

CRIDF's Gender Journey - Lessons Learned



List of Acronyms

CBA	Cost Benefit Analysis
CRIDF	Climate Resilient Infrastructure Development Facility
DFID	Department for International Development
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
GBV	Gender Based Violence
GESI	Gender and Social Inclusion
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PPI	Poverty Probability Index
WPC	Water Point Committee

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
Purpose	2
Findings	2
Recommendations	2
PART I: CONTEXT	3
A. Introduction	3
1. Structure of the Report	3
B. Background	4
1. Objective of Review	4
2. Methodology	4
3. Rationale for Inclusion of Gender	4
C. CRIDF and Gender	5
1. CRIDF's Commitment to Gender and Social Inclusion	5
2. Gender and Social Inclusion in CRIDF Workstreams	5
PART 2: REVIEW OF CRIDF'S GENDER ACTIVITIES	6
D. Review of CRIDF Gender Tools and Resources	6
1. Gender Strategy	6
2. Gender Mainstreaming Tools for Water Infrastructure Project Preparation Processes	6
3. Field Work	7
E. Review of CRIDF's Field Reports	8
1. General Observations	9
2. Integration of GESI into Sections of CRIDF Project Reports	9
3. Gender Analysis	9
PART 3: RECOMMENDATIONS	12
F. Recommendations	12
1. Priority Recommendations	12
2. Specific Recommendations	14
G. Conclusions	16
H. Endnotes	17

Executive Summary

Purpose

CRIDF reviewed its experiences in the design and implementation of its Gender and Social Inclusion (GESI) tools to identify best practices, lessons learned and recommendations with a view to improving upon its existing work, and to share these learnings with other stakeholders. We reviewed the CRIDF Gender Strategy and Tool Kit, key reports from CRIDF I and interviewed some of the sociologists who have conducted field work for the CRIDF programme.

While the Gender Strategy and DFID's own Strategic Vision for Gender Equality tends to focus principally on women's empowerment, this review adopted a broader Gender and Development framework which acknowledges the need to look at both genders as well as to disaggregate each gender to identify specific differences and vulnerabilities.

Findings

The review demonstrated that CRIDF has shown some level of ability and commitment to mainstreaming gender. However, it also identified a number of key findings that could reinforce CRIDF's current efforts to mainstream GESI considerations into its overall work and enrich the work of other organisations working on water infrastructure or related projects.

With respect to the Gender Strategy, there is a need to ensure a broader accessibility, understanding and uptake of the Strategy amongst CRIDF staff.

The Gender Tool Kit is recognised for reflecting on gender and social inclusion issues connected to water infrastructure projects. However, it needs updating and to incorporate the latest thinking on gender mainstreaming. External checklist questions need to be reviewed to ensure that they are sufficiently general to accommodate a diversity of contexts. Probing questions enabling the adaptation to the different project contexts need to be included. These revised questions together with the addition of tools to conduct stakeholder mapping and identification of vulnerable populations would provide valuable input into the completion of the Gender Action Plan - a fundamental requirement for many potential donors.

The review assessed some of the Action Plans from CRIDF I and feels that these could be strengthened, especially regarding indicators of change. To achieve this, sociologists conducting the field work and developing the Action Plans may need assistance or capacity building. There is also a need to consider how these feasibility reports can be positioned as or contribute to baseline reports gathering the information applicable to both CRIDF's results tracking and to be used by other organisations and donors.

The review identified the tendency to isolate the analysis of gender and social inclusion (GESI) within one report section without integrating the findings, creating an artificial and unrecognised barrier to GESI mainstreaming. More importantly, it is not always evident how the GESI analysis contributes to CRIDF decision making on project selection, bankability and construction. The analysis should also take into account specific challenges faced by women and vulnerable populations such as safety or socio-cultural issues that could prevent them from participating in and benefiting from different dimensions of a



water infrastructure project. There is also a need to ensure that analysis demonstrates an effort to gather and review quantitative and qualitative disaggregated data both before going to the field and during field work to ensure that barriers faced by women and vulnerable populations are adequately considered when moving forward on water infrastructure projects.

For CRIDF 2 projects, more effort needs to be made to collect disaggregated data in keeping with the requirement articulated in CRIDF 2 Outcome 2.1 and 2.2 indicators. Efforts should also be made to ensure that a stakeholder mapping is always conducted and that it identifies not just water organisations, but organisations connected to GESI issues. This will enable CRIDF (or other stakeholders) to engage with these stakeholders to more accurately identify GESI barriers and to provide information on the context or serve as partners to address some of the identified barriers.

In the reviewed reports there is little evidence of participatory data gathering – a methodology that is often recommended as the best way to engage women and vulnerable populations. It would be helpful if reports included more details on methodologies and that efforts are made to encourage the use of participatory approaches which may, in some cases, require building the capacity of some of the sociologists.

Recommendations

To address some of these shortcomings, CRIDF should modify its approach to preparing sociologists explaining the programme's requirements and the importance of the data to inform decision making. It is suggested that this revision include a redrafting of the Generic Scope of Work and updating the Gender Toolkit. Sociologists should also be requested to integrate their GESI work more systematically into the overall reports, rather than only drafting a standalone section. Finally, all CRIDF staff including sociologists and others going to the field would benefit from some form of gender sensitisation or training to ensure both an understanding of the merits of factoring in GESI considerations as well as a commitment to doing so as part of the programme's mandate.

PART I: CONTEXT

Introduction

As part of its commitment to learn from past experiences and improve on this CRIDF has commissioned a review of past efforts to mainstream Gender and Social Inclusion (GESI) into its work. In particular the programme wants to review its experiences in the design and implementation of its gender and social inclusion tools as well as to assess the gender and social inclusion experiences of its pilot programmes in CRIDF 1. While the review has highlighted some specific challenges in terms of CRIDF's ability to mainstream gender and social inclusion, it has also highlighted a number of efforts that are worth noting that demonstrate and confirm CRIDF's commitment to Gender and Social Inclusion. The objective of the exercise is to highlight areas where lessons can be learned both from positive and negative performances in considering GESI issues and to recommend steps that can be taken to implement these recommendations. The findings will also help to expand and enhance CRIDF's role in supporting other organisations working on water infrastructure such as SADC and regional River Basin Organisations.

While CRIDF's own Gender Strategy and DFID's Strategic Vision for Gender Equality tends to focus principally on women's empowerment, the review has adopted a broader Gender and Development approach.² It is acknowledged that women and girls tend to be disproportionately disadvantaged in terms of economic opportunities and in terms of vulnerabilities to sexual violence and exploitation, but there is a need to disaggregate data relating to each gender to identify specific differences and vulnerabilities connected to characteristics such as age, marital status and level of education. As the SADC Gender Handbook on Mainstreaming Gender in the Water Sector notes in defining the Gender and Development Approach, gender is not a 'women's issue' but an interpersonal issue between men and women, women and men have different and specific needs, women cannot be treated as a standardised group...and women tend to be disadvantaged relative to men, but that gender differences can also result in men being disadvantaged.³



I. Structure of the Report

The report has been structured into three parts. Part I includes details on the approach to the review as well as highlighting tools, resources and approaches that CRIDF has taken to demonstrate its commitment to integrating gender equality and social inclusion into its work. Part 2 focuses on reviewing

CRIDF's activities, field work and reporting on gender equality and social inclusion. Part 3 responds to findings from the review by putting forward a number of prioritised recommendations including those specific to CRIDF's work.

B) BACKGROUND



1. Objective of Review

CRIDF is seeking to learn from its past activities related to the mainstreaming of Gender and Social Inclusion (GESI) into its work with a view to improving both its own performance as well as to share lessons learned and best practices with other stakeholders. To this end, the programme commissioned the review, including recommendations for improvement, of its experiences in the design and implementation of its GESI tools to gather a more in-depth understanding of lessons learned and best practices in its efforts to apply a gender and social inclusion lens.

2. Methodology

The review included interviews with three of the sociologists who have undertaken social assessments as part of the pre-feasibility and feasibility requirements for water infrastructure projects. To understand what is required of the sociologists, the consultant also undertook interviews and engaged in discussions with relevant CRIDF and experts involved in other cross-cutting roles. The review examined CRIDF's documents including the Generic Scoping Work for Bankability,⁴ (GSW) and Social Assessment Guideline⁵, 16 pre-feasibility, feasibility and bankability reports from CRIDF 1 and CRIDF 2, a review of the CRIDF Gender Mainstreaming Tools for Project Preparation,⁶ CRIDF Gender Strategy⁷ and the CRIDF Training Workshop Report.⁸

3. Rationale for Inclusion of Gender

Gender disparities are connected to a range of social, cultural, political and economic assumptions and values all of which contribute to the manifestation of inequalities between men and women in a particular society. Although women in Southern Africa represent slightly more than half of the

region's population, they constitute the majority of the poor in the region for a number of reasons including high illiteracy rates, restrictive and discriminatory laws, and limited access to, and control over, productive resources.⁹ Women remain underrepresented in decision making, have lower levels of education and spend a higher percentage of their income on feeding and educating their children.

As is the case in most developing countries, patriarchy is a dominant influence throughout Southern African societies resulting in women and girls carrying a higher work load and being denied a voice in decision-making processes at the household and community level. As part of their overall household responsibilities women and girls have the primary responsibility for management of household water supply, sanitation and health. Because of this responsibility women tend to hold considerable knowledge about water resources. They are the often the ones who can speak about the location, quality, storage methods and management during times of water stress. They also have concerns about the location of water sources as they are often the most vulnerable and hardest hit when there are water shortages including heavier workloads and greater vulnerabilities to sexual violence when they have to walk longer distances to collect water. Evidence suggests that water and sanitation services are generally more effective and sustainable when women are actively involved in all phases of water infrastructure, from design to planning through to the ongoing operations and maintenance procedures. Despite this reality, women are rarely consulted or involved in the planning and management of this community and household resource.¹⁰

C) CRIDF AND GENDER

I. CRIDF's Commitment to Gender and Social Inclusion

CRIDF recognises that gender equality and social inclusion is of central concern in water access, management and use for productive activities and adopted a GESI approach to improve the project impact, performance and sustainability of its pro-poor mandate. CRIDF seeks to show water infrastructure institutions how to provide women and girls with a voice, choice, and control water and water related resources.

CRIDF developed a Gender Strategy in November 2017 to map out how the three programme workstreams can clarify their role in mainstreaming gender; using programme tools and highlights how CRIDF's indicators connect to gender equality. The Strategy used three separate theoretical frameworks to frame the gender work including DFID's Strategic Vision for Girls and Women (Voice, Choice and Control), Thejiwe Mtintso's Access, Participation and Transformation and the World Bank's Space, Service and Asset.¹¹

2. Gender and Social Inclusion in CRIDF Workstreams

CRIDF is structured to be delivered through three main workstreams, namely Infrastructure Project (IP), Mobilising Finance (MF), and Stakeholder Engagement and Influencing (SE&I). A fourth component of the programme which sits within the SE&I workstream is the Sustainability element, which seeks to ensure that the defining aspects of CRIDF are sustained beyond the programme's lifespan.¹²

2.1. Infrastructure Project (IP)¹³

While the IP stream also constructs water infrastructure projects, a key focus of its work is project preparation both for projects it builds and to put forward for consideration to other funders. This workstream assesses multiple potential projects through a series of screens, including several relating to GESI. This multi-criteria decision analysis includes inputs from a range of experts, including sociologists responsible for social assessments including incorporating GESI considerations into their research¹⁴ and analysis and completion of the CRIDF Gender Mainstreaming Tools for Project Preparation Processes.¹⁵

2.2. Mobilising Finance (MF)

According to the Gender Strategy,¹⁶ gender considerations and the potential impact that a project may have on women and girls should, at a minimum, be integrated into all funding proposals. This includes ensuring the funder's relevant frameworks on gender and inclusion are adhered to, with a view to i) strengthening the case for funding, and ii) holding funders accountable to their own frameworks.

Key requirements include:

- I. approach funding bodies that have an explicit or targeted focus on gender;

2. investigate innovative funding mechanisms such as micro finance and loan schemes that could specifically support women;
3. integrate qualitative and quantitative components into the cost-benefit analysis (CBA) guidelines around the value of supporting women's empowerment through water infrastructure interventions; and
4. ensure when CRIDF supports the drafting of a funding application that capacity support is provided to the partner to integrate gender considerations into future funding applications.

The emphasis on mainstreaming gender considerations is particularly important as donors are increasingly requiring and scrutinising whether gender equality has been adequately mainstreamed into proposals put forward for their consideration,

2.3 Stakeholder Engagement and Influencing: (SE&I)

A critical component of all Engagement Plans developed and delivered through this workstream is gender mainstreaming.

This includes:

- 2.3.1. identifying and engaging in partnerships that will extend CRIDF's emphasis on Gender and Social Inclusion and demonstrate the value of adopting a gendered approach to water infrastructure interventions and disseminating CRIDF tools;
- 2.3.2. collaborating with SADC, GIZ and the Global Water Partnership (GWP) to build the capacity of key stakeholders including the SADC Water Ministry Gender Focal Points and broader SADC Gender Machineries on the use and application of CRIDF's gender tools; and
- 2.3.3. effectively communicate impact as part of efforts to mainstream gender and to engage and influence stakeholders during and beyond CRIDF's life span.

2.4 Gender and Social Inclusion Toolkit

CRIDF developed a set of Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines and Tools during CRIDF I¹⁷ for the project preparation cycle to guide teams addressing gender issues throughout each stage of project development. The practical, fit-for-purpose tools are designed to be action-oriented and measurable, requiring limited time to complete in the field.

The Tools are comprised of an Internal and an External checklist and an Action Plan. The Checklists are applied during pre-feasibility and/or feasibility phase in the IP workstream with a view to informing both direct decisions around the project design and implementation arrangements. Sociologists use the Action Plan to clarify roles and responsibilities, and develop indicators to measure progress, during and post-implementation.

PART 2: REVIEW OF CRIDF'S GENDER ACTIVITIES

D) REVIEW OF CRIDF GENDER TOOLS AND RESOURCES

This section reviews the application of the CRIDF GESI related strategy and tools, commenting first on the application and adoption of the strategy itself and then the tools design and finally examining the application of the tools in conducting fieldwork.

I. Gender Strategy

The Gender Strategy highlights the programme's overall commitment to GESI but lacks clarity on how this gender specific commitment will be monitored and quantified. Noting that disaggregated data is not always readily available, a review of CRIDF's pre-feasibility, feasibility and bankability reports suggests that efforts to collect disaggregated data in many reports is limited or completely absent. Except for referencing the Gender and Development Approach, the Strategy makes almost no reference to factoring in the role and voice of men and boys. The Strategy also makes passing reference to vulnerability and social inclusion but is less clear on how this dimension should be factored into efforts to mainstream gender.

While a strategy is a valuable starting point, its application and implementation are vital to any programme. A workshopping session to enable adequate understanding of the objectives and approach of the Strategy might not have been sufficient to ensure ongoing application of the Strategy. The frameworks outlined in the Strategy may be difficult to understand and apply, particularly for those CRIDF staff who lack gender expertise. Likewise, the "transformation" dimension of the Access, Participation & Preference and Transformation Model¹⁸ is likely to be difficult for CRIDF to achieve given its short timeframe and the size of its projects.

2. Gender Mainstreaming Tools for Water Infrastructure Project Preparation Processes¹⁹

The CRIDF Gender Toolkit²⁰ has been praised for being simple and easy to use. One sociologist also noted that CRIDF should be recognised for having developed tools since organisations do not always develop and provide them. The toolkit guides sociologists regarding what information they should gather on gender and social inclusion and offers a way to ensure that gender equality is systematically factored in as part of field work. While the tools' guidelines include a key framework that is aligned to DFID's "Voice, Choice and Control" Framework at the front, it could be difficult for people with no gender background to understand. It could benefit from the use of concrete examples to frame how each dimension of the Framework should be applied.

Whereas most sociologists should have some understanding of basic definitions such as the difference between gender and sex, one should not assume that all sociologists have a sound understanding of gender equality. One sociologist noted having limited understanding of gender equality and more details within the introduction section of the document to guide his approach to conducting the field work would have helped. Since the tool is meant to be passed on to organisations such as SADC, River Basin Organisations and Member States, it

would be important to strike a balance between being too basic and ensuring that fundamental information is imparted.

Some sociologists indicated that they were able to go through all of the questions contained in the check list although others said it was a struggle to complete the questions. It is important to note that some sociologists have been known to complete the questionnaire retrospectively either after some significant time has elapsed or in cases where they simply did not go to the field which calls the accuracy of that analysis into question.

It was felt that some questions in the check list are good at sparking discussions about issues that people may not normally talk about it. One sociologist agreed that the questions focused too much on understanding the situation of women noting that it be worth amending the questions and to tailor it such that it solicits views about and from men and boys.

Although some of the questions are relevant to the overall CRIDF context, a number of the questions in the External Check List are either too specific or too general for CRIDF. However, this may allow for the tools to be used by institutions other than CRIDF, with some context specific adjustment. As one sociologist noted, the tools tend to be directed to gathering information about women living in a rural context and are not adapted to gathering information about peri-urban or urban contexts. Recognising that the time in the field is limited, inclusion of probing questions could also be useful to facilitate the gathering of data tailored to the specific context.

For CRIDF I reports the Gender Action Plan was not completed consistently as part of the overall process. In cases where it was completed, some of the recommended actions are not always appropriate or grounded in issues of relevance to gender equality. Most of the Action Plans are particularly weak in developing sound indicators that would enable relevant measurement and do not include guidance on how to develop indicators to be able to measure and report on results.²¹

Given that CRIDF's Outcome Indicators 2.1 and 2.2 make reference to disaggregated data, the tool should also encourage systematic disaggregation to identify differences and vulnerabilities within each gender group such as illiteracy or widowhood including encouraging efforts to identify and consider specific vulnerabilities. Instead the questions that connect to social inclusion offer a dispersed and inconsistent approach to social exclusion. For example, the participation section includes details on vulnerable groups including "children, persons with disability, pregnant women and the sick" whereas the access and benefits section speaks to gathering information on "female or child-headed households".²²

Recognising that the tool has been positioned as focusing on gender, it should encourage a broader examination of what constitutes social inclusion. The tools do not sufficiently facilitate reflection to gather an understanding of the more nuanced vulnerabilities such as levels of literacy, marital status such as widowhood or child marriage as well as the impact of socio-cultural influences such as patriarchy and the belief that women should not speak in public. These can have a negative impact on women's ability to benefit from water infrastructure.

3. Field Work

3.1. Desktop Review

Interviews with sociologists indicate that they have about three days to conduct a desk top review although it does not appear to be documented in terms of the allocated amount of time or in clarifying what the desktop review entails, nor is this aligned to any CRIDF understanding of time allocation.

Some of the reports such as the Chibabava WASH and Flood Protection Scheme²³ demonstrate an extensive desktop review whereas others are less comprehensive. Overall, there is a lack of consistency in terms of content in each report which suggests an inconsistency in approach to conducting the desktop review.

A review of the GSW²⁴ suggests that there is no clear direction as to what critical documents should be reviewed as part of the desktop review process. Aside from the reference to gathering data on “gender and social inclusion” and listing areas where data should be gathered, there is no further guidance about what sort of information should be gathered and what

Although organisations such as IMWI have been successful in conducting participatory mapping exercises as part of their field work, it does not seem that this has been widely considered and/or required as an option despite its potential to gather pertinent and timely information as well as to facilitate more broad-based participation particularly for the most vulnerable and illiterate.

Except for the pre-existing questions linked to the Gender Check List, there appears to be some confusion amongst sociologists regarding requirements to prepare or use a standardised survey instrument. As mentioned, the GSW simply provides details on the type of information that should be collected such as population size. It also speaks only generally to the need to gather information on gender and social inclusion. For households, one sociologist explained that you seek to gather specific information including the PPI, disability, poverty although it is not clear if this information is required or whether it is left to the sociologist to determine what information should be collected. The development of



is intended when using the term “gender and social inclusion”. Conducting a desktop review represents a critical first step to ensure that field work draws upon information and perspectives that already exists. It can also provide the foundation for probing in areas that may not have been considered without this first stage of investigation. While the GSW need not be too prescriptive, some detail and guidance on what is expected from the desktop review would be critical to promoting consistency including whether the desktop review should include a mix of quantitative and qualitative data.

3.2. Methodologies

Generally speaking, sociologists indicated that field work begins with an introductory meeting to the community and emphasised the need to follow proper protocol in terms of who to meet such as local government or traditional leaders. Consultations may also begin with a group meeting where CRIDF and the proposed project are introduced before moving to interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).

Sociologists spoke to the use of observations, for example of who and where people collect water, as being one of the means for collecting data. However, the reports made only general reference to the approach to observation without providing detail on how long observations were undertaken, who was observed and when. They also stated that they try to have diversity within each focus group such as having women with different levels of literacy. Sociologists said that the approach to accommodating the voices of women and men would vary noting that in cases where they are working within a cultural context where women are afraid to speak, they will organise separate consultations.

the Social Assessment Guidelines offer more detail in guiding expectations of data gathering and analysis at each project stage but need to be reviewed and refined to ensure that guidance is clear and realistic. Noting that the Social Assessment Guideline is still in draft format, more detailed analysis will be provided as the document moves towards being revised and finalised.

3.3. Stakeholder Mapping

While some of the reports make reference to the existence of women's groups, for example, stakeholder mapping does not appear to have been done for most reports nor has it been documented as having been a process that was undertaken. For example, in the Chibabava WASH and Flood Scheme Bankability²⁵ report it is not evident that stakeholder mapping to speak to organisations working in the area was performed. In contrast, the Chikowa Dam Feasibility: Bankability Report²⁶ reported extensive mapping of institutions including describing the roles and responsibilities of each institution. More importantly, only a few reports have demonstrated an effort to gather an understanding of groups working on gender and women's issues.

It would be good to take note of what NGOs, government ministries and other organisations would be available as potential partners or are already undertaking programs to address barriers to ensure that access to water infrastructure leads to the benefits proposed. There is apparently one person within each Country Office who is responsible for stakeholder mapping who should be in a position to do the outreach and to assist in setting up stakeholder meetings. If this person lacks the capacity, it may be necessary for additional support and guidance to be provided to that person.

E) REVIEW OF CRIDF's FIELD REPORTS

The following section includes findings based on the analysis of the reports that include scoping, pre-feasibility and bankability reports from CRIDF 1. Whereas some findings are fairly consistent in all reports, there are other cases where the analysis seeks to highlight reports that have done an excellent job in integrating GESI considerations and others where analysis is weak or absent. It is important to note that there have been changes and improvements in terms of the approach to gender mainstreaming from CRIDF 1 to CRIDF 2. Likewise, it is understood that bankability reports include much more detail and analysis than pre-feasibility and scoping reports.

I. General Observations

The following section looks at observations connected to an overall analysis of the report from the perspective of GESI. It includes general observations as follows:

I.1. Gender Mainstreaming

Overall reporting and analysis on gender and other vulnerabilities tends to be siloed into the GESI section rather than mainstreamed throughout other sections of the reports. Since the sociologist is usually the same author for the GESI section as for the overall social assessment section, there is a notable disconnect when the social assessment section refers to "the community" whereas the GESI section disaggregates the analysis to take into account gender and vulnerability considerations.

The upfront analysis as well as the Executive Summary offers a simplified analysis of the benefits of water infrastructure to a population or community. In contrast the gender section tends to highlight some important findings with respect to challenges and needs identified for women and other vulnerable populations that would be highly relevant for inclusion within the Executive Summary.

These findings should also form part of the overall analysis particularly for facilitating decision making on whether or not to undertake a project, how and where to undertake it and to determine what mitigating measures need to be put in place to protect or enhance the benefits of women and the most vulnerable.

Ideally, a key person reviewing the report would ensure the mainstreaming of GESI and that the inclusion of analysis in one section is not necessarily contradictory to the analysis in other sections. For example; misleading statements that water infrastructure will benefit all members of a community in one section whereas the GESI section may have highlighted significant barriers (time constraints, poverty, illiteracy and cultural practices that forbid women's participation or access) women and vulnerable populations face. The Executive Summary and section on decision making should include reference to gender and social inclusion issues as part of the overall analysis. The social assessment section should seek to ensure that gender and social inclusion considerations are mainstreamed throughout.

I.2. Assumptions/ Generalisations

Most reports put forward the assumption that there will be improvements when water infrastructure is introduced and that there will be specific outcomes such as "sustainable employment opportunities and an improved standard of living" without taking

note of particular enabling factors that would need to be instituted for the positive impacts to be achieved. For example, in the analysis on positive and negative impacts, the Chikowa Dam report²⁷ notes general positive impacts such as sustainable employment and income generation without making the connection to barriers faced by women and the most vulnerable and without putting forward enabling factors that would need to be put place and for which CRIDF would need to either establish partnerships or secure supplementary funding.

More importantly, when barriers are noted, they are often not followed by recommendations about overcoming specific barriers that women and vulnerable populations face.²⁸

I.3. Disaggregated Data

CRIDF's Outcome Indicator 2.1 and Indicator 2.2 require some documentation of the number of beneficiaries disaggregated by gender. Recognising that the UN has acknowledged ongoing challenges in procuring sex-disaggregated data and gender statistics,²⁹ in cases where the country may not have been able to collect the data other organisations efforts should be made to identify other sources such as the UN or World Bank as they have often gathered data as part of their overall agenda. Furthermore, there are a number of sources where countries do provide such as the Demographic Health Survey and the Multi-Indicator Cluster Surveys that can be accessed through web searches. Data also need not be limited to gathering official government data but could also involve seeking reports from NGOs, academics or donors who have conducted studies in the field.

I.4. Desktop Review

It is assumed that all sociologists conduct some form of desktop review noting that interviews with sociologists suggest they spend about three days on conducting research and reviewing documents. However, review of some reports suggest that limited research and analysis has been conducted particularly as it pertains to gender and vulnerability and that the focus is principally on collecting quantitative data. As a positive example, the Chibabava WASH and Flood Protection report³⁰ cites the sources upfront, includes a reference section and demonstrates that an effort was made to gather more detail on the context. The lack of guidance in the Generic Scope of Work may account for the inconsistencies in the desktop review.

2. Integration of GESI into Sections of CRIDF Project Reports

The following section analyses key sections that are relevant to the integration of GESI into pre-feasibility, feasibility and bankability reports that were reviewed.

2.1 CRIDF Project Definition/Introduction

Given the acknowledgement of the pro-poor and GESI mandate, an early connection should be made to the fact that women and the most vulnerable are generally the poorest and therefore stand to benefit significantly from improved water infrastructure. Currently, the introduction is silent in this regard. In the absence of these references, the report sometimes reads like a standard engineering report that is putting forward a water infrastructure project.

2.2. Key Definitions

In order to understand how gender is situated, it is helpful to provide a definition that clarifies the frame of analysis for GESI and provides a good way of situating what is the frame of reference for understanding gender.³¹ This could be standardised throughout all the reports. Only the Chibabava WASH and Flood Protection Scheme report³² includes a definition for gender equality and social inclusion.

2.3. Community Consultation

Generally speaking, reports speak to community consultation but do not explicitly refer to the importance of considering different perspectives of men and women as well as vulnerable populations. Furthermore, since the reports do not document the methodological approach used it is difficult to assess if approaches are used to accommodate the needs and comfort level of women and vulnerable populations. For example, the Mwami Water Supply and Sanitation report³³ makes reference to consulting local leadership about the location of boreholes but does not make reference to consulting women who are the collectors of water and would have concerns connected to the location of the borehole. The Lower Incomati Flood Plain report is more comprehensive in that it includes an analysis highlighting the power issues within committees and notes that despite the fact that women play a key role as farmers they are not present on committees.

In terms of ensuring that women have a voice that is heard, some reports reference identifying women's groups within the community that have been consulted. While consulting with women's groups is a valuable process, representation through these proxies is not identical to hearing the voice of women in the communities. It is not clear how identification of women's groups directly translates into determining key concerns such as the type of water infrastructure that would best serve women's needs. Since most of the reports did not document how many people were consulted and what questions were asked it is also difficult to assess the breadth and depth of consultations conducted by sociologists.

2.4. Analysis of Potential Positive and Negative Impacts

The current level of analysis of potential social and environmental impacts does not provide disaggregated analysis of benefits accruing to different groups including women and vulnerable populations. For example the Mashili Rehabilitation Final Bankability Report³⁴ highlighted a series of benefits but did not disaggregate the analysis to indicate whether benefits will accrue universally to all members of the population or whether there will be some particular barriers that could prevent some groups from benefiting. The border post reports have tended to cite benefits to truckers and less about other vulnerable populations such as migrants and informal cross-border traders many of whom are women. The BuPuSa Pre-Feasibility Report³⁵ states that the programme will represent an economic boost in the area impacting economic and social development of the poorest population without noting any connection to specific barriers that women and vulnerable populations could face such as lack of access to land and other critical inputs such as cash or equipment for irrigation projects.

More importantly reports such as the Chikowa Dam Feasibility Report³⁶ and the Mashili Rehabilitation Bankability Dam Reports identify important negative impacts that could

have severe negative implications for women. For example, Mashili Dam Report has identified that women were not present at the meeting. The Chikowa Dam project report cites statistics that might be regarded as misleading stating that "it was observed that 89% of the landowners under the area proposed for irrigation are females who could be negatively affected by the proposed distribution of land in an attempt to maximise benefits for the wider community", when in fact this percentage referred to a total population of 18 women. The total population of the benefitting community was not stated.

3. Gender Analysis

The following are examples of where gender analysis has or should be integrated into the field reports:

3.1. General

Reports such as the Incomati Flood Plain³⁷ and the KAZA Zimbabwe Feasibility Report³⁸ have done a good job of undertaking a gender analysis although more so within the GESI section and less throughout the whole social assessment section. KAZA Namibia GESI Assessment was done as a stand-alone GESI analysis after the report was completed so is particularly comprehensive.³⁹ Others have included some analysis within the narrative or have limited the analysis to responding to the gender check list and/or gender action plan. Furthermore, it is not always evident that the findings from the Gender Checklist are integrated into the overall narrative report. It would seem this would be critical since it is the report that serves as the principal basis for decision making. As mentioned in the first section, the gender analysis tends to be limited to the GESI section and is not mainstreamed into parts of the report where the impact on women and vulnerable populations would be relevant.

3.2. Roles and Responsibilities

In many reports reference is made to improving the productivity of women or reducing their labour at home in generalised terms. A few reports made reference to the fact that men provided little to no support in household tasks noting that problems also exist with men spending time drinking alcohol rather than helping women. However, there is also little to no specific reference to the benefit to men in terms of productivity and the linkage to what role men play or could play in the community both generally and in relation to water. Since most of the reports have not unpacked or analysed the separate roles that women and men play and the amount of time they spend in individual daily tasks, it is difficult to measure whether water infrastructure improvements will lead to reduction in time spent or in freeing up time for other activities.

In some cases, there are also references made to roles such as smallholder farmers or small-scale traders. However, this data is not disaggregated to clarify the number of men and women in the role which is critical to determine in terms of reporting on potential gender benefits.

In the case of natural disasters, it is also important to take into account that women and men play different roles in these situations. Overall, findings indicate that women tend to endure a much greater burden that would be important to take into consideration generally and in relation to water infrastructure.

Women and Natural Disasters

In many situations, women and girls are disproportionately affected by natural disasters. As primary caregivers who often have greater responsibilities related to household work, agriculture and food production, women may have less access to resources for recovery in multiple areas of responsibility.

If law and order break down, or social support and safety systems (such as the extended family or village groups) fail, women and girls are also at greater risk of GBV and discrimination. (Adapted from Global Protection Cluster. n.d. 'Strengthening Protections in Natural Disaster Response: Women and Girls')

3.3 Gender Diversity

Although sociologists have indicated that they do examine diversity as part of their analysis, there is limited indication in reports that gender analysis is sufficiently disaggregated (e.g. education, literacy, poverty and marital status) to understand diversity within a gender population. Understanding this diversity is important to connect to measures and outcomes targeted to promoting CRIDF's pro-poor agenda as well as determining how to tailor programs to demographic differences of women within a community or beyond. For example, awareness raising campaigns or income-generating programmes for poor, illiterate women should be developed and targeted differently than for women who are better educated and have greater access to financial resource.

3.4. Gender Disaggregated Indicators

The KAZA Zimbabwe Feasibility report⁴⁰ recommends the development of indicators for GESI although it is not clear how this would be done. Noting that indicators are required to be included in the Gender Action Plan, it would be worth exploring whether to build upon the work of other organisations that have already gone through an exercise of developing gender indicators connected to water infrastructure.⁴¹

3.5. Participation on Committees

Some of the reports provide a disaggregated head count of participation on key committees such as water committees without analysing the issue of voice or leadership in the committees. The Chikowa Dam Feasibility report⁴² makes reference to the existence of Dam Committees as indicators of community buy-in. However, they have not systematically analysed the composition of the committees including who holds leadership positions to assess the level of influence that women and vulnerable populations might have. In contrast, the Mashili Dam Feasibility report⁴³ has noted the gender breakdown on the water committee as well as taking note of the existence of women's groups. The KAZA Zimbabwe Feasibility report⁴⁴ has also made an important observation about the composition and power structure of water committees that would have important relevance for the role women could realistically play in shaping decisions around water infrastructure in their community. In particular this report has noted that the majority of Water Point Committee (WPC) members are women, but that the positions of leadership and leadership within the WPC are held by men.

3.6. Differentiated Needs

While it is laudable that some reports speak to the need for separate ablutions for women and men, analysis in CRIDF I reports rarely address or make recommendations connected to the specific needs of women and girls connected to

differences of gender and sex such as providing separate water sources for women and girls to enable them to wash in privacy in cases where they are menstruating or installing proper lighting as a way to ensure their safety. Understanding needs should also take into account the demographic and diversity of populations, particularly in the case of border projects. For example, migrants and refugees crossing borders were identified in the case of discussions related to the launch of the Nchelenge Border Town pre-feasibility report⁴⁵ which identified the need to consider refugees and migrants coming from the Eastern DRC so considerations such as vulnerability to Gender Based Violence should be considered when factoring in refugees and those crossing borders who need humanitarian assistance.⁴⁶

Gender Based Violence and WASH Programmes

WASH programming that is poorly planned and insensitive to gender dynamics can exacerbate risk of exposure to sexual and other forms of gender-based violence (GBV). This is particularly true for women, girls and other at-risk groups. These groups face an increased risk of sexual assault and violence while travelling to WASH facilities (including water points, cooking facilities and sanitation facilities) that are limited in number, located far from homes or placed in isolated locations. In some emergencies, women and girls must travel through unsafe areas or after nightfall to relieve themselves. If there is insufficient water (e.g. during drought), they may be punished for returning home empty-handed or for returning home late after waiting in line for hours. School-age girls who must spend a long time collecting water are at a higher risk of missing and/or not attending school, which limits their future opportunities. This, in turn, may place them at a higher risk of GBV in the future. Source: *Guidelines for Integrating Gender-Based Violence into Humanitarian, IASC*.

While involvement of women, girls and vulnerable populations tends to be mapped out in more detail at the bankability stage, it would still be valuable to cite specific needs or barriers faced by women and vulnerable populations in the pre-feasibility reports as a means of guiding next steps including issues that should be considered in preparing for the bankability stage. For example, identifying issues possible impacting vulnerable groups that require further exploration at the next stage of the process.

3.7 Government Engagement

In the recommendation section of KAZA Zimbabwe Feasibility report⁴⁷ there is reference to the merits of engaging government in playing a critical role of ensuring gender equality. What is not clear within the context of this recommendation is whether the Ministry has the resources, capacity and willingness to meet its own commitments to gender equality as the role and capacity of gender equality may be placed in a marginalised ministry that has had limited training or access to resources. For this reason, the stakeholder mapping stage should include the identification and assessment of government representatives and ministries responsible for gender equality and gender-related issues including ministries such as health and social services.

3.8. Cross-Cutting Issues

Despite climate change being one of the cross-cutting issues, reports rarely undertake a disaggregation of the impacts of climate change on different stakeholders including women and vulnerable populations including noting the differentiated

impact in areas such as health, food security and overall household burden. Overall, the cross-cutting issues are addressed in isolation including the institutional, climate change and economic analysis such that gender and social inclusion is not systematically integrated.

3.9 Land

Whereas some of the reports have noted differences in women's access to land, it should be considered for all reports, where appropriate, since access to land can be a critical issue which can determine whether or not women are able to benefit from new water infrastructure. This is particularly the case for irrigation or small dam projects where the expectation is that the water infrastructure will lead to increased productivity, income generation and employment connected to agricultural production including small vegetable gardens.

3.10. Agricultural Productivity

In the same vein, it would be important to disaggregate the role that women and men play in terms of agricultural productivity, where appropriate, including whether men and women have equal access to inputs and tools, whether women engage in the same agricultural activities to determine if they would benefit equally from the introduction of an irrigation project. For example, in some places in Southern Africa women are not able to access land and are not always able to control

income generated for any of their agricultural activities so this should be determined in conducting the assessment or in liaising with organisations that have knowledge about agriculture such as the USAID Feed the Future Program. Without this background knowledge, it is difficult to draw assumptions of equal benefits being derived from improved water infrastructure.

3.11 Socio-Cultural Considerations

The majority of reports contain no analysis about the socio-cultural drivers and impacts on issues of gender inequality such as patriarchy, child marriage and wife inheritance. They also do not seem to factor in how socio-cultural norms and beliefs such as the desire for women to meet separately from men at a borehole to enable them to share and exchange with one another without fear of retribution. Recognising that addressing socio-cultural issues tend to require longer term interventions, it is nonetheless valuable to factor in socio-cultural issues as they can serve as fundamental barriers to women's participation in decision-making processes such as water committees or could impact on whether a project is accepted by women and men within a community. Considering socio-cultural issues can determine whether women would be able to gain access and control over potential benefits from water infrastructure projects.



PART 3: RECOMMENDATIONS

F) RECOMMENDATIONS

CRIDF's adoption and implementation of the recommendations will take account of available budgets and timeframes.

I. Priority Recommendations

The following are recommendations that CRIDF should prioritise moving forward to improve its commitment to gender and social inclusion. The recommendations have been organised to identify those that should be done as part of CRIDF's overall work and others that are more specific to the role of sociologists as part of field work preparation and implementation.

I.I. CRIDF

Decision Making

1. Provide more systematic details on how gender and social inclusion is factored into the decision-making process for projects that go to bankability. Similarly, with projects that will be put forward for consideration to other potential funders.
2. Where CRIDF has decided to implement the project, ensure that any major GESI issues and barriers highlighted in reports are investigated to ensure that mitigating measures are put in place. For projects that are handed over to other implementers or funders, efforts should be made to highlight key concerns identified through the assessment process.
3. Liaise with the Mobilising Finance team to ensure that information gathered and reported on GESI meets the requirements of potential funders such as the African Development Bank, GCF, GEF and the World Bank.

Reporting

4. Review the approach to preparing CRIDF pre-feasibility, feasibility and bankability reports to ensure that there is a consistency in terms of overall structure and content including ensuring that requisite GESI information and analysis is systematically integrated into relevant sections of the report. Consider including details in a standardised Table of Contents for reports and identify where GESI should be integrated within the report as a minimum requirement.

Tools and Resources

5. Update and pilot the Gender Tools & Guidelines to: 1) ensure that checklist questions are relevant for gathering the necessary data while also facilitating the opportunity to probe about specific project contexts; 2) provide additional guidance on methodologies including the use of participatory approaches; 3) include links to key information drawing upon the SADC Gender and Water tool as well as other relevant tools; 4) provide more guidance on the Action Plan including how to develop and monitor indicators.
6. Consider developing supplementary tools that are aligned to CRIDF's separate areas of focus for water infrastructure such as border posts, irrigation and small dams as a means of highlighting specific considerations of relevance to each area of focus and identifying additional tools to assist with GESI analysis within each context.

7. Identify ways to integrate GESI considerations into CRIDF's other cross-cutting issues including climate change, institutional and economic and funding considerations. This may require undertaking an exercise to gather and document information on the connection between GESI and the cross-cutting issues as well as identifying opportunities to highlight gender issues as part of tools and activities prepared by other cross-cutting issues.
8. Ensure that the Updated Gender Tool Kit is aligned with other CRIDF tools including the draft social assessment guidelines and climate change tool to facilitate a seamless approach to CRIDF's tools and resources.
9. Provide gender-specific input into the draft Social Assessment Guidelines. Align this process with the revision of the GSW and the updating of the CRIDF Gender Tool Kit to ensure that relevant information and recommendations of how to effectively integrate GESI considerations are aligned and not duplicative.
10. Revise CRIDF's Generic Scope of Work (GSW) by aligning with or referring to provisions in the updated Gender Tool Kit to provide more guidance on GESI issues and requirements to sociologists and other relevant stakeholders on:
 - a. Required Information: provide details on required information and data (both quantitative and qualitative) to be collected for the desktop review and field work;
 - b. Methodological Approach: provide suggestions for methodological approaches including recommending the use of participatory approaches such as mapping exercises to gather information on gender differences in terms of time allocation; geographic spaces within communities for men and women that take into account safety and security; preferred locations for water infrastructure and other critical information of relevance to GESI and the project;
 - c. Level of Effort: provide guidance on days allocated per activity including desktop review; fieldwork; drafting report and participation in relevant pre and post-planning meetings that factor in the need to gather disaggregated data and qualitative reports on gender and social inclusion issues;
 - d. Stakeholder Mapping: provide details on what is expected when undertaking a stakeholder mapping including the need to identify organisations connected to or able to address GESI issues;
 - e. Definitions: include definitions on what is meant by Gender and Social Inclusion within the context of CRIDF projects to ensure that CRIDF adopts a consistent approach to defining Gender and Social Inclusion;
 - f. Accountability: provide details on accountability and quality assurance for delivery and reporting on requisite GESI information including requirements to complete all elements of the updated Gender Tool Kit;
 - g. Reporting: provide guidance on what sort of GESI information should be provided in CRIDF field reports (scoping, pre-feasibility and bankability) including where in the report reference should be made to GESI issues.

Training/Capacity Building

- 11 Explore ways to build upon, improve and document CRIDF's existing efforts to build the capacity of organisations working on water infrastructure including SADC and the River Basins to integrate GESI particularly in cases where these organisations will be considering moving forward on projects that CRIDF has identified.
- 12 Consider developing modified training that responds to different contexts and job requirements. For example, training for field staff may require addressing different skills and requirements than those working at the institutional level.
13. Consider partnering with other organisations such as the World Bank and African Development Bank on the joint delivery of gender training related to projects where CRIDF has an interest. Ensure that training is delivered at all levels (national, regional and local) to facilitate broad based understanding and buy-in for integrating a gender lens into water infrastructure projects.

Data on Gender and Social Inclusion

14. Identify and share sources of disaggregated data with sociologists and other relevant stakeholders and develop a list of required sources to be reviewed to use as a basis for monitoring whether reports adequately respond to CRIDF's requirement to collect disaggregated data.
- 15 Explore partnerships with other organisations working on gender and water infrastructure or related issues such as health, food security as a means of gathering the most up-to-date information on issues that can inform its work as well as to facilitate the sharing of best practices and lessons learned.
16. Encourage field staff to identify, reach out and document relevant sources of data and information on GESI issues as part of the stakeholder mapping process. This may require allocating additional time for the outreach process.

Best Practices/Lessons Learned

17. Identify some projects where CRIDF can test, document and share findings related to the application of "gold standard" programming on gender and social inclusion. This could include capacity building of relevant stakeholders on gender and social inclusion to a diversity of stakeholders at different levels of the project (national, regional, local), identifying partner organisations working on gender that can complement or address gaps identified at the feasibility phase and facilitating the integrating of gender considerations into other CRIDF cross-cutting issues such as working with water institutions to do gender training or to raise awareness on gender issues.
18. Undertake an exercise to gather, document, package and disseminate CRIDF's approach to factoring in and addressing gender and social inclusion issues into its project preparation and implementation process.

Monitoring and Evaluation

19. Ensure that sociologists and other relevant staff are aware of the requirement to collect and document gender disaggregated data whenever possible as per Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2.
20. Consider organising a session with sociologists and other relevant staff on how to develop gender indicators as required for the CRIDF Gender Action Plan and for other donors.
21. Explore ways that CRIDF can undertake ongoing monitoring of its performance on mainstreaming GESI into its three streams of work including how to report on results achieved.

I.2. Sociologists

1. Where specific concerns are identified that could have a negative impact on women and vulnerable populations, develop recommendations of how to mitigate these impacts and ensure that they are included in projects that go to bankability as well as those that are put forward to other funders or organisations including government. Where possible and appropriate, work with CRIDF to monitor whether mitigating options have been effectively integrated.
2. Undertake a more thorough desktop review that identifies gender-disaggregated data that is quantitative but also identifies studies and qualitative findings such as those on behavioural and cultural practices on issues that could be of relevance to understanding gender and vulnerability differences and challenges.
3. Ensure that the stakeholder mapping process identifies organisations and individuals that have a specific understanding of gender and social inclusions within the context under investigation and take steps to interview identified stakeholders to gather qualitative and quantitative data that can inform CRIDF programming.
4. Use participatory approaches such as mapping exercises to identify preferences for location of ablutions or an activity journal to gather an understanding of current activities undertaken by men, boys and women and girls on a daily basis.
5. Ensure that GESI issues and recommendations identified through the application of the updated Gender Tool Kit and through overall field work is mainstreamed within the Executive Summary, the social assessment and decision making sections of the report and in other areas of relevance to the project.
6. Include the following in the report: details on stakeholders contacted; methodology used; details of people consulted; salient points from interviews undertaken both individually and through Focus Group Discussions and a list of references consulted for the desktop review.
7. Identify opportunities to build the capacity of relevant stakeholders on GESI issues that will be part of a CRIDF project as a way of ensuring that a solid foundation exists for the uptake of gender and vulnerability considerations.
8. Prepare questions that are adapted to the specific context under investigation. For example, questions for border towns are likely to involve a great focus on urban and peri-urban issues and populations whereas irrigation is likely to focus more on gathering an understanding of GESI issues within a rural context.
9. Document and share information on key findings on GESI issues related to a specific context that can help to inform future work in that area and for the work of other sociologists. For example, if particular challenges are identified related to gender and irrigation or if a study or tool is identified, share with colleagues as part of a broader knowledge management process.
10. It is recommended that the sociologists look at examples of reports that have done a good job of integrating gender considerations as well as meeting a number of critical requirements such as stakeholder mapping, documenting methodology used and noting the number of people who were interviewed for each Focus Group Discussion.

2. Specific Recommendations

The following are specific recommendations that build upon and provide more detail to the priority recommendations listed above.

2.1. Project Preparation

1. The scoping phase allocates limited human and financial resources since many of the options considered do not go forward. Currently the scoping exercise is done by an engineer with limited to no understanding of GESI issues. Prior to the scoping mission, the Scoping Expert should be briefed and sensitised to CRIDF's cross cutting issues including GESI.
2. For the pre-feasibility and feasibility stage, ensure a preparatory discussion between the sociologists and the CRIDF Gender Expert takes place, that goes beyond the discussion that takes place during the kick-off meeting. This would include reviewing the updated Gender Tool Kit to ensure that expectations are clear about what information should be provided and what tools need to be completed.
3. Organise a meeting with the sociologists to gather input on their experiences and approach to conducting GESI analysis per project. This will help to facilitate an iterative revision of the GSW and Social Assessment Guidelines including determining current level of effort allocated to each activity. Consideration should be given to preparation and post-field work reporting and what can be reasonably expected for the time allocated to each activity. This will also assist with budgeting and assessing the quality of results provided.

2.2. Methodology for Social Assessment and Application of GESI

1. Day Allocation: Provide some guidance on number of days that should be spent on desktop review, field work, writing reports that takes into account that different contexts will require more or less time, so a standardised allocation is not advised. For example, a large project or a project with a larger and more diversified population is likely to take more time both for field work and for preparatory desk top research and analysis. Consideration should be given to allocating time to meet with organisations and individuals working on gender and social inclusion issues
2. Desktop Review: In terms of quantitative data, this report includes a list of possible sources of data that are usually disaggregated. Data collected for the desktop review should also include data of relevance to the project and connected to cross-cutting issues such as on maternal and child mortality, water-borne diseases, school attendance disaggregated by gender and rates of gender based violence. Findings should be analysed within the context of how they will impact on the potential for different genders and vulnerable populations to benefit from a CRIDF water project. The desktop review should also seek to include a mix of quantitative and qualitative data that is disaggregated to take into account the issues of gender and vulnerable populations.
3. Disaggregated Data: While there may be some limitations in gathering disaggregated data, there are multiple sources of disaggregated data beyond what the country is expected to develop that can be sourced to provide an understanding of the differences that exist between men and women and girls and boys. Sociologists should therefore be required to collect gender disaggregated data as this is stated as a deliverable within Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2. In particular, they should be required to gather reports and studies and also to look at qualitative

data such as studies on particular vulnerable groups and vulnerabilities that could have a negative impact on the project and can help to prepare them before going to the field. Sources could include NGOs, academic studies, donor studies or other sources. A survey instrument could also be devised to capture differences in perspective including by asking respondents to rank or rate perceptions on particular water issues. Effort should also be made to gather information on differences within a gender connected to age, marital status, level of education and literacy that could impact on an individual's ability to benefit from a water infrastructure project.

4. Stakeholders: A list of recommended key stakeholders that should be consulted at each stage should be developed and provided to all sociologists to ensure that key stakeholders connected to GESI issues are considered including looking for women-specific institutions at the national and local level to ensure that their perspective is gathered. The revised Gender Tools will include a list of possible stakeholders that sociologists should consider that can serve as a form of check list such as widows, female-headed households and women in polygamous relationships.
5. Stakeholder Mapping: In advance of going to the field or while in the field it is recommended that sociologists should be required to work in coordination with the person at the country office assigned to do stakeholder mapping to identify organisations (NGOs and Community-based organisations) that are working in the field on relevant GESI issues both to gather their perspective on the local situation and to see if barriers that CRIDF cannot address because of its mandate can be addressed by them. The stakeholder mapping stage should include the identification and assessment of government representatives and ministries responsible for gender equality and gender-related issues including ministries such as health and social services.
6. Methodology: Provide details on the nature and type of methodologies used and connect this to the importance of ensuring that data collected is triangulated by collecting data from multiple sources e.g. observation, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), participatory mappings. For example, state that sociologists should be required to conduct a minimum number of FGDs that contain a maximum of 15 people and that demonstrate that they have accommodated both male and female voices. Require sociologists to include more details, at least for the social assessment, as to proposed or required methodology within the report to serve as a means of assessing the quality and validity of data collected. Sociologists should be encouraged to use participatory methods such as conducting a participatory mapping exercise as this would also assist in capturing critical information which is not always present in reports such as gathering information about time that women and men spend in their daily tasks, about different roles and responsibilities as well as mapping out safe and unsafe locations within a community which could assist in determining the best place to locate water infrastructure. In cases where the sociologists make reference to using observation as a source of data, more detail should be provided on who was observed, number of people, where and any other relevant information. While the use of observations may help to gather a preliminary understanding of the context, the findings from observations should be triangulated against direct input using a diversity of stakeholder consultations.

- Cross-cutting Issues: Efforts should be made to ensure that the different cross-cutting issues integrate gender considerations to demonstrate that CRIDF is more coordinated in its approach to cross-cutting issues. For example, the climate change lead should liaise with the sociologist to ensure the Risk and Vulnerability Assessment Tool (RVAT) is applied during women only group discussions, as well as mixed/men-only groups to determine if their views on the impacts of climate change differ. This would be budget-dependent but it could be an interesting study. It would also be worth finding ways to tap into women's indigenous / traditional knowledge with regard to climate adaptation responses. The same would be relevant for institutional issues such as looking for ways to do awareness raising or capacity building of staff working in water institutions of relevance to CRIDF projects.

2.3. Gender Tools & Guidelines

The tool should consider the following recommendations:

- Require the gathering of disaggregated data including the documentation of how and where data has been gathered.
- Require systematic disaggregation within each gender group including encouraging efforts to identify and consider specific vulnerabilities.
- Develop a list of vulnerable groups to serve as a point of reference for gathering data on vulnerable groups.
- Include a more detailed introductory section that provides foundational information to guide field work and highlights what is expected, sources of additional information and options for the use of different methodological approaches.
- Include details on methodologies that can be adopted to gather data including how to use participatory approaches.
- Reference tools on how to develop indicators such as the guidelines that have recently been developed by United Nations World Water Assessment Programme.
- Include probing questions that can be adapted to the specific contexts.
- Offer gender training to the sociologists to facilitate the more effective uptake and use of the updated Gender Tool. Ensure that the training provides how to use participatory methodologies.

2.4. Feasibility Reports

- Standard Information: The GESI section should include a list of required sections or information that should be included in all reports. Overall the GSW should highlight standard information that should be gathered during field work and should be incorporated into reports. A proposed Table of Contents could assist in guiding sociologists and other relevant stakeholders in this regard.
- Stakeholder Engagement: With respect to stakeholder engagement, sociologists should be encouraged to use a diversity of approaches and should consider the option of using participatory approaches. The updated Gender Tool Kit includes examples of participatory tools that could be used. IFC has developed a handbook on Good Practices for Stakeholder Engagement that could also be consulted: https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/topics_ext_content/ifc_external_corporate_site/sustainability-at-ifc/publications/publications_handbook/stakeholderengagement_wci_1319577185063
- Vulnerability: While involvement of women, girls and vulnerable populations tends to be mapped out in more detail at the feasibility/bankability stage, it would be useful if the report cited specific needs or barriers faced by women and vulnerable populations in the pre-feasibility reports as a means of guiding next steps including issues that should be considered in preparing for the bankability stage. Steps should be undertaken to ensure that at the feasibility stage that input from women and girls from vulnerable groups is systematically taken into consideration. Some of this information could be gathered at the feasibility stage as a means of informing engagement

with relevant government stakeholders and in taking stock of whether there is a location that can accommodate these specific needs.

- Disaggregated Data: Disaggregated data should not be limited to the standard population data but should also seek to capture other variables. If meetings are conducted with government representatives, this could also be used as an opportunity to find out what data or general information already exists as well as observations about women's ability to participate in community meetings and other GESI issues. Since each project has a specific context, gathering both quantitative and qualitative data including studies that highlight perspectives and challenges connected to the community at large or a sub-population could assist in determining which people or topics to investigate when going to the field.
- Disaggregated Indicators: Given that the development of indicators are required to be included in the CRIDF Gender Action Plan as well as Gender Action Plans for potential funders, efforts should be made to building upon the tools developed by other organisations. For example, the United Nations World Water Assessment Programme has produced a series of working papers on how to collect sex-disaggregated data that could assist in collecting and documenting indicators more generally while also inputting into the Gender Action Plan. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002345/234513E.pdf>; http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SC/pdf/Sex_disaggregated_indicators_for_water_assessment_monto.pdf
- Key Terminology: Key terminology needs to either be clarified e.g. peace dividends, peace more generally and expanded to make a connection to GESI issues. Also, CRIDF should consider referencing human rights commitments to water and gender as a way to incorporate a rights-based approach to its analysis on gender and water infrastructure.
- Policies: While it is useful to undertake an analysis of country policy and legal commitments connected to gender and water, CRIDF should seek to ensure that the statements it makes connected to water and the implications on gender are aligned to policies and commitments made by the countries in which is operating. It should also seek to identify ways to use policies as ways to hold government accountable to commitments made. This could include citing government commitment to international and national gender obligations such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) which many SADC countries have signed.
- Enabling Environment: The reports frequently makes reference to the potential for the project to contribute to income generation or employment which could include temporary employment in construction while not considering particular vulnerabilities women and other vulnerable populations could face in being active participants in construction or maintenance. Reports should therefore cite what enabling factors would need to be instituted either by CRIDF or through existing or potential external programmes to enable the achievement of outcomes that CRIDF has proposed would be linked to its own water infrastructure projects.
- Participation: Given that the assessment of whether to go forward on projects is based on determining whether there is broad-based community buy-in, it would be critical to assess who is participating on these committees including looking at the gender breakdown both in terms of participation and voice to determine if they truly reflect the buy-in and perspective of all community members disaggregated by gender and vulnerability and to determine which genders will be positively and negatively impacted by the project.

2.5. Overarching Core Issues:

1. Understanding diversity: Sociologists should be encouraged to gather an understanding of the diversity within a specific gender population as a means of identifying measures and outcomes targeted to promoting CRIDF's pro-poor agenda as well as determining how to tailor programmes to demographic differences of women and men within a community or beyond including issues such as age, marital status and disability.
2. Transformative Change: While transformative change is generally linked to longer term interventions, CRIDF could consider proposing ways that its project could be more "transformative" or contribute to transformation as per the frameworks included in the Gender Strategy. For example, they could seek ways to incentivise men to play more of a role in water collection or other water related tasks or look at ways to ensure that women are able to play an active role on water committees which could include capacity building measures. It would be worth exploring whether small measures can be taken such as finding ways to engage women more in the planning and decision-making process. Alternatively, CRIDF could look at ways to partner with other organisations working to transform the situation for women such as fostering small businesses or promoting financial literacy for women as a way for CRIDF to leverage gender equality efforts of other programs that could be linked to its own work.
3. Involvement in Decision-Making: Given that the assessment of whether to go forward on projects is based on determining whether there is broad-based community buy-in, it would be critical to assess who is participating in community consultations including on committees including looking at the gender breakdown both in terms of participation and voice to determine if consultations and committee truly reflect the buy-in and perspective of all community members disaggregated by gender and vulnerability and to determine which genders will be positively and negatively impacted by the project.
4. Due Diligence at all Stages: Noting that some concerns would be taken into account or addressed if a project were to move to implementation, it is nonetheless important to identify some key issues at the pre-feasibility and feasibility stage connected to gender and social inclusion. While some projects may not go forward by CRIDF, the analysis could be used by others who could choose to take the project forward.
5. Planning Process: For projects moving forward to the implementation phase, steps should be taken to ensure that women and girls are involved in the planning process to take into consideration their input regarding location of latrine and specific needs and concerns about safety. Some of this information could be gathered at the feasibility stage as a means of informing engagement with relevant government stakeholders and in taking stock of whether there is a location that can accommodate these specific needs. Efforts could also be made to partner with organisations working on these issues.
6. Gender Based Violence: Gender Based Violence is emerging as an overall societal issue in Southern Africa and has direct and indirect implications on water infrastructure and GESI. The Inter-Agency Standing Committee Guidelines for Integrating Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action: Reducing risk, promoting resilience and aiding recovery (IASC, 2015) has developed guidelines that can assist those developing WASH projects that involve refugees and those seeking humanitarian assistance to take the concerns of women and vulnerable populations into account. The guidelines are available at: www.gbvguidelines.org and should form part of efforts to encourage a more systematic analysis of the situation of GBV within the contexts in which CRIDF works.
7. Access to Land: With respect to differences in access to land, it should be considered for all reports, where appropriate. This is particularly in the case of irrigation or small dam projects where the expectation is that the water infrastructure will lead to increased productivity, income generation and employment connected to agricultural production including small vegetable gardens. It also has implications when resettlement is involved in the project as is often the case with dam projects and is an issue that donors and partners such as the World Bank watch closely as part of their safeguard policies.
8. Agricultural Productivity: It would be important to disaggregate the role that women and men play in terms of agricultural productivity including whether men and women have equal access to inputs and tools, whether women engage in the same agricultural activities as some reports reference women developing small gardens and, most importantly, whether women are able to access land and control income generated for any of their agricultural activities. There are a number of organisations working on agriculture such as FAO, IFAD and regional organisations such as SACAU that could be consulted to gather their perspective on gender and agricultural considerations.
9. Cross-border Populations: Given the number of border post projects with which CRIDF engages either directly or through passing on the project to others, there is a need for a better understanding of who crosses the border and to disaggregate the cross-border populations in terms of gender and vulnerabilities to determine if there are any specific vulnerabilities that may exist that would warrant changes to planning for water infrastructure projects.
10. Construction and Maintenance: Require consideration of the issues of construction and maintenance of at least in a general sense, at the pre-feasibility/feasibility phases including identifying barriers to the participation of women and vulnerable populations and proposing mitigating factors to enable participation.
11. Knowledge on Water: Because of their dependence on water resources, women in particular have accumulated considerable knowledge about water resources, including location, quality and storage methods. It would be worthwhile to encourage the gathering of information on knowledge women have on effective water uses including those that are more traditional and grounded in current and past cultural practices.

G) CONCLUSIONS

The Review has sought to take stock of what CRIDF has done in terms of gender mainstreaming as well as to take note of areas where things are going well and where things could be improved. Overall, CRIDF has made some good strides in factoring in gender as part of its overall work. It has developed tools and a Gender Strategy as well as training relevant stakeholders which demonstrate a commitment to integrating gender into its work.

A review of programme reports shows that some of its sociologists have a solid understanding of how to apply gender whereas there are also areas of improvement including doing more to ensure that gender is mainstreamed throughout a social assessment rather than treated as a stand-alone issue.

It is equally important to factor in vulnerabilities as part of the gender social inclusion analysis particularly since many of the vulnerabilities highlighted tend to impact women more than men while also highlighting the overall diversity within a particular population that would warrant tailored interventions and strategies when designing water infrastructure projects.

With less than two years remaining in the programmes, there are some excellent opportunities for CRIDF to continue to advance its work on mainstreaming gender both through its own direct work on project development as well as through working in partnership who can help to move the gender agenda forward, to showcase its achievements as well as to facilitate the sharing of best practices and lessons learned with other relevant stakeholders. It will also be important for CRIDF to document its best practices and lessons learned as it moves forward in using its updated tool and in revising its approach to integrating gender into its work.

H) ENDNOTES

1. DFID Strategic Vision for Gender Equality can be accessed at:
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/708116/Strategic-vision-gender-equality1.pdf
2. For more information on the Gender and Development approach, see SADC Gender and Water Handbook,
<https://www.sadc.int/documentspublications/show/4815>
3. SADC Handbook on Mainstreaming Gender in the Water Sector, SADC, Gaborone, Botswana, 2015, p. 4.
4. Infrastructure Projects, Generic Scoping Work for Bankability, May 2018, Version 2.
5. CRIDF Social Assessment Guideline, June 2018.
6. CRIDF Gender Mainstreaming Tools for Project Preparation Processes Practical application and lessons learned from using CRIDF's gender tool to influence water projects in SADC, June 2018.
7. CRIDF Gender Strategy, November 2017, Version 9.
8. Gender Tools for Project Preparation: Training Session Zimbabwe, Back to Office Report, 13th June 2018.
9. <https://www.sadc.int/issues/gender/women-economic-empowerment-programme/>
10. Sourced from: https://www.unicef.org/esaro/7310_Gender_and_WASH.html
11. CRIDF Gender Strategy, November 2017, Version 9, p. 10.
12. CRIDF Gender Strategy, November 2017, Version 9, p. 12.
13. In CRIDF 2, the Program Preparation stream has been renamed the Infrastructure Project Stream
14. This includes gathering gender disaggregated data on: population size, population growth, population demographics, poverty analysis, affordability and willingness to pay, health considerations, gender and social inclusion, economic activity and impact of climate change, stakeholder mapping, disability and poverty.
15. CRIDF Gender Mainstreaming Tools for Project Preparation Processes Practical application and lessons learned from using CRIDF's gender tool to influence water projects in SADC, June 2018.
16. CRIDF Gender Strategy, November 2017, Version 9, p. 18
17. CRIDF Gender Strategy, November 2017, Version 9, p. 8.
18. Gender Mainstreaming Tools for Water Infrastructure Project Preparation Processes, Practical Application and lessons learned from using CRIDF's gender tools to influence water projects in SADC, CRIDF, June 2018
19. CRIDF Gender Mainstreaming Tools for Project Preparation Processes Practical application and lessons learned from using CRIDF's gender tool to influence water projects in SADC, June 2018.
20. The United Nations World Water Assessment Programme has recently developed Guidelines on how to collect sex-disaggregated water data that could serve as an important reference tool rather than CRIDF developing its own separate guidance note. It can be sourced at:
http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SC/pdf/Sex_disaggregated_indicators_for_water_assessment_monito.pdf
21. CRIDF Gender Mainstreaming Tools for Project Preparation Processes Practical application and lessons learned from using CRIDF's gender tool to influence water projects in SADC, June 2018.
22. Chibabava WASH and Flood Protection Scheme, Bankability, February 2018.
23. CRIDF Infrastructure Projects, Generic Scoping Work for Bankability, May 2018, Version 2.
24. Chibabava WASH and Flood Protection Scheme, Bankability, February 2018.
25. Chikowa Dam Feasibility: Bankability Report, Version 1, July 2016
26. CRIDF Chikowa Dam Feasibility: Bankability Report, Version 1, July 2016.
27. The Chibabava WASH and Flood Protection project has done a good job of mapping organizations that can or are responding to particular enabling factors such that challenges cited have the potential to be overcome through the work of these other organizations and could serve as an example to others. CRIDF Chibabava WASH and Flood Protection Scheme, Bankability, February 2018.
28. Progress has been made on the availability of sex-disaggregated data for basic indicators on population, families, health, education and work, thanks to commitments by Governments to conduct decennial censuses, along with increases in the number of household surveys. Yet, gender statistics are still far from satisfactory, and many gaps exist in terms of data availability, quality, comparability and timeliness. According to a 2018 assessment, sufficient and regular data is available for only 10 out of the 54 gender-specific indicators in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Globally, less than one third of the data needed for monitoring the gender-specific indicators is currently available. For example, high-quality data on causes of deaths, crucial for monitoring several SDG indicators under Goal 3 (good health and well-being), can only be produced by about 30 countries. Less than half of all developing countries regularly produce information on labour force activities disaggregated by sex. <https://developmentfinance.un.org/data-availability-including-disaggregation-and-adequacy>
29. CRIDF Chibabava WASH and Flood Protection Scheme, Bankability, February 2018.
30. As is stated in the introduction, the review puts forward that Gender and Development should be the guiding frame of reference as articulated in the SADC Handbook on Mainstreaming Gender in the Water Sector.
31. CRIDF Chibabava WASH and Flood Protection Scheme, Bankability, February 2018.
32. CRIDF Chipata (Mwami) Water Supply and Sanitation Feasibility Report, Final May 2016.
33. CRIDF Mashili Rehabilitation Final Bankability Report, August 2016.
34. CRIDF BuPuSa Livelihoods Programme Mazifara Irrigation, Water Supply and Cattle Water Facilities, July 2018.
35. CRIDF Chikowa Dam Feasibility: Bankability Report, Version 1, July 2016, p. 144 -145
36. CRIDF Incomati Flood Plain Risk Management Project Phases 2 and 3 Summary Report, Final, July 2016.
37. CRIDF KAZA Zimbabwe Feasibility Report, Kaza Water Infrastructure and Livelihoods Intervention, December 2015.
38. CRIDF D02a: GESI Assessment for KAZA Namibia, CCo5 Cross Cutting – Gender, Final, 8 September 2016.
39. CRIDF KAZA Zimbabwe Feasibility Report, Kaza Water Infrastructure and Livelihoods Intervention, December 2015.
40. For example, the United Nations World Water Assessment Programme has recently produced a series of working papers on how to collect sex-disaggregated data that could assist in collecting and documenting indicators more generally while also inputting into the Gender Action Plan. These tools can be accessed at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002345/234513E.pdf>, http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SC/pdf/Sex_disaggregated_indicators_for_water_assessment_monito.pdf
41. CRIDF Chikowa Dam Feasibility: Bankability Report, Version 1, July 2016
42. CRIDF Mashili Rehabilitation Final Bankability Report, August 2016.
43. CRIDF KAZA Zimbabwe Feasibility Report, Kaza Water Infrastructure and Livelihoods Intervention, December 2015.
44. CRIDF Nchelenge Border Town Water Supply and Sanitation, Pre-Feasibility Report, October 2018.
45. The Inter-Agency Standing Committee Guidelines for Integrating Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action: Reducing risk, promoting resilience and aiding recovery (IASC, 2015) has developed guidelines that can assist those developing WASH projects that involve refugees and those seeking humanitarian assistance to take the concerns of women and vulnerable populations into account. The guidelines are available at: www.gbvguidelines.org.
46. CRIDF KAZA Zimbabwe Feasibility Report, Kaza Water Infrastructure and Livelihoods Intervention, December 2015.

Climate Resilient Infrastructure Development Facility CRIDF II

Email: gerry.mcdonald@cridf.com

www.cridf.com

Phone: 012 364 0720

