projects, a film-making documentary programme and a leadership skills programme. The activity’s completion is entirely subject to the availability of extrabudgetary funding.

**Case 7: UBRAF "Scaling up gender-responsive and rights-based comprehensive sexuality education in China through curriculum review, educator training and outreach activities for young key populations" (implemented by the Beijing Office during 2012-2013)**

116. **Description:** The aim of the intervention is to support scaling up of gender-responsive and rights-based comprehensive sexuality education, which addresses HIV and sexual risk behaviours of young people through a sexuality education programme and curriculum review; policy advocacy and support to educator training; and outreach to young key affected populations.

117. **Budget:** USD 135,800 from extrabudgetary resources.

118. **Partners:** Ministry of Education, civil society organizations.

119. **Relevance:** The project addresses Gender Equality concerns as it is impossible to talk about sexuality education without also talking about gender – this has been ingrained in professional thinking. The intervention takes into account Gender Equality in the implementation strategy and one of the three expected results has a gender focus. The project is in line with the overarching objectives of the C/4 and C/5, and it is a priority of UNAIDS and other UN partners. Communication and knowledge building on Gender Equality concerns among young people is a key element in combating HIV/AIDS; therefore the activity was found to be relevant.

120. **Results:** A total of 25 teachers from 21 different colleges/universities of 14 prefectures of Yunnan were trained in school-based sexuality education in August 2012. The workshop covered ten different subjects including gender and sexuality education and gender diversity. Technical support for an online survey on homophobic bullying and educational materials were also provided to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender organizations. It is yet too early to conclude on longer-term results of this activity, however, the intervention has a monitoring system and an approach to results that will be able to indicate achievements.
Case 8: Joint Programme: Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality (implemented by the Maputo Office during 2008-2012)

121. **Description:** The Joint Programme on Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality aimed to maximize the UN’s effectiveness and strengthen its support in the areas of gender sensitive legislation, economic empowerment of women and elimination of gender-based violence. The programme was meant to contribute towards building the capacity of the government and partners from civil society in advocating for gender sensitive legislation and disseminating information on women's rights, supporting national efforts to fulfill commitments made to women on the national agenda; enhancing economic empowerment of women through enterprise development and access to credit; and increasing women’s and girls’ access to basic education. The Programme aimed to strengthen institutional capacity through the provision of joint and systematic training, monitoring and evaluation and reporting on progress in order to learn from good practices, complement government efforts based on the UN's comparative advantages, joining efforts and mobilizing the necessary resources for a common goal.

122. **Budget:** USD 758,111 from extrabudgetary resources.

123. **Partners:** The Joint UN Programme involved nine UN agencies: UNDP, UNFPA, UNIDO, ILO, FAO, UNIFEM, UNICEF, UNESCO and WHO, and the coordinator of this joint programme is UNFPA. A large number of government ministries, civil society organizations, and academic institutions were also involved in implementation.

124. **Relevance:** The programme contributes to the GPGE in its expected result: “National capacities strengthened for policy formulation and planning focusing on promoting the right to quality education and Gender Equality.” It is part of a UN joint programme and thus in line with the Organization’s Partnership strategy. Two out of three of its Expected Results are gender-specific and so are three of five indicators.

125. **Results:** Together with other UN agencies, UNESCO trained government and partner organizations in integrating gender, culture and human rights into legislation. UNESCO’s Cultural Diversity Lens was applied in the training sessions. Partnerships were also developed with local authorities to strengthen TVET training. As a result, a number of guiding documents on Gender Equality were produced, including the National Action Plan for Advancement of Women. The final report in SISTER explains that government institutions and civil society organizations now have strategic plans reflecting gender mainstreaming issues at national, provincial and district levels and that a Chair on customary Law has been installed at the Faculty of Law - University Eduardo Mondlane. Access to justice and penal reforms have also led to progress. The number of cases related to gender based violence reported, mediated and solved by the formal structures, civil society organizations and traditional leaders at community levels has increased. While the project can successfully claim to have strengthened government and civil society capacities, the longer-term results are not yet known.

126. The case studies illustrate examples of gender-specific interventions in all five of UNESCO’s programme sectors. All activities were found to be relevant, in line with UNESCO’s objectives and to contain gender-specific objectives, expected results and indicators. While it is too early to speak of long-term results, the analysis shows that progress was made in achieving the activities’ expected results at the output level. Some of the activities were also part of other UNESCO programmes and longer-term initiatives. In most activities, UNESCO engaged with a wide variety of partners from governments to civil society to academia.

**Gender mainstreaming**

127. Gender mainstreaming represents the second pillar in UNESCO’s dual approach to promoting Gender Equality. The GEAP (page 2) defines mainstreaming as follows:
“UNESCO’s gender mainstreaming approach ensures that women and men benefit equally from programme and policy support. Mainstreaming is intended to transform development such that equality becomes both a means and an end. It aims at achieving all international development goals, including, but not only, those explicitly seeking to achieve Gender Equality. Gender mainstreaming means:

- identifying gaps in Gender Equality through the use of gender analysis and sex-disaggregated data;
- raising awareness about gaps;
- building support for change through advocacy and alliances/partnerships;
- developing strategies and programmes to close existing gaps;
- putting adequate resources and the necessary expertise into place;
- monitoring implementation; and,
- holding individuals and institutions accountable for results.”

128. The list above can be used to assess achievements with regards to gender mainstreaming within UNESCO’s programmes. Table 5.1 summarizes the findings from the case studies, interviews and the inputs from the ILO Participatory Gender Audit. Another important input to the assessment in Table 5.1 comes from the evaluations of the Strategic Programme Objectives that were described in chapter 4.

Table 5.1: Assessment of the elements of Gender Equality Mainstreaming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>More in Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identifying gaps</td>
<td>Large differences between sectors and programme areas within sectors, some good practices, as for example gender indicators in Education and Communication and Information sectors’ activities.</td>
<td>5 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Raising awareness</td>
<td>Awareness is generally high, but not always built on substantive analysis of GE gaps. There have been significant efforts to raise awareness through capacity-building in the Organization.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Building support</td>
<td>Partnerships are often in place, but many interventions focus on a few partners rather than on network-building.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developing strategies</td>
<td>The C/4, C/5 and GEAP provide the strategic framework, but there is a need to coordinate and align these documents as well as to make them more coherent and focused.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adequate resources</td>
<td>Overall resources allocated to the priority Gender Equality are impossible to determine; however, they appear to be rather small.</td>
<td>2 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Monitoring implementation</td>
<td>There is limited progress in this area, as GEAP outcomes are often not linked to C/5 Expected Results, which are the ones being monitored and reported on in SISTER.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accountability</td>
<td>Not developed, and assumes information on results and processes leading to results.</td>
<td>3 and 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

129. A small sample of activities was analyzed in this review for evidence of gender mainstreaming. The analysis is presented below.

**Case 1: The Virtual Classroom: using new media to increase HIV knowledge among young people (implemented by the Education Sector and a number of Field Offices during 2012-2013)**

130. **Description:** The aim of the intervention is contribute to the UNAIDS Strategy 2011-2015 of empowering young people to protect themselves from HIV, by strengthening HIV knowledge and sexuality education, advocacy, leadership and participation among young people using the
platforms of social media, mobile phones and the Internet. It creates a “Virtual Classroom” web-based learning space that will be accessible through social media and mobile phones to provide young people aged 15 to 24 with resources, peer educator supported interactive facilities and youth friendly support and services on HIV.

131. **Budget:** USD 250,000 from extrabudgetary resources.

132. **Partners:** UNAIDS, UNICEF, UNFPA, civil society and media organizations, existing web platforms aimed at promoting young people’s health and well-being, Nokia.

133. **Relevance:** The basic content of the project consists of key components of HIV and sexuality education as outlined in the *International Technical Guidance on Sexuality Education*, which includes knowledge of Gender Equality and issues specific to young women and men. The intersectoral project is targeting one of UNESCO’s priority areas, youth, which therefore makes it all the more relevant. Gender, however, has not been mainstreamed into the project’s expected results or indicators.

134. **Results:** The web-based platform was not yet online at the time of this evaluation, but partnerships were being developed with youth organizations, NGOs and Nokia to host and implement the project. The project team was planning to involve the Gender Division in the design of all its activities with a ‘gender lens’. Gender could definitely have been mainstreamed further in the project’s design from the start, but there is still a potential for integrating gender elements into the development of partnerships and the targeting of future users of the platform.

**Case 2: School Readiness Program for Vulnerable Jordanian and Iraqi Youth (implemented by the Amman Office during 2009-2012)**

135. **Description:** The overall goal of the programme was to enhance school readiness for up to 1,500 at-risk and vulnerable Iraqi and Jordanian youth (aged 6-18). The project aimed to achieve this by registering them in informal education classes in three targeted communities in order to decrease the drop out rates of Iraqi and Jordanian youth, and by building the capacity of senior Ministry of Education staff from relevant directorates on inclusive education planning and minimum standards guidelines.

136. **Budget:** USD 773,000 from extrabudgetary resources.


138. **Relevance:** The project aims to address the education needs of Iraqi and Jordanian children and youth in a post-conflict post-disaster setting. While it contributes to the GPGE expected result “National capacities strengthened in designing and managing literacy policies and programmes targeting women and girls”, none of the projects expected results nor indicators include any evidence of gender mainstreaming. The potential for gender mainstreaming has therefore not been realized.

139. **Results:** The project does not report any gender-disaggregated data on the numbers of girls and boys who may have benefitted from the programme. While the results of the project are reported to have been achieved, the project documents or SISTER reports do not indicate any evidence of gender mainstreaming into the project design or implementation.

**Case 3: Establishing international standards and policy frameworks for bioethics (implemented by the Bioethics Team during 2012-2013)**

140. **Description:** Establishing international standards and policy frameworks for bioethics by reflecting on and elaborating bioethical principles, through the statutory bodies (International
Bioethics Committee (IBC) and Intergovernmental Bioethics Committee (IGBC) and the UN Interagency Committee on Bioethics (UNIACB).

141. **Budget:** USD 170,000 from the regular programme.

142. **Partners:** The statutory bodies IBC, IGBC and UNIACB are made up of networks of scientists, and representatives of government and civil society organizations.

143. **Relevance:** This activity is an excellent example of where new thinking in combination with support from ODG/GE identified and led to new opportunities for the mainstreaming of gender issues.

144. **Results:** Two draft IBC reports on Traditional medicines and its Ethical Implications and on Human Vulnerability and Personal Integrity were recently being prepared. It is in the second report that Gender Equality has been mainstreamed. While Gender Equality affects traditional medicines as well, the IBC decided to focus the gender mainstreaming on the 'Report on Human Vulnerability and Personal Integrity'. ODG/GE provided support for this, both through training and through personal advice on draft texts of the report. The final document is said to have changed considerably in light of this, and the introduction of the report even deserves to be quoted:

"Gender-related vulnerabilities and in particular the special vulnerabilities of women and girls have always been in the forefront of the Committee's reflections throughout its work on this publication. Females, both children and women, are given special attention in the Report. Seven of the eighteen cases proposed for discussion specifically refer to the treatment of women in healthcare delivery, research and the applications of new biotechnologies. Female cases are prominent as they are particularly exposed to the whole range of the social, cultural, economic, educational and political determinants of vulnerability."

This report is an example of an important output of UNESCO's normative work. Whether it leads to an increased concern for Gender Equality depends on how it is disseminated and used in the world. Of course, it won't be possible to trace its impact until many years later. Its impact would furthermore also be determined by many other factors. Nevertheless, the fact that gender is addressed in the report is definitely a positive result.

**Case 4: Development of the World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme at the UNESCO World Heritage Centre (implemented during 2012-2013)**

145. **Description:** The programme aims to provide support for the development of strategies for tourism and income generating activities around the World Heritage Sites. The programme is expected to initiate a number of activities that generate employment.

146. **Budget:** USD 450,000 from extrabudgetary resources.

147. **Partners:** Partnerships are being developed with other UN agencies (UNDP, development banks, and others) as well as with civil society organizations around World Heritage sites.

148. **Relevance:** The World Heritage Tourism Programme has the potential of making a significant contribution to the GPGE. Indeed the tourism sector employs a large number of women and can have a lasting effect on many gender issues.

149. **Results:** The analysis is based on a review of the World Heritage Tourism Programme strategy document that was presented to the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in July 2012. A review of the document indicates that gender concepts have not at all been integrated. While programme management generally recognized that female entrepreneurs could play an important role, the programme has not identified who they are, or whether they have any particular needs. No gender analysis has taken place. The programme officers in the WHC are aware of the Global Priority and sensitive to its needs and demands, but they have not been in contact with the ODG/GE and have not received any Gender Equality training.
**Case 5: Social, economic and educational roles of museums as vectors for sustainable development and intercultural dialogue promoted and capacity-building in this area strengthened, in particular in developing countries (implemented by the Museums Section of the Culture Sector during 2012-2013)**

150. **Description:** The Museums programme aims to mobilize scientific and technical stakeholders and development partners to promote and strengthen the role of museums as social, educational and economic actors, particularly in LDCs and in Africa as well as in countries in emergency situations as a result of conflict or natural disasters. The programme should contribute to development through capacity-building in museum management, inventory building, basic conservation, security and storage improvement, in combination with economic entrepreneurship. Museums' educational role shall be strengthened and expanded and access to museums increased in particular for youth.

151. **Budget:** USD 40,000 from the regular programme plus extrabudgetary resources are to be mobilized for the individual projects (this mobilization is part of the expected results).

152. **Partners:** The Culture sector lists 40 museum projects under the programme. The projects involve different partners including museums, bilateral funding agencies, civil society organizations, professional organizations in the museum and cultural heritage sphere - mainly governmental and civil society organizations in the museum sector.

153. **Relevance:** The project is expected to contribute to two GPGE expected results: (1) Involvement of women in the conservation and management of tangible and intangible cultural heritage increased, (2) Indigenous women's movement and faith-based organizations engaged in reconciliation and peace-building initiatives. However, none of the project's expected results nor indicators show any evidence of gender-mainstreaming. The multi sectoral nature of many of the sub-projects indicates that there is great potential for mainstreaming gender.

154. **Results:** An overview of the museums projects listed on the Culture website indicates that none of them has a gender focus with the exception of the opening of a Category II International Center for Women Artists in Amman Jordan. The review examined one of the projects “Thinking Towards a New Possible Standard-Setting Instrument for the Protection and Promotion of Museums and Collections” in more detail as that was deemed an excellent example of a project with a potential for gender mainstreaming. The review concludes that there was no indication of gender mainstreaming in that activity, no gender related analysis, nor any conclusions or evidence that gender may be of concern in the development of such an instrument.

**Case 6: International Programme for the Development of Communication (implemented by the IPDC Secretariat)**

155. **Description:** The IPDC is the only multilateral forum in the UN system designed to mobilize the international community to discuss and promote media development in developing countries. The Programme not only provides support for media projects but also seeks an accord to secure a healthy environment for the growth of free and pluralistic media in developing countries.

156. **Budget:** IPDC has mobilized some USD 100 million for over 1500 projects in more than 140 developing countries and countries in transition. The question of to what extent gender mainstreaming has taken place in these 1500 projects cannot be answered here, but the list of projects shows that there are several gender specific projects, for example, 'Gender Awareness and Media in China'.

157. **Partners:** There are several different partners, most of which are from the media sector – be they professional organizations, commercial organizations, or government agencies in that sector. UNESCO does not appear to have many other UN agencies or other types of civil society organizations as partners in this field.
Relevance: IPDC projects cover a broad range of fields covering, among others, the promotion of media independence and pluralism, development of community media, radio and television organizations, modernization of national and regional news agencies, and training of media professionals. The relevance of the programme is motivated by reference to the rapidly developing media world and its global impact.

Results: Projects are submitted to the IPDC by local media organizations and selected according to UNESCO’s strategic approach that applies the IPDC-endorsed Media Development Indicators. These indicators are not gender-specific, but the 44 page handbook contains a half-page of text on how the indicators can be made gender and poverty sensitive. UNESCO has developed gender sensitive indicators in another programme (see case 3 in gender-specific programming above), and using these would be a good way of mainstreaming gender in IPDC projects. It is also worth noting that the GPGE is not reflected among the four IPDC priorities. Furthermore, the IPDC Council recently examined evaluation reports for a number of IPDC projects (CI-12/CONF.2012/1 INF) which can be used to analyze gender mainstreaming. The present review examined these reports which cover 16 projects, one of which is gender specific. The objectives of the projects do not show any evidence of gender mainstreaming. Two of the capacity-building projects have objectives that express an expectation that female journalists will also be trained (in one case 60 journalists trained, of whom at least 15 should be female (the objective was not reached)). The evaluation reports sometimes present gender disaggregated data in respect of training. Overall, the review found that gender mainstreaming is either weak or absent in IPDC projects.

Case 7: International Hydrological Programme (IHP) (implemented by the Division of Water Sciences)

Description: As a science and education programme at the global level, IHP covers a wide spectrum of programmes and initiatives. All IHP-related activities are endorsed, recommended and coordinated through the IHP Intergovernmental Council. There are 11 different programmes under IHP, and several projects under each of these.

Partners: As the approach of the programme is to establish networks, there are several partners to each network and several networks on each continent.

Relevance: Gender mainstreaming can be expected to vary considerably in each of the different programmes under IHP. The IHP was evaluated in 2011 (External Evaluation of the 6th phase of the International Hydrological Programme IHP-VI, dated 25 January 2012) and the present review limits its analysis to an examination of the evaluation report’s conclusions.

Results: The external evaluation report briefly discusses the GPGE in IHP-VI. According to the report, IHP Secretariat staff were aware that gender was a priority area for the Organization and their programme; however, it was not clear how the priority was meant to be implemented and there was no guidance on this in the IHP-VI Strategy. It was therefore difficult for the external evaluators to assess this further. However, the report also indicates that "the realization of IHP-VI outputs for priority UNESCO areas such as Africa and gender, have been low because of apparent inadequate motivation of key regional staff responsible for implementation of such priorities, their inability to move beyond their pet disciplinary areas, and perhaps inability to link with relevant Member Country gender and other experts if they existed and were sufficiently interested." (page 4) The conclusion is that mainstreaming of the GPGE in the IHP-VI has not occurred, and some of the reasons given in the external evaluation correspond to the analysis of the present review.

The examples above illustrate different experiences of gender mainstreaming. In the first case, the intervention took place in an environment and amongst professionals where taking Gender Equality concerns into consideration was a natural process. In that case it did not take any major effort to mainstream gender, and it would in all likelihood have happened even if it had not been a
Global Priority. In the third case, it is not so likely that Gender Equality would have had such a prominent place in the IBC report if it had not been a Global Priority and if ODG/GE had not provided support. In the other cases, the opportunities to mainstream gender were certainly present, but the initial awareness of how to mainstream was low, no particular support had been provided, and the review could not find any evidence of incentives or sanctions that would have encouraged the programmes to increase their efforts to mainstream.

Concluding remarks

165. The review found that there is general awareness in the Organization of the Priority Gender Equality and of the need to mainstream gender. However, the actual implementation of gender mainstreaming has proven to be quite a challenge. One of the reasons for this is that gender mainstreaming depends on the conduct of a gender analysis before the start of any intervention and relies on the availability of sex disaggregated data. While some programme areas have such data, many do not. Overall, as explained in previous chapters, due to a lack of systematic reporting on Gender Equality at the activity-level there is no reliable information on how significant or widespread gender mainstreaming is within UNESCO programmes.

166. UNESCO is not the only Organization that displays a lack of progress with regard to mainstreaming. The African Development Bank has analyzed 26 thematic gender evaluations that were undertaken over 20 years and concluded that there was no example of a development organization that has successfully mainstreamed gender to the degree that it had been incorporated into its "DNA". The study points to six critical areas where action is needed if Gender Equality is to be embedded in the culture, i.e. in the mission, values and goals of an organization:

- Management must consistently lead and support the mainstreaming of Gender Equality and policy.
- Systems of accountability and incentives must have enough ‘bite’ so staff cannot evade responsibility to deliver Gender Equality results.
- Gender Equality work must be properly funded and there must be sufficient trained senior staff.
- New procedures and practices must be well designed, given a big push at the outset and the momentum maintained.
- A consistent approach is needed for recording results and disseminating lessons learned.
- Gender Equality must be seen to be contributing rather than competing with the drive for more effective aid or other priorities.

167. The present review found that UNESCO’s top management is overall supportive of the Global Priority, but not equally visible in leading the operational mainstreaming. Regarding the second point, the review could not find any organization-wide mechanism to hold management and staff accountable for contributing to the GPGE or any incentives that compel staff to engage. As discussed earlier, reporting is limited to the C/5 expected results in SISTER, which means that many of the GEAP outcomes are not systematically followed up on, except in a biennial report to the General Conference. No system to track resources allocated to and spent on the Global Priority exists. This makes it impossible to continuously monitor progress made with regard to GPGE.

168. As discussed in Chapter 3, despite recent efforts, and although it has been mandatory for many years, capacity-building related to the GPGE has not yet reached all senior staff of the offices.
organization. Significant progress also still needs to be made in regards to organizational procedures and practices (in terms of accountability) and a consistent approach for recording results and disseminating lessons learned needs to be developed. Finally, the review found that while Gender Equality appears as a priority in all strategic documents, in practical terms it is still seen very much as an extra burden and not yet fully integrated into the programme planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation processes of the Organization.
Chapter 6: Networks and Partners

Introduction

169. UNESCO has assembled a network of significant assets, including Institutes, National Commissions, UNESCO Clubs, scientific and expert communities such as Goodwill Ambassadors, UNESCO Chairs, winners of UNESCO prizes, etc., that has often allowed it to demonstrate new ways to promote international cooperation and development. In this section the review turns to an analysis of whether the Priority Gender Equality plays any role in the development of activities and interventions in this wider network. Does the wider network contribute to UNESCO achieving its Priority Gender Equality?

170. The Partnership Framework\(^{26}\) that was presented to the Executive Board in October 2012 clearly states that the overall objective of entering into partnerships is to strengthen the scope, outreach, visibility, results delivery and impact of UNESCO's programmatic objectives and priorities in accordance with the C/4 and the C/5 documents. While the GPGE is not explicitly mentioned, neither is Global Priority Africa\(^{27}\), and it must be concluded that the statement refers equally much to both of them. The document does not contain any mention of Gender Equality and does not express any notion that this could or should play a prioritized role in the development of partnerships.

Partners in the UN family

171. UNESCO's comprehensive partnership strategy comprises an overall framework for partnerships and separate strategies for engagement with individual categories of partners. Interestingly and surprisingly, these documents do not list UN agencies as a category of potential partners (190 EX/INF.7). This is obviously an unfortunate omission. As was demonstrated in the previous chapters, UN agencies are essential partners in UNESCO's work on Gender Equality, and the GEAP also emphasizes the importance of partnerships with UN agencies and the networks for Gender Equality that UNESCO takes part in.

172. The 36C/5 includes the following result in terms of cooperation with UN partners; “UNESCO's strategic contribution to the UN inter-agency cooperation in the area of Gender Equality and the empowerment of women articulated and integrated at the global, regional and country levels.” Among UN agencies, it seems that the strongest relations have been formed with UN Women and UNICEF. At the field level, UNESCO often collaborates with UNDP. For sectors, other UN agencies have become close partners, such as UNAIDS with whom UNESCO closely cooperates in the context of interventions that relate to HIV/AIDS and education.

173. Cooperation with UN Women was reinforced to ensure greater collaboration in programming and implementation between the two agencies. In 2012, a consultation meeting was organized that resulted in a letter of cooperation listing main areas of current and future collaboration. The letter notes that UN Women and UNESCO will cooperate to enhance the synergy and coherence of their programmes, activities and other initiatives on normative intergovernmental work. In particular, it is stipulated that education is a primary area of cooperation between the two agencies, and that UNESCO will continue to play a major role in UN Country Teams.

174. UNESCO furthermore collaborates with several UN working groups and task forces on Gender Equality and women’s empowerment, including the Standing Group on Women, Peace and Security, and a working group on rural women, inter-agency task force on women’s economic empowerment and co-chairs, with UNDP, the inter-agency Task Force on gender and climate change. UNESCO also participates in the activities of the UNDG Task Team on Gender Equality,


\(^{27}\) This also applies to 190 EX/INF7: Policy Framework for Strategic Partnerships: A Comprehensive Partnership Strategy. Separate Strategies for Engagement with Individual Categories and Partners.
and in particular in the preparation of a Gender Equality marker system that tracks and reports on allocations and expenditures for Gender Equality and women's and girls' empowerment with agreed upon parameters and standards inside the UN system. The marker will allow for UN system-wide reporting with regard to funds contributing to promoting Gender Equality. In this same framework, UNESCO is contributing to the "System-wide Action Plan for implementation of the CEB Policy on Gender Equality and the empowerment of women" (UN-SWAP).

175. UNESCO is a member of the Interagency Network on Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality (IANWGE) and has observer status with the OECD GenderNet. It participates in annual IANWGE and biannual joint IANWGE-GENDERNET meetings. ODG/GE also participates in common advocacy exercises with UN Women and other UN agencies, such as in the preparation of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio + 20). UNESCO's contributions in relation to Gender Equality were retained in the final document, as in other preparatory documents. UNESCO furthermore contributed inputs to the Annual Reports of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) in its 52nd and 53rd sessions, as well as to the various Reports of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in all of UNESCO's fields of competence (CSW: Situation of and assistance to Palestinian Women, for example) and to the ECOSOC meeting in July 2012.

176. The three paragraphs above list some of the inputs highlighted by ODG/GE in its latest contribution to the C/5 Monitoring Report, which articulates the activities and outputs from the division and sectors. Although the present review was not able to assess the quality and relevance of all the activities undertaken, it has become clear that the level of partnership activities within the UN family are considerable and far more extensive than those with any other category of partners, including those partners that would be considered part of the wider UNESCO.

National Commissions

177. National Commissions (NCs) for UNESCO form a global network of national cooperating bodies. The Commissions are expected to “act in an advisory capacity to their respective delegations to the General Conference”, and they can “disseminate information on the objectives, programme and activities of UNESCO”, “participate in the planning and execution of activities of UNESCO” and “undertake on their own initiative other activities related to the general objectives of UNESCO”. The text suggests that the NCs could make a UNESCO Global Priority as priority of their own, but they are not under any obligation to do so.

178. The history of the work on GPGE in NCs is interesting. In 2002 UNESCO launched an initiative to establish Gender Focal Points in all NCs. This was motivated by the need to increase commitment to Gender Equality everywhere and to narrow Gender Equality gaps. A handbook was developed in 2005 and this challenged NCs “to establish a constant and consistent pressure for change” (page 14). It emphasized that one of the main functions of the NCs was to act as a catalyst for the participation of key national actors in respect of UNESCO’s objectives and priorities. The 77-page handbook outlines roles and responsibilities for GFPs in NCs and contains practical advice on how to undertake gender analyses and how to mainstream Gender Equality in the work of the NCs. The handbook seems quite useful and the idea of partnering with the NCs to build a network of GFP could also be of interest. The notion that NCs should take initiatives and act on their own also resonates well with the GPGE (though that had not yet been formulated at the time. The thinking here actually precedes the GEAP).

179. However, it is uncertain how much of a network was actually established. It seems that after an initial impetus the network was subsequently forgotten and resulted in wasted efforts. The NCs that were interviewed in the course of this review did not have any gender specific activities nor

28 Draft 191 EX/4 Part I (A and B)
did they mainstream Gender Equality in their work-plans. The review\textsuperscript{31} of the relationship between UNESCO and the NCs concluded that while there are many examples of effective cooperation between the Secretariat and NCs, there are opportunities to better use the network of NCs.\textsuperscript{32} The evaluation also found that some NCs did operate gender specific interventions of their own. Though it would be natural to suggest that the network be re-established, it would probably be prudent to first find out why it failed before venturing into a new initiative.

**UNESCO Goodwill Ambassadors**

180. The UNESCO Goodwill Ambassadors are an outstanding group of celebrity advocates who spread the ideals of UNESCO through their name and fame. They are expected to extend and amplify UNESCO’s work and mission and to help focus the world's attention on the work of UNESCO. Through their careers and humanitarian commitment they have made an important contribution towards the objectives and aims of UNESCO. The interviews, however, indicate little awareness and no actual work on the GPGE. Some of the UNESCO Goodwill Ambassadors have a personal commitment to Gender Equality (Claudia Cardinale was mentioned as the one who takes the strongest personal stance on the issue and who consistently brings up Gender Equality issues in her work for the organization. Two recently nominated ambassadors were also chosen for their work in advancing Gender Equality: Dr Hayat Sindi from Saudi Arabia aims to support science education, especially inspiring more girls to enroll in science subjects, and, Metin Arditi from Turkey who works to support young musicians.) Whether GPGE is part of the work of the Ambassadors depends on individual commitment. It is not part of any general brief. There are no indications that the overall network is systematically used to emphasize the Global Priority, and no efforts were made to mainstream Gender Equality in the selection, briefing and functioning of the Goodwill Ambassadors. There are obvious opportunities to exploit and it seems that many Ambassadors would welcome clear signals from UNESCO on how to work for the organization’s strategic priorities.

**UNESCO Chairs**

181. The UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs network is expected to connect the Organization with communities and to mobilize expertise to support the advancement of UNESCO’s goals. As a global network, built on a common vision of a world free of poverty and discriminations, it strengthens UNESCO’s links with scientists, researchers and communities of practice and wants to contribute to the formulation and delivery of UNESCO’s programmes and to achieving the MDGs. The overall purpose of this network is to advance teaching, learning and research that supports the development of sustainable knowledge societies. UNESCO’s partnership strategy sets the following objectives for the Chairs:

- To build capacities at higher education and research institutions through the exchange of knowledge and sharing in a spirit of international interuniversity solidarity, which respects cultural diversity;
- To establish new teaching programmes, generate new ideas through research and reflection, facilitate enrichment of existing academic programmes allowing higher education institutions to respond more readily and with greater autonomy to the demands for new learning and research in a world undergoing rapid economic, social and technological change;
- To encourage interdisciplinary research/studies;

\textsuperscript{31} Review of the Cooperation of UNESCO’s Secretariat with the National Commissions for UNESCO; IOS/EVS/PI/112
\textsuperscript{32} It should be noted that the Gender Equality Division is involved in the induction process of all newly appointed Presidents/Secretary-Generals of National Commissions.
• To promote North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation as a key strategy for institutional development; and,
• To foster partnerships and cooperation among academia, civil society, local communities, research and policy-making.

182. These five functions do not explicitly mention how Chairs are expected to contribute to the GPGE. Given that Gender Equality is one of UNESCO’s priorities, Chairs could both be encouraged to mainstream Gender Equality in their work and to conduct gender-specific activities where appropriate. The choice of Chairs could also reflect the Global Priority, and some of the 762 Chairs do have a gender focus, such as for example the UNESCO Chair on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment, established in 2009 at the University of Cyprus (Cyprus). The specific objectives of this Chair are to:

- produce research-based guidelines, standards and indicators for gender mainstreaming, as described in the Roadmap for Equality between Women and Men (Commission of the European Communities, 2006-2010);
- work to integrate a gender dimension in all the training and educational centers and institutions of higher education, secondary and primary education in Cyprus as well as in the participant countries by developing a model curriculum and the relevant teaching aids (including computer-based instruction) in the field of gender studies;
- create and disseminate "good practices" for effective interventions which promote gender mainstreaming and quality in equality; and,
- strengthen links and communication with existing women's studies Chairs and Networks in the domains of women and Gender Equality.

183. A Global Network of UNESCO Chairs on Gender was established that enhances exchange of experience and cooperation between these Chairs. A newsletter was created by the Chairs to inform about the network’s activities.

184. Overall, however, the UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs network has not been systematically used by the Organization to promote the GPGE. It certainly has the potential to play a bigger role and to make a more significant contribution. Monitoring and evaluation of the work of the Chairs also needs to be improved. At the moment, little is known about how UNESCO Chairs contribute to the GPGE.

**Associations, Centers and Clubs for UNESCO**

185. Clubs for UNESCO are non-profit bodies that work on a voluntary basis and are legally and financially independent from UNESCO. They are often established in schools and higher educational institutions, and have close links to the general public and other professional and local authorities. Clubs share a commitment to UNESCO’s ideals and assist in their realization at the grass-roots level. They are expected to contribute to the promotion of UNESCO’s values, messages and actions. Today, the movement includes more than 3,500 Clubs, Centers and Associations in more than 100 countries.

186. Its strategic objective is to foster the interest of children and youth in issues related to UNESCO; to develop and promote understanding of UNESCO’s goals and ideas at grass-roots level; strengthen the implementation of its programme at local and national levels; contribute to the civic and democratic education of the members of Clubs for UNESCO and through them the public at large; promote solidarity and tolerance among children and youth; and promote the international cooperation. It was beyond the scope of the present review to look at these activities in detail. It has, however, tried to establish whether UNESCO had forwarded any communication on the GPGE to these organizations. This does not seem to have been the case, nor are any specific incentives or encouragement provided for them to work with Gender Equality, such as access to funding, expert advice, or other incentives. However, it seems that there is scope
for these networks to get involved in gender specific interventions, such as for example the project ‘Addressing homophobic bullying and gender based violence in the school setting in Central America and the Caribbean’ and The Virtual Classroom: using new media to increase HIV knowledge among young people’.

**Partnerships with civil society, the private sector and others**

187. The review established that in the context of GPGE partnerships with academic, policy-making and civil society networks have continued to be developed and reinforced, in particular through the establishment and development of a series of regional and international Gender Equality research and documentation centers. In the first half of 2012, for instance, UNESCO worked with the Regional Research and Documentation Centre on Women, Gender and Peace Building for the Great Lakes Region in Kinshasa to define a Plan of Action and budgets for the Centre. UNESCO also supported Member States of the Great Lakes Region in establishing their National Associate Centers through planning meetings with Ministries concerned, and training for the establishment of virtual libraries. For the Palestinian Women's Research and Documentation Centre (PWRDC) in Ramallah, UNESCO worked with the Palestinian Authority and the Norwegian Representative Office in Palestine to carry out an evaluation of the Centre. The evaluation report has led to a decision to restructure the Centre, and UNESCO is involved in elaborating a new strategic plan for the Centre. Progress has also been achieved with regard to the establishment of the first regional Centre on the Elimination of Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting in Nairobi, in collaboration with the Government of Kenya, WHO and UNFPA.

188. An extrabudgetary programme on training for the advancement of women’s rights in Madagascar (funded by the European Commission) was launched in December 2012. Partnerships are being developed with universities and higher education institutions across Madagascar, and consultations have taken place with civil society organizations to identify regional locations and targets for community based training. This project forms part of a range of projects coordinated by ODG/GE to develop training for elimination of gender-based violence and promotion of women’s political participation. Most of the partnerships mentioned above show how UNESCO’s two Strategic Priorities Gender Equality and Africa were developed hand in hand.

189. The private sector partnership that is most commonly pointed to, is the L’Oréal – UNESCO ‘For Women in Science’ (FWIS) initiative. This is a joint initiative of the UNESCO Natural Science Sector and the L’Oréal Corporate Foundation to promote and highlight the critical importance of ensuring greater participation of women in science. By rewarding the scientific excellence of women in research and identifying role models for future generations, FWIS aims to enhance the role of women in devising scientific solutions to problems confronting humankind in the twenty-first century. The partnership objectives identified in the 1999 and 2009 agreements between UNESCO and L’Oréal include:

- UNESCO and L’Oréal commit to work together closely to implement joint projects for the benefit of the situation of women at international level, particularly with regard to their scientific activities (1999 agreement).
- Both organizations commit to carry out joint initiatives to achieve the common strategic objectives of UNESCO and of the L’Oréal Corporate Foundation (2009 agreement).

190. Within the framework of collaboration, UNESCO provides a network across all Member States with strong links to the academic and scientific communities, expertise related to Women in Science, management of fellowship programmes, and credibility within academic and government circles. L’Oréal provides an estimated allocation of 7 million Euros per annum to the programme. The partnership identified results in terms of improved capacity-building of women in science: over 700 women in over 70 countries have been recognized for their research and received

---

33 Information on progress in the three paragraphs above come from 191 EX4, Part 1, page 5
funding to further their careers. The partnership brought enhanced visibility for L’Oréal within the scientific community and with some key stakeholders and a stronger understanding of women in science issues.

Concluding remarks

191. UNESCO’s Partnership Framework\textsuperscript{34} states that the overall objective of entering into partnerships is to strengthen the scope, outreach, visibility, results delivery and impact of UNESCO’s programmatic objectives and priorities in accordance with the C/4 and the C/5 documents. It is complemented by a paper on Separate Strategies for Engagement with Individual Categories and Partners.\textsuperscript{35} Neither of these documents explains how partnerships could be used to advance GPGE.

192. As the chapter has shown, the wider UNESCO network consists of a number of actors that could be engaged to support the Global Priority. When involved, results seem to be encouraging. It is, however, difficult to tell how many of UNESCO’s Chairs, Goodwill Ambassadors and others have made the GPGE their own priority.

193. UNESCO’s overall policies in respect of NC, Chairs, Goodwill Ambassadors etc. state clearly that UNESCO’s objectives and priorities should inspire their work. The next steps in making that happen would be to (1) formulate specific directives for the network partners with regard to how they are expected to contribute to GPGE, (2) engage partners in developing interventions and activities, (3) provide backstopping, training and other incentives, and (4) systematically learn from experiences, disseminate results and share learning.

\textsuperscript{34} 190 EX/21 Part II. Policy Framework for Strategic Partnerships: A Comprehensive Partnership Strategy.

Chapter 7: Defining the Comparative Advantage

Introduction

194. The question of UNESCO's comparative advantage with regard to the promotion of Gender Equality first and foremost relates to the gender-specific interventions. It has to do with the choice and focus of gender-specific interventions in each sector. On the subject of UNESCO’s comparative advantage in gender mainstreaming, the question has to be asked in a different way given that mainstreaming is to be applied throughout the programming cycle at all programme levels. So to that extent the question comes back to the issue of UNESCO’s comparative advantage as an organization. And, naturally, where UNESCO has a comparative advantage, that’s also where the GPGE would be mainstreamed.

Findings on UNESCO’s comparative advantage

195. The 2010 Independent External Evaluation of UNESCO discussed what UNESCO does well compared with other UN agencies, looking at strengths and weaknesses; at alliance management in value-chains; at complementarity and competition in partnerships; and at flexible specialization as contribution to efficiency. Comparative advantage was used as a loose metaphor for ‘doing something better than others’. Different evaluations, and in particular the evaluations of UNESCO’s Strategic Programme Objectives pointed to a comparative advantage for UNESCO with regard to:

- **UNESCO’s mandate** – the organization has a mandate for education, science and culture. Respondents to the interviews conducted in the present review often pointed to this as a source of comparative advantage.
- **Linking normative and operational activities** – e.g. policy development on Gender Equality to capacity-building in educational systems.
- **UNESCO’s lead-role** – e.g. UNESCO is the lead body for EFA, which is a comparative advantage and could also be used to promote Gender Equality in EFA.
- **Something UNESCO does well** – e.g. scientific ethics and world heritage. *What others are not doing or mandated to do* – e.g. communication and information and Gender Equality might be something that only UNESCO is engaged in.
- **Having different sectors and disciplines** – e.g. UNESCO can work across sectors and disciplines and connect Gender Equality issues in, for example, culture, science and education. However, this review has not found any cross-sector initiatives in respect of Gender Equality and hence it would be strange to consider that a comparative advantage.
- **Having ‘convening power’** e.g. can bring together networks of scientists and experts. *Being part of the UN* – e.g. as a UN agency we are able to act as an ‘honest broker’, which is one of UNESCO’s comparative advantages.

196. The examples of results and value-added suggest that it is in the combination of a recognized lead role, linking normative and operational roles, having a record of success and having convening power that the comparative advantage is to be found. UNESCO is of course part of the UN system, and whatever it does has to be part of the mandate. The above items are useful pointers to different understandings of UNESCO’s strength, in respect of Gender Equality as well as in any other area. They suggest that UNESCO needs a combination of qualities. In a UN context complementarity with other UN offerings must also be taken into account, as must the priorities of Member States.
Comparative advantage and the selection of gender-specific activities

197. Figure 7.1 outlines three aspects that need attention when trying to identify UNESCO’s comparative advantage with regards to gender-specific programming. These are: first, the necessary precondition of a gender analysis in each of the sectors, and based on that, the identification of what thematic interventions UNESCO might focus on. This paves the ground for an identification of what to do. Based on that, the review suggests a series of answers to the question of how gender specific interventions might be initiated and implemented.

Figure 7.1: The process of identification and implementation of gender-specific activities in line with UNESCO’s comparative advantage in respect of Gender Equality.

First step: gender analysis

198. Gender Equality as an ideal and a vision must be seen in a context. The need for priority activities within sectors therefore varies strongly. This need should be determined by a gender analysis, which would help sectors identify strategic opportunities for gender-specific interventions. In a context of scarce resources, such an exercise would also help the sectors decide where to focus their gender-specific interventions or how to sharpen an already existing focus. For instance, a gender analysis of the education programme, which at first appears well researched, might reveal gaps in knowledge in relation to gender issues in non-formal education settings, or in respect of gender identities in sexuality education. In other sectors, the question of what would constitute a high priority intervention, for instance in the Culture sector, may need more strategic attention before the focus areas can be identified to make sure that the most relevant issues are targeted.
Second step: identifying thematic interventions

199. The Draft 37 C/4 has identified some future focus areas where GPGE would be addressed, such as:

a. Ensuring that Gender Equality is a constituent element of the global education agenda with a focus on “equality of opportunity” as well as “equality of outcome”, especially in the post-2015 agenda;

b. Identifying gender specific targets and timelines within the framework of inclusive, quality and lifelong learning opportunities for all in support of creative and global citizenship for women and men in all walks of life;

c. Ensuring that international science cooperation for peace and sustainability allows for representation and voice for women and men and provides the conditions for both women and men to be agents of mitigation, adaptation, resilience and sustainability;

d. Ensuring that policies for sustainable development are gender transformative by including both women and men in capacity-building efforts in order for those policies to serve the needs of as broad a constituency as possible;

e. Ensuring women’s representation and voice in cultural expressions to enable them to fully utilize the medium of culture for development and for achievement of sustainable peace;

f. While respecting the diversity of cultural expressions, paying special attention to the “equal valuing” of cultural expressions irrespective of the gender and other identity specificities of the actor(s); and rejecting cultural expressions that have a harmful impact on the physical and psychological integrity of girls and women and that prevent them from enjoying equal life chances and opportunities;

g. Ensuring freedom of expression to all irrespective of gender or other social identity and supporting a gender transformative media development.

200. These are some examples of areas of intervention that at a very general level appear to be relevant. The specific thematic orientation of each sector would have to build on a gender analysis as indicated above. The following are examples of where each sector’s comparative advantage with regard to gender-specific programming might lie:

- **The Education Sector.** The Dakar Framework for Action, the Millennium Development Goals and other initiatives striving to eliminate gender disparities and to achieve Gender Equality in education form the basis of interventions. The work includes all levels of education, formal and non-formal, and education throughout life, as exemplified in the literacy interventions. UNESCO’s overall comparative advantage lies in a combination of advocacy and support for policy development, pilot initiatives and sharing of experiences, and comparative data on global developments.

- **The Natural Sciences Sector.** The Sector focuses on the integration of gender perspectives in science and technology policies. Among other issues, women and girls should have equal opportunities to take full part in all aspects of science, technology and the engineering sciences. UNESCO’s comparative advantage around these issues might be found in advocacy and support for policy development, assistance with interventions with the potential for learning and scaling up as well as network building, and in pilot projects that lead the way forward for Gender Equality in the natural sciences.

- **The Sector of Social and Humans Sciences.** Interventions emphasize the connection between human rights, gender perspectives, socio-economic development and rights,
changing social structures and progress in achieving Gender Equality. The comparative advantage of UNESCO could be found in research, networking and knowledge-sharing regarding Gender Equality and human rights of women and girls. It should build on the development and exchange of ‘engendered’ knowledge and critical thinking on public policy.

- **The Culture Sector.** UNESCO’s comparative advantage may lie in acquiring a better understanding of, and handle on, how Gender Equality refers to the work of the Culture Sector and how the sector could contribute to advancing Priority Gender Equality. Particular attention should be paid to the sector’s standard-setting work and its work on the Culture for Development Indicator Suite, which is where the sector’s comparative advantage can be found. In this context, and following a gender analysis, the sector’s contribution to the development of gender-sensitive policies, indicators, and interventions could be strengthened and conducted in a more systematic and targeted manner.

- **The Communication and Information Sector.** The activities in the Sector currently focus on increasing the participation and access of women to expression and decision-making in and through the media and new communication technologies. The interventions promote a more diverse and non-stereotyped portrayal of women and men, through the provision of training programmes. UNESCO’s comparative advantage in this Sector lies in its partnership and networking power, pilot interventions and capacity-building.

**Third step: practical steps in management and criteria for selection of interventions**

201. Currently, the portfolio of gender-specific activities contains a wide number of activities both in sectors and in many subunits of the organization. The paragraphs above point to a significant number of already successful interventions and highlight areas, where UNESCO could focus its contribution to Priority Gender Equality. What follows is a suggestion with regard to the criteria to be used for planning and selection of gender-specific interventions:

- Budget limits, no small, scattered activities;
- Extended partnerships involving different categories of the wider UNESCO and external partners wherever feasible; and,
- Clear outcome targets, with realistic indicators of success and a monitoring and evaluation plan.

202. Strategic partnerships with new and existing partners, including UN Women, partnerships with a range of stakeholders from governments, UN agencies, other multilateral and bilateral organizations, civil society groups, private sector, network of UNESCO Chairs and Institutes, Women’s Research Centers, national commissions, etc. should be developed to disseminate UNESCO’s messages on Priority Gender Equality, help guide UNESCO’s activities and implement joint programmes.
Chapter 8: Recommendations

203. The recommendations that follow are grouped into three major themes. It is assumed that the two-pronged strategy, consisting of gender-specific interventions and gender mainstreaming, will be continued under the new C/4 and C/5.

1. The first area of recommendations concerns the integration of Priority Gender Equality in the overarching strategic framework.

   a. The Global Priority should be fully integrated both in the 37 C/4 and in the 37 C/5. This means:

      i. Ensuring that the higher level outcomes to be achieved during the 8-year period of the C/4 Mid-Term Strategy build on the results that are to be realized in the shorter C/5 periods,
      ii. Mainstreaming Priority Gender Equality into the Strategic Programme Objectives and Expected Outcomes of the C/4 and the Main Lines of Action and their respective Expected Results in the C/5,
      iii. Ensuring that Expected Results are defined at the same level of abstraction. They should refer to a measurable change that has happened as a result of an activity, and not be mixed up with outputs; and
      iv. Linked to the Expected Results, developing a limited set of realistic and measurable performance indicators related to Priority Gender Equality to be included in the C/5. The current number of indicators needs to be significantly reduced.

   b. UNESCO’s future Gender Equality Action Plan, which will succeed the current GEAP 2008 – 2013, should be fully in line with the C/4 and C/5, and contain the same thematic priorities, intervention areas, objectives, expected results and indicators for the Global Priority. It should not include any objectives and indicators that are not part of the C/5, thereby adding an additional layer to the results framework. The purpose of the new Action Plan would be to communicate UNESCO’s vision with regard to Priority Gender Equality, to focus attention on its various aspects, to facilitate coordination and cooperation across sectors and offices, and to clearly outline roles and responsibilities and implementation modalities.

   c. The Priority Gender Equality needs to be integrated and coordinated with Priority Africa. The two strategic priorities ought to support each other and to work towards joint results in terms of impact and outcomes. The Organization should ensure coherence and synergies between the priorities by aligning interventions and expected results.

2. The second area of recommendations concerns gender mainstreaming and gender-specific programming, as well as organizational structures and processes.

   a. Each sector’s niche and flagship with regards to gender-specific programming need to be identified.

   b. The capacities of the Gender Focal Point (GFP) Network need to be strengthened and better utilized to help integrate Gender Equality in the work of sectors, with ODG/GE acting in an advisory and support function. Gender expertise existing in sectors and other parts of UNESCO should be mapped, and brought into the GFP Network (especially degree level and extensive working experience). GFPs’ responsibilities need to be recognized as integral parts of their respective jobs (integrated into PerfoWeb expected results) and should not constitute an additional burden.
c. UNESCO’s overall approach to building capacity for mainstreaming needs to be further developed:

i. A long-term capacity-building plan should be developed based on the mapping of available gender expertise. This plan should clearly outline what kind of expertise will be needed in the future, what kind of expertise is currently missing in the Organization, what measures will be taken to address these gaps, how they will be taken, who should benefit and by when.

ii. Capacity-building efforts need to be scaled up and new forms of capacity-building, such as Gender Equality Clinics that provide hands-on training for gender mainstreaming, should be given priority in the future. Priority should also be given to the strengthening of the GFP Network so that it is better equipped to provide additional assistance to staff in sectors and central services.

iii. The eLearning programme needs to be either significantly improved (content updated and improved and the modules made much more user-friendly) and its purpose redefined, or closed.

iv. All capacity-building initiatives need to be assessed on a regular basis and the results of these evaluation exercises should be analysed and used to improve them.

d. The recommendations of the 2010 Task Force on Gender Equality should be reviewed and implemented where they are still relevant. In particular, the priority must be to develop an accountability mechanism for the achievement of Gender Equality results.

e. UNESCO’s larger network (National Commissions, Goodwill Ambassadors, Chairs, Associations and Clubs, etc.) should be mobilized to contribute to the GPGE and clear directives given on how this could be achieved.

3. The third area of recommendations concerns monitoring and evaluation, which connects to the overarching policy framework and the decisions on objectives and results, and also to the accountability system.

a. Progress made towards the Expected Results related to Priority Gender Equality must be measured and reported on through SISTER, and a mechanism established to track financial resources spent on the Priority.

b. Indicators should be connected to a feasible plan for data collection and use. There should be a budget linked to the data collection to ensure its quality, relevance and usefulness.

c. Gender Equality should be mainstreamed into all evaluation processes from start to finish (development of Terms of Reference with evaluation questions, selection of evaluation teams, collection of sex disaggregated and gender-sensitive data, gender analysis, and development of conclusions and recommendations etc.). Quality control of evaluations needs to include an assessment of the quality of these evaluations in relation to Gender Equality and the empowerment of women. IOS could consider developing instruments to standardize that assessment.
Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Review of UNESCO Priority Gender Equality
PART II and III

Consultant Terms of Reference
November 2012

The Executive Board, at its 190th session, called for a Review of priority Gender Equality and decided "to await the results of the forthcoming review of Gender Equality, which will determine the operational strategy for the medium-term period" (see 190 EX/decisions Prov, page 29). In response to this request, and taking limited budgetary resources into account, IOS formulated a three prong approach that will help answer the following overall three major review questions:

To what extent is UNESCO’s approach to promoting Gender Equality conducive to gender-responsive and gender-transformative programming?

What results have been achieved so far and what factors have contributed to their achievement or non-achievement?

What are UNESCO's comparative advantages in the promotion of Gender Equality, and how should the Organization focus its work in the future?

The approach consists of three complementary elements:

First, the ILO will conduct (at no cost to the organization) a Participatory Gender Audit (PGA), which is a "social audit" of priority Gender Equality. The ILO is providing four facilitators who will be working on the exercise for approximately six weeks. Data collection at HQ has been scheduled for 19 – 30 November 2012.

Second, IOS will summarize any systemic issues in connection with Priority Gender Equality that became apparent during the wide array of evaluations that have been conducted during the last 4 years.

Third, IOS will be assisted by one or more external evaluators (with the financial support of Sweden) to complement and build on the information generated by the first two exercises. Specifically, the evaluator/s will (i) further assess the results that have been achieved in the context of UNESCO’s Priority Gender Equality, (ii) look at UNESCO’s comparative advantage in the promotion of Gender Equality, and (iii) formulate recommendations that will feed into the next C4 and C5.

A synthesis of the results of these three exercises will be presented by IOS to the Executive Board at its 191st session in spring 2013.

THE PRESENT TOR RELATE TO THE SECOND AND THIRD OF THE THREE ELEMENTS OF THE OVERALL REVIEW OF UNESCO’S PRIORITY GENDER EQUALITY.

Background Information

Programmes and projects on women's empowerment, women's rights and Gender Equality have long been part of UNESCO's agenda. In 1996 -After the World Conference, "Women" were considered a "Priority Group" with earmarked funds made available to programme sectors or launching flagship projects. With the Medium-Term Strategy for 2002-2007 (31C/4) the work on the promotion of women's needs was seen as a "mainstreaming area" calling for a gender perspective to be integrated in policy planning, programming, implementation and evaluation activities.
As called for by the 2005 World Summit Outcome document, the General Conference decided to increase the efforts in this area by declaring Gender Equality one of the Organization’s two global priorities for its 2008-2013 Medium-Term Strategy (34C/4). In order to deliver on this priority UNESCO confirmed its two-pronged approach, with the pursuit of both women’s empowerment (through gender-specific programming) and gender mainstreaming in the Member States and within the Organization.

The Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP), submitted to the Executive Board in 2008 in document 181 EX/4 Part I Add. 2, has been conceived as the results-based road map to translate the policy “Priority Gender Equality” (contained in the 34 C/4) into specific actions. It lays out strategic actions, expected outcomes and performance indicators by programme sectors, for the duration of the strategy. Additionally, it presents the principal elements of the accountability, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting on actions in support to the Priority. Finally, it describes the principal institutional mechanisms in place for the pursuit of Gender Equality in the Organization.

As defined in the GEAP, the three expected outcomes at the organizational level are:

- Changes in programmes (“Progressive increase in the number and quality of gender-responsive and gender-transformative programmes and initiatives in all sectors and field office initiatives”)
- Changes in Member States’ realities (“Advancement of women’s empowerment and Gender Equality in Member States through policy dialogue and programmes and initiatives promoted by UNESCO”)
- Changes in the Organization (“Institutionalization of the commitment to Gender Equality in the Secretariat with an objective to change the gender parity of staff at senior management levels”).

The Division for Gender Equality, within the Office of the Director-General (ODG/GE), is responsible for ensuring the promotion of Gender Equality at UNESCO, in the secretariat and in the Field Offices. According to the GEAP the specific role of the Division is to support improved monitoring and evaluation on Gender Equality issues and by guiding and coordinating the process, as well as providing advice on M&E specific to Gender Equality and on gender-responsive budgeting. The Division’s mandate encompasses five major aspects: (i) providing policy advice to the Secretariat and to Member States; (ii) raising awareness and fostering political commitment to Gender Equality; (iii) supporting capacity development within UNESCO by conducting training and developing guidelines and tools; (iv) coordinating cutting-edge policy and action research; (v) developing partnerships.

**Review Purpose**

The GEAP is currently in its last biennium, which is a propitious period to review the progress achieved and the challenges encountered, in view of the forthcoming development of the new Medium Term Strategy. An review is therefore deemed necessary and was requested by the Executive Board at its 190th session (190 EX/decisions Prov, page 29). The results of the review are expected to “determine the operational strategy for the medium-term period”.

Moreover, the Independent External Evaluation of UNESCO undertaken in 2010 recommended the organization to increase its focus, to strengthen its participation in the United Nations System, and to develop a Partnership Strategy. Building on these conclusions, the purpose of this review is three-fold:

- Generate practical recommendations to move UNESCO’s Priority Gender Equality forward.
- Identify areas where UNESCO has a comparative advantage in the promotion of Gender Equality.
- Inform the preparation of the future policy framework and approach for Gender Equality.

---

37 ODG/GE website (consulted July 18th, 2011)
38 181 EX/4 Part I Add.2-page17
**Review Scope**

The evaluation of SPOs assessed the implementation of the Gender Equality Priority in their respective areas of analysis. The conclusions of these exercises are consistent with those of the Task Force on Priority Gender Equality organized by the DG in 2010; overall:

There is little evidence of the use of a gender-sensitive frameworks or a gender analysis for programming.

Staff members are aware of the necessity to “take gender into account” when programming but they lack understanding of the relevance of gender analysis in some areas of their work, and of how gender can be practically integrated.

When gender-specific activities are undertaken, monitoring mechanisms are rarely in place to track the results of these endeavours.

The summative part of the review will focus on the policy and programmatic activities of the two previous and the ongoing biennia (2008-2009, 2010-2011, 2012-), in particular the GEAP and the Medium-Term Strategy of UNESCO (34C/4) as well as on the Bi-annual Programme and Budget (34C/5, 35C/5, 36C/5). Additionally, it may be necessary to go back to earlier biennia in order to capture the potential evolutions in programme design after the adoption of the GEAP.

The formative part of the review will consider UNESCO’s work in the context of the creation of UN-Women and will take into account the reviews of the Gender Equality Policies and Mainstreaming strategies of other UN agencies. It will also consider cutting-edge research in terms of Gender and Development.

The overall review focuses on answering these three major review questions:

- To what extent is UNESCO’s approach to promoting Gender Equality conducive to gender-responsive and gender-transformative programming?
- To what extent have results been achieved so far and what factors have contributed to their achievement or non-achievement?
- What are UNESCO’s comparative advantages in the promotion of Gender Equality, and how should the Organization focus its work in the future?

These three questions will be answered by three complementary exercises as described above:

- A Participatory Gender Audit (PGA) to be conducted by a team from ILO;
- An analysis of UNESCO evaluations with regard to the results achieved by UNESCO’s Priority Gender Equality;
- A complementary review exercise that will further complement I) and II).

THE PRESENT TOR RELATE TO EXERCISES II) AND III). They will be further refined in light of the key issues to be identified by the ILO Participatory Gender Audit (Part I of the overall review of Priority Gender Equality). Most of the data collection for this audit will happen prior to the conduct of the present exercise.

**Methodology**

- A desk study comprising:
  - Review of all evaluations managed / conducted by IOS and a sample of UNESCO evaluations managed by other sections with regard to results achieved and challenges encountered in the implementation of UNESCO’s Priority Gender Equality.

---

40 See Annex for a comprehensive list of evaluation questions
– Review a sample of standard documents (policy documents, mission reports, EX budgetary documents, Speeches...) from a gender perspective to assess to what extent GE is routinely and adequately considered/addressed.

– Review of a selected number of programmes / projects / activities including both gender-specific interventions and gender mainstreaming, with particular attention paid to UNESCO’s potential contribution to global initiatives or partnerships (e.g. the Inter-agency Network on Women and Gender Equality; the Global partnership for girls’ education, etc.).

• Interviews at HQ and phone interviews with UNESCO staff and partners in Member States.
• Review of the Gender Equality training programme, including a content analysis, and a skill and expertise mapping exercise. This might involve the conduct of a survey.

The evaluators are invited to use the UNEG handbook for the integration of Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation41.

Roles and responsibilities

The review will be managed by IOS and conducted jointly with an external consultant(s). IOS will also provide methodological guidance and participate in the data collection and analysis.

Deliverables and Schedule

The evaluator/s will be responsible for the following key deliverables to be developed in English or French:

a. Short inception paper that outlines the review approach.
b. Review report of between max.25 pages (excluding annexes) with key forward looking recommendations for the new C4 and C5.

Tentative timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables and Schedule</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start of work of the evaluator/s</td>
<td>26/11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection/analysis Paris</td>
<td>26/11/12 – 30/11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception Paper</td>
<td>05/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection / analysis from home base</td>
<td>8/12/12 – 21/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary draft review report</td>
<td>08/01/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft review report</td>
<td>11/01/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final review report</td>
<td>18/01/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluator Qualifications

The review will be conducted by IOS jointly with an external review/gender expert. The external evaluator should have the following complementary expertise and qualifications:

• At least 10 – 15 years of professional experience in programme and project review of relevance to policy making, to include international experience and a strong record of leading and/or conducting reviews.
• Advanced university degree in specialized fields of social sciences, humanities, public policy, or related fields.
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• Advanced knowledge of gender studies.
• Professional experience/expertise in the field of gender mainstreaming, and gender-specific programming, and Gender Equality policy-making, including at the international level.
• Strong knowledge of the United Nations, including previous work experience or assignments for the UN.
• Excellent oral communication in English and French. Report writing skills in English or French.
Annex 2: List of persons interviewed

Division of Gender Equality

Sara Callegari  
Gulser Corat  
Cvetan Cvetkovski  
Jane Freedman  
Anna Maria Majlòf  
Mugiho Takeshita  

Associate Expert  
Director  
Senior Planning and Programme Officer  
Programme Specialist  
Programme Specialist  
Programme Specialist  

UNESCO Staff

L. Anathea Brooks  
Mary Guinn Delaney  
Peter Debrine  
Chetty Dhianaraj  
Hongyan Li  
Alice Ochanda  
Lynne Patchett  
Sayeeda Rahman  
Lydia Ruprecht  
Ang Tee Wee  

Programme Specialist, Programme Coordination and Evaluation Unit, Executive Office, Natural Sciences Sector  
Regional HIV/AIDS Advisor for Latin America and the Caribbean, UNESCO Office in Santiago and Regional Bureau for Education  
Programme Specialist, Special Projects Unit, World Heritage Centre  
Programme Specialist, Section of HIV and Health Education, Education Sector  
HIV/AIDS Officer, UNESCO Office in Beijing  
National Programme Officer in Science, UNESCO Office in Nairobi and Regional Bureau for Science  
Chief of Executive Office, Culture Sector  
Programme Specialist, Section for Literary and Non-Formal Education, Education Sector  
Chief of Unit a.i., Knowledge Management Services, Education Sector  
Programme Specialist, Bioethics Team, Social and Human Sciences Sector  

National Commissions for UNESCO

Rut Carek  
Jinsung Jeon  
Mwoze Nziwili  

Secretary-General, Croatian National Commission  
Head, International Relations Team, Korean National Commission  
Programme Officer for Social and Human Sciences, Kenyan National Commission  

Partner Organizations

Patricia Cortes  
Jean D’Cunha  
Malcolm Ehrenpreis  
Nora Fyles  

Programme Specialist, UN System Coordination Division, UN Women  
UN Women  
Gender and Development, World Bank  
Senior Education Advisor, Head of UNGEI Secretariat, UNICEF  

Note: This report also builds on interviews conducted by IOS for other evaluations.
Annex 3: References

Publications, sources from other agencies:


UNESCO documents:

- Analysis of 35 C/5 workplans, ADG/BSP 29/12 2009
- CI 35C/5 Gender Relevant Projects
- Delivering the UNESCO Priority for Gender Equality: Increasing impact, effectiveness and visibility 26 February 2010
- Director of the Division for Gender Equality in the Office of the Director-General (DG/Note/11/15)
- Discussion Paper on GENDER EQUALITY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
- Draft 37 C/4 - Preliminary Thoughts on Priority Gender Equality, Drafted by: DIR/ODG/GE, 30 July 2012
- Draft 37 C/5 - Division for Gender Equality, Office of the Director-General, 30 July 2012
- Preliminary analysis of 35 C/5 Workplans for Priority Gender Equality Memo BSP/GE/09.26, 17 December 2009
- Priority Gender Equality – Improvement of the Gender Focal Point Network. (DG/Note/11/05 rev)
- UNESCO Programme on Capacity Development and Training for Priority Gender Equality (DG/Note/11/04)
- Priority Gender Equality, Preliminary Assessment of 2008-2009 Workplans, Prepared by BSP/WGE
- Preliminary Analysis of 36 C/5 Workplans for Priority Gender Equality, By ODG-GE , January 2012
- REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL ON UNESCO ACTIONS PROMOTING WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT AND GENDER EQUALITY, ANNEX A AND ANNEX B TO 35 C/INF.21
- Transfer of the Division for Gender Equality to the Office of the Director-General. (DG/Note/10/17)
- The Partnering Initiative (2011) Approaches to building and managing partnerships: Contributing to a UNESCO partnership strategy.
2008-2013 Medium-Term Strategy 2008 - 2013 (34C/4)
The Gender Equality Action Plan; 181 EX/4 Part I Add 2
Delivering the UNESCO Priority for Gender Equality: Increasing impact, effectiveness and visibility”; DG/Note/10/01 of 8 January 2010
Gender Mainstreaming Training IIIEP, Paris, February 2011;
Gender Equality Training for SHS, 18 January 2012,
UNESCO Gender Focal Point Network Training.
Priority Gender Equality Guidelines. UNESCO Publications Board
Review of the Cooperation of UNESCO’s Secretariat with the National Commissions for UNESCO; IOS/EVS/PI/112
UNESCO Chair on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment; Progress Report 2009 – 2010
Gender, Conflict and Peace building: On the Margins of Development, UNESCO 2011

UNESCO sources for case studies in Chapter 5:

- Project Documents and SISTER Activity Reports from the 35 C/5 and 36 C/5
- Measuring Gender Equality in Education. UNESCO Kathmandu Series of Monographs and Working Papers No.17
- Guidelines for Mainstreaming Gender in Literacy Materials. UNESCO Islamabad, 2010
- Gender Responsive Budgeting in Education. UNESCO Bangkok, 2010
- Reorienting Teacher Education for Sustainable Development; Gender Sensitizing.
- Education Sector Responses to Homophobic Bullying, May 2012
- Literacy Initiative for Empowerment strategy for 2006-2015
- Gender-Sensitive Indicators for Media, 2012
- IPDC Project on Gender Awareness and Media in China
- Gender Equality in Journalism
- Global Report on the Status of Women in News Media
- Gender Mainstreaming in S&T in Kenya Report 2010
- International Technical Guidance on Sexuality Education
- Bioethics UNESCO Site
- World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme
- Joint Programme on Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality, Final Programme Narrative Report
- School Readiness Programme for Vulnerable Iraqi and Jordanian Youth, Final Report, September 2009 to December 2011
- Evaluation Reports on Projects Selected by the IPDC Bureau, 28th session of the Intergovernmental Council of the IPDC, March 2012
- Partnership Proposal: Mapping Gender Equality in culture: the impact of culture on women’s empowerment and equality
- Yunnan Sexuality Education TOT Workshop, Mission Report, August 2012