



COVID-19
RESPONSE

UN
WOMEN

Recommendations for advancing gender-responsiveness of the UN Myanmar SERF Monitoring Framework

Background

On 11th June 2020, the UN Gender Theme Group (GTG) received a refresher-orientation on gender sensitive Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems to strengthen capacities of the group to provide technical support to the socio-economic workstream (SEWS) in the development of the upcoming Monitoring Framework for the UN framework for the immediate socio-economic response to COVID-19 in Myanmar (UN-SERF).

To ensure the upcoming Monitoring Framework for the UN SERF in Myanmar is gender-responsive and promotes the incorporation of explicit and measurable results and indicators to advance gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) in each of the five pillars, UN Women conducted an orientation workshop on gender-responsive Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluations with the M&R Working Group (WG) on 16th July 2020.

Methodology

The refresher-orientation for the GTG members was focused on recommendations on how to formulate gender indicators, examples of gender-responsive M&E systems and lessons learnt. The orientation workshop for the M&R Working Group dwelled deeper into the concept of gender-mainstreaming, and its added value in developing monitoring frameworks, namely indicators. The goal was to orient the group with the application of Human Rights and GEWE based approaches to monitoring and evaluation efforts.


The orientation also sought to highlight approaches to apply, in considering how to strengthen the integration of GEWE (i) in defining results statements; (ii) developing indicators and (iii) the corresponding developing monitoring and reporting plans.

Both the GTG and M&R WG conducted practical exercises in small groups to review the global programmatic indicators, the Checklist for a Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) to Socio-Economic Country Responses to COVID-19, and Myanmar UN-SERF indicators through a gender lens. In analyzing the given indicators, the exercises enabled the groups to discuss on how to improve the indicators to ensure they are more gender-responsive – and better able to track progress in advancing GEWE, for consideration in refining the upcoming Monitoring Framework for Myanmar UN SERF.

Outcome

This guidance is based on the consolidated observations provided both by the GTG and M&R WG in assessing the relevant to the UN indicators. It provides the minimum standards for developing gender responsive M&E systems as well as a set of practical and achievable recommendations on how to formulate gender-responsive indicators and refine/enrich identified country-specific pillar indicators for the Monitoring Framework. This guidance will be shared with the SEWS Pillar Groups, SEWS Core Group, UNCT, GTG and M&R Working Group.

M&E systems need to be strengthened to understand an intervention's impact (whether positive or negative) on gender outcomes, not only in terms of health, education and nutrition outcomes, but also in terms of women's empowerment and gender norms, including changes in women's decision-making power, leadership and inclusive participation.



The observations and recommendations are based on the assessment of 18 mandatory Global SERF, 10 advised Human Rights and Myanmar UN-SERF indicators on gender-responsiveness.

Observations and Recommendations

Areas for improvement

Sex-age disaggregated data (SADD)

- Inclusion of sex and age disaggregated indicators need to be consistently reflected across the pillars of the action plan (to the extent possible)
- Indicators which aim to be age specific (youth, adolescents) should be disaggregated by sex, where such data is available
- Where applicable indicators should reflect other dimensions, including geographical location, ethnicity, migration status, disability, wealth or income and other characteristics

Gender and age-based vulnerabilities

- Gender- and age-based vulnerabilities and intersectionality are reflected in indicators, however not consistently

Qualitative and quantitative indicators

- Prevalence of quantitative indicators
- Quantitative indicators do not address barriers to women's level of participation, leadership, access, status, power, safety, etc.
- Lack of attention to differences in men's and women's experiences or equitable analysis of intervention's results

Practical and strategic gender needs

- Indicators mostly focus on measuring practical gender needs (water provision, health care and employment) of women and girls with little to no attention towards assessing the progress in structural change and gender relations.

Recommendations

- Impact assessments covering a broad spectrum of aspects of the socio-economic consequences of the COVID-19 crisis should be conducted to provide real life-data to inform formulation of indicators
- M&E frameworks that are based on Human Rights and GEWE approaches should go beyond including sex disaggregation only
- Understanding the nuances within groups as well as any form of exclusion caused by discriminatory norms (attitudes and practices), power dynamics, as well as intersectionality and vulnerabilities (age, disability status, ethnic origin, place of residence, sexual orientation, social class or income group, citizenship etc.) will offer the UN a much broader view of how their interventions affect the target beneficiaries differently. Reflecting intersectionality in indicators ensures that needs and capacities of target populations are fully reflected, addressed, and accordingly measured and monitored.
- Combining both quantitative and qualitative indicators allow for a better reflection of the complexities of gender roles and power relations. They also ensure that monitoring, reporting, and evaluation efforts are participatory and inclusive.
- Formulate indicators in a way that both practical and strategic gender needs are reflected. While practical gender needs focus on women and girls' immediate needs, strategic needs address gendered divisions of power and control, and traditionally defined norms and roles.

Compare the indicators against below criteria

Indicator 1. Number of women who received sexual and reproductive health care and services

- SADD ✓
- Qualitative and quantitative ✓
- Participatory approach ✓
- Age vulnerability ✓
- Strategic gender needs ✓

Indicator 2. Proportion of women and girls aged 15–49 years who make their own informed decisions regarding sexual relations, contraceptive use, and reproductive health care



Key questions to ask when designing gender indicators

Guiding questions in the design and review stages of developing gender indicators

- What change do we want to see? What would success look like? How will people's gender or sexuality affect the way they understand, are engaged in and benefit from these changes?
- Who should be involved in defining the vision of change, determining the indicators, and gathering data?
- How can we ensure small changes will be measured? It is important to consider which indicators could capture the often small, nuanced shifts in gender equality and women's empowerment, that tend to happen over time.
- Are there existing national indicators that could be used or adapted? (For example, Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan ([MSDP](#)), COVID-19 Economic Relief Plan ([CERP](#)), etc.)
- What policy and legal frameworks exist that may enable or inhibit gender equality and women's empowerment? For example, is there a national law that prohibits violence against women and girls, or GBV more broadly? These frameworks can provide the basis for indicators.
- What information already exists, or is being collected, to assist in tracking changes? Can the data from the socio-economic assessments be used? If there is no data, what does that tell you and where might you look?
- How will the data collected be analyzed and disseminated? And how will the results be used as lessons learnt for programming adaptations and future planning and design?
- Do partner governments have the political will to undertake data collection on the gender indicators selected? And were they consulted in the formulation of the indicators? Do they have the capacity to collect data?

Guiding questions to ensure participation and inclusion in monitoring process

- Identify how vulnerable populations can be included in data gathering. What are the constraints they may face in the process? What are the challenges for inclusive participation?
- How can we create an enabling environment and channels to ensure representatives from all targeted groups and stakeholders can fully participate in the monitoring and evaluation process?
- How can we ensure flexible methodological approaches that factor in the constraints and challenges of the informants and the broader context?
- How can we create data collection methodologies and analysis in a participatory way which allows stakeholders to collect and submit data by themselves as well as actively participate in defining what data should be collected and how it should be interpreted?



Gender-responsive indicators mapping for the UN SERF in Myanmar

Global Indicators		Human Rights Indicators	
Pillar 1	1.1 # of people accessing essential health services	2.	# of countries where the health system is impeding access to other essential health services by the public, (SRHR, maternal and childcare)
	1.2. # of health facilities to maintain essential immunization services		
	1.3 # of health service plans to provide continued essential services		
	1.4 # of community health workers to maintain essential services		
Pillar 2	2.1. # of people reached with critical WASH supplies (including hygiene items) and services	7.	Adoption/implementation of measures to ensure occupational health, safety. MHPSS, reasonable work hours for those who cannot work from home or remotely
	2.2 # of children supported with distance/home-based learning	4.	Proportion of vulnerable groups receiving relevant COVID-19 information
	2.3 # of primary school children receiving meals or alternatives to meals		
	2.4 # of countries with measures in place to address gender-based violence (GBV)		
	2.5 # of beneficiaries of social protection schemes and services		
Pillar 3	3.1 # of countries reinforce employment policies, economic recovery, and decent work	8.	Adoption/implementation of country measures, including by businesses, to ensure equal access to social protection floors
	3.2 # of supported private sector companies, formal & informal sector workers		
	3.3 # of countries adopting fiscal stimulus packages		
	3.4 # of beneficiaries of food supply protection regimes		
Pillar 4	4.1 # of countries undertook socio-economic impact assessments	1.	Proportion of adopted/ implemented COVID-19 Country Preparedness and Response Plans containing systematic mapping of most vulnerable and marginalized groups
	4.2 # of countries implementing policies informed by socio-economic impact assessment		
Pillar 5	5.1 # of organizations benefiting from capacity building shape socio-economic policy responses	5.	# of recorded cases of censorship, digital shutdown, deliberate dissemination of inaccurate/misinformation related to COVID 19
	5.2 # of CBOs capacitated to respond, mitigate, and ensure longer-term recovery	9.	State's adoption/ implementation of alternatives to deprivation of liberty
	5.3 # of social dialogue, advocacy and political engagement spaces facilitated	6.	# of recorded acts of discrimination, harassment, racism or xenophobia relating related to COVID-19
		10.	State of emergency, emergency legislation and procedures

The scaling of indicators is based on the minimum standards for developing gender-responsive indicators outlined in the [Gender Equality Indicators: What, Why and How?](#) and assessment analysis provided by the Gender Theme Group and Monitoring and Results Working Group in Myanmar.

Scale of Gender-Responsiveness of Indicators

Entirely	Could be improved
Partially	Not applicable