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Executive Summary

Background and Context of the Evaluation

UN-Habitat is the lead United Nations agency responsible for promoting sustainable urbanization. The world is becoming increasingly urbanised. In 1990, 43% (2.3 billion) of the world’s population lived in urban areas; by 2015, this had grown to 54% (4 billion). The world will further urbanize over the next decade, from 56.2% today to 60.4% by 2030.

Gender inequality persists within the trend towards greater urbanisation, with systemic gender discrimination, inequality and exclusion evident in cities globally. According to the World Cities Report 2020, women are at the bottom of the economic ladder provide 12.5 billion hours of unpaid care work every day, which is three times more than men do. Worldwide, men own 50% more wealth than women, and income inequality has increased since 1980. It is widely argued that achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls (SDG 5) requires more vigorous efforts, including the implementation of legal frameworks, to counter deeply rooted gender-based discrimination that often results from patriarchal attitudes and related social norms. Human development could not be conceived without gender equality and women’s and girls’ empowerment.

UN-Habitat’s approach to mainstreaming gender draws on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) of 1979, the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action where the international community established a strategy of gender mainstreaming, and the 2001 Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) elaboration of the gender perspective in the UN system, which led to the creation of the system-wide gender strategy and accountability mechanism (SWAP). In addition, various resolutions of the ECOSOC highlight the multifaceted dimensions of gender mainstreaming including the goal of 50/50 gender balance at all levels in the UN system. 1

Several UN-Habitat Governing Council (GC) resolutions have addressed gender mainstreaming in UN-Habitat’s work. The GC resolution 24/4 of 2013 which requested UN-Habitat to execute two-fold gender strategy comprising of the mainstreaming of gender equality and women’s empowerment in normative and operational programmes, and to set up policies and programmes needed to achieve equity and women’s empowerment led to the formulation and implementation of the UN-Habitat Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements (GPP) 2014-2019. The GPP builds upon the implementation experiences of the former UN-Habitat Gender Policies of 1996 and 2002, and the Gender Equality Action Plan (2008-2013). Also, the GPP contains commitments to define standards of gender mainstreaming performance included in the United Nations System-Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP).

Alongside the GPP, the UN-Habitat Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) 2014-2019 was developed to operationalize the Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements, with a comprehensive results framework for each of the seven sub-programmes of UN-Habitat plus Executive Management. The GEAP serves as an accountability framework designed to measure, monitor and drive progress in UN-Habitat towards specific expected accomplishments, indicators of achievement and illustrative actions to achieve gender equality and empowerment of women. The GEAP also details institutional arrangements, with specified roles and responsibilities.

In the context of the UN-Habitat reform and restructuring, which started in 2018, gender equality and parity are priorities of the organization. This evaluation is therefore of strategic importance. It assesses how UN-Habitat mainstreamed gender in its organizational context and programme of work during the implementation of the GPP and GEAP for the period of 2014-2019.

Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope

The purpose of this evaluation as specified in Terms of Reference is to provide UN-Habitat and its key stakeholders with an independent assessment of the implementation of UN-Habitat Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements (GPP) 2014-2019. The evaluation findings will be used for strategic decisions, organizational learning and accountability as well as for the generation of knowledge on what works and what did not work during the implementation of the GPP; feed into UN-Habitat efforts to promote the gender equality in the achievement of SDGs and implementation of the New Urban Agenda, and the new UN-Habitat strategic plan 2020-2023. The specific objectives of the evaluation were to:

(i) Assess progress and achievement on the goal and expected accomplishments of the gender policy and plan for 2014-2019

(ii) Assess the relevance of the UN-Habitat gender policy and plan in view of 2014-2019 and looking forward for 2020-2023

---

(iii) Assess extent to which UN-Habitat approach towards gender mainstreaming has been effective, efficient, sustainable and impactful on delivery of programmatic result
(iv) Assess the institutional arrangements and processes, including the added value of the Advisory Group on Gender Issues as it is presently structured and recommend any amendments to its structure and mandate, for greater impact
(v) Identify lessons learned, good practices and examples of innovations of the gender mainstreaming work supported by UN-Habitat at global, regional and country levels
(vi) Recommend strategic, programmatic and management considerations for future gender mainstreaming.

The targeted users for the evaluation are the UN-Habitat Executive Board, the UN-Habitat Management and staff, donors, partners and other key stakeholders, including UN-Habitat Advisory Group on Gender issues. The scope of the evaluation was the assessment of UN-Habitat Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements (GPP) 2014-2019 and the Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) that operationalized the policy and plan, as well as the role and results of the UN-Habitat Advisory Group on Gender issues. The evaluation was managed by the Independent Evaluation Unit in close consultation with the Human Rights and Social Inclusion Unit and conducted by evaluation consultant Ms Ingrid Obery.

Approach and Methodology
The evaluation was based on gender principles and adhered to the United Nations norms and standards for evaluation in the United Nations System. The evaluation examined to what extent UN-Habitat has achieved its goals and expected accomplishments, through illustrative actions and indicators of achievement for gender mainstreaming for the period of 2014-2019. The evaluation criteria used follow United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidelines, which are aligned with the OECD DAC evaluation criteria.

The evaluation process considered GPP institutional arrangements, procedures, collaboration, coordination, partnerships and targeted beneficiary needs. Overarching evaluation questions were supported by a series of sub questions for the interview process.

The evaluation Terms of Reference required a Theory of Change approach. The GPP did have a results framework, but not a clear Theory of Change (TOC). During the inception phase a Theory of Change was developed based on the GEAP Results Framework, a review of the 2014-2019 Strategic Plan and the 2020-2023 Strategic Plan. However, subsequent analysis of the GEAP Results Framework confirmed that it covered the substantive work of the agency rather than gender mainstreaming. The GEAP was not directly implemented in any way, nor were any of the indicators monitored. Therefore, the evaluation analysis relied on the evaluation categories and questions to triangulate data and draw conclusions about gender mainstreaming over the 2014-2019 period. The analysis also considered GPP institutional arrangements, procedures, collaboration, coordination, partnerships and targeted beneficiary needs. The evaluation was transparent and participatory, involving relevant stakeholders and partners.

Three primary methods were used to collect data: A document review, interviews, and two surveys. The document review involved a review of 100 documents. Interviews were conducted with UN-Habitat staff at Headquarters in Nairobi and across eight countries, and with a sample of partners and stakeholders at global, regional, national and local levels. In total, 60 people were interviewed or consulted. Two surveys were administered: one targeting partners and another for staff, both with capacity building, outcomes and impact questions. In addition, staff were asked relevant questions about gender institutionalization, parity and equity within UN-Habitat. In total, 149 partners and 165 staff responded to the surveys.

The information collected from the survey, the interviews and through the extensive document review was triangulated to reach the findings and conclusions of this report. Quantitative analysis of the survey was done using the Auckland University online package, Inzight. Data are largely presented using graphs generated in Excel.

There were some limitations to the evaluation, including: limited access to stakeholders as all interviews were conducted remotely; the evaluation budget only allowed for in-house translation support which by its nature will yield less accurate translations; translations into Spanish, Portuguese and French were via the Survey Monkey Google translate function which delivers poor quality translation. With Covid-19 restrictions, no field travel was possible to visit UN-Habitat programmes/projects.

---

2 These definitions have been taken from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance, Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use, adopted by the DAC at its meeting on 10 December 2019
3 https://lite.docker.stat.auckland.ac.nz
Evaluation Findings: Achievement against GPP Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) At Programme level, technical and normative assistance provided to national, regional and local authorities and other stakeholders, to improve policies, plans and programmes that achieve clearly articulated, timebound and measurable gender equality and women’s empowerment results in the areas of UN-Habitat’s strategic priorities, identified on the basis of gender analysis and assessed against clear defined baseline data disaggregated by sex and age.</td>
<td>Implementation of gender mainstreaming across UN-Habitat was variable, depending on existing gender focused initiatives. The Gender Equality Marker was important in signalling the agency’s commitment to gender mainstreaming. There is evidence of many effective practices across a wide range of countries and focus areas. It has become the norm at country level to push for inclusive participatory consultation processes that include women, and this is slowly yielding good results – good examples were found in Iraq, Bolivia, Somalia. Focused local coherence across a country programme was evident in Afghanistan, where there is a full-time gender advisor. Land Tenure tools and processes were identified as increasingly gender focused, and the work around Public Space and Safer Cities is achieving change in the daily lives of women at community level – an important element is ensuring that leaders can see the benefits of including women’s concerns and interests. However, poor monitoring systems at the institutional level means that the many good practices, as well as the learning from more challenging situations, has not been consolidated into an agency-wide picture of results.</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Progress towards internal gender parity at all levels, particularly at the P5 levels and above clearly demonstrated, according to the defined United Nations formula, as an objective indicator of organizational commitment to gender equality and women’s rights, and of an organizational culture with the capacity to advance them</td>
<td>In the six years from 2014 to 2020, the gender ratios have changed, but gender parity is not yet achieved. In the G2-7 and the P4-5 levels, the percentage of women employed by UN-habitat increased by 2%: G2-7 from 68-70%; and P4-5 from 34-36%. The P1-3 levels saw a decrease of 5% from 51% in 2014 to 46% in 2020. The National Officers’ as well as the ASG/USG-D levels both saw a 12% increase: NOs from 30% in 2014 to 42% in 2020; ASG/USG-D levels from 18% to 30%. Gender bias training has taken place and there are initiatives to address recruitment parity. There are also ad-hoc gender focused initiatives at head office which were considered useful. However, the survey revealed significant gender differences in opinion regarding the level of influence women have internally and whether this has changed over the period, and the extent to which capacity building has improved internal gender focus. It is important to note that gender parity among country office staff has positively influenced counterpart attitudes about women’s empowerment in countries like Egypt and Iraq.</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Internal institutional arrangements fully enabling two objectives, 1 and 2, and progressive compliance with the performance standards of the System-Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and The Empowerment of Women (SWAP).</td>
<td>The Gender Equality Unit was understaffed and under resourced for the whole GPP period, which limited its ability to provide active support to gender-focused implementation. The allocation of 5% time for Gender Focal Points to undertake gender mainstreaming work is not sufficient to support critical area of work. The AGGI was active and influential from its establishment in 2012 and during in the first two years of the GPP period, but has declined in influence, with low member turnover and a lack of clarity and structure in its engagement with the Secretariat and the agency as a whole. Member states’ commitments to supporting gender focused work may not be fully aligned to intent expressed in the 2013 and 2016 Assembly resolutions. UN-Habitat has consistently reported to UN SWAP, although the ratings achieved in some cases may not reflect the full picture.</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Findings: Performance against Evaluation Criteria

Relevance
The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies

To what extent was the UN-Habitat Gender Policy and Plan 2014-2019 known, understood, accepted, and acted upon internally and externally for maximum contribution to gender mainstreaming?

To what extent was the GPP aligned with the UN System-wide Action Plan on gender equality and the empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP), thus being relevant to UN system-wide expectations?

Despite an overarching statement of commitment to gender equality and women’s empowerment, Gender is not very visible in UN-Habitat’s corporate Strategic Plan 2014-2019 and this may be one of the reasons gender mainstreaming has
shown variable success over the period.\textsuperscript{4} UN-Habitat’s Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements (GPP) for 2014-2019 was relevant to UN-Habitat’s mandate in that it was aligned to the Strategic Plan 2014-2019. It was also very relevant to the broader international UN and development aid context where gender equality and women’s empowerment were increasingly being stressed as critical elements necessary to achieve Agenda 2030. Despite this alignment, the GPP does not appear to have been a useful, strategic or visionary driver of gender mainstreaming. Importantly, the GEAP results framework did not push UN-Habitat to be more gender transformative and did not seek to monitor key elements such as impact of gender Technical Assistance or support to implementation of GGP, the usefulness of gender-focused capacity building, or establishment and use of a process to ensure gender transformative language within normative tools and knowledge products.

Among those interviewed, there was mixed awareness of the policy and few people had knowledge of its content. Despite this, there is good evidence that gender mainstreaming was increasingly recognised as a necessary component of UN-Habitat’s practice over the GPP implementation period. There was consensus that there should be a revised Gender Strategy for the 2020-2023 strategic period, and it will be important that this strategy challenges and deepens UN-Habitat’s incorporation of gender into its daily practice.

Was the GPP a living document that added value to the gender mainstreaming project over the strategic period? Not at all, but it had symbolic significance and the main goals were generally well understood. The GEAP’s Results Framework did not define how the strategy’s Goals could be delivered, but rather partly mirrored the corporate Strategic Plan’s Results Framework. No monitoring against the GEAP indicators was done in the GPP period.

UN-Habitat has consistently reported as required against the UN’s System-Wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN SWAP), but ratings are inconsistent with the gender mainstreaming reality. The GPP and the GEAP are frequently cited as evidence of gender mainstreaming. However, as the GEAP was not implemented or monitored, these documents cannot be said to be valid evidence of gender mainstreaming. In the absence of direct implementation and monitoring of the GEAP this evaluation addressed the evaluation categories and questions.

Coherence

To what extent did UN-Habitat implement its gender mainstreaming approach in coherence and synergy with other development programmes?

UN-Habitat works coherently with other UN agencies, implementing partners, NGOs and country and local governments, and in various global forums. UN-Habitat appears to consistently include gender issues in the content of its work.

One of the most significant events during the GPP period was Habitat III and the primary product of that event, the document describing the New Urban Agenda (NUA) does include gender-specific indicators.

UN-Habitat works closely with a range of partners at global, regional, national and local levels. The nature of the partners and the partnerships have a significant bearing on the extent to which gender is a central focus. Over time – extending further back than the last GEAP period 2008-2013 – some partners’ insistence on gender as a central focus has influenced UN-Habitat’s gender approach very positively. A criteria for partnership with UN-Habitat is the potential partners’ familiarity or commitment to a gender approach. Covid-19 saw focused partnership between UN agencies with each bringing its particular expertise to support government responses, including support to deal with Gender-Based Violence and stigma. Most country interviews indicated that resources had been diverted to support the response to the pandemic.

UN-Habitat spearheaded the development of a United Nations System-wide Strategy on Sustainable Urbanization working with over 24 UN organizations: Gender is identified as one of the key elements to be addressed to achieve sustainable and equitable urban development.

Effectiveness

The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance

How clearly aligned has UN-Habitat gender mainstreaming been in terms of clarity and coherence of linkages between agency’s operational and normative work streams at global, regional and country levels and institutional arrangements?

UN-Habitat consciously addresses gender mainstreaming in the planning of its normative and programmatic work. However, implementation is less consistent, although there are a number of excellent practices and results. Also, the

\textsuperscript{4} The corporate Strategic Plan 2014-2019 mentions gender three times only: once in the goal statement and in two of the goal’s indicators which require data disaggregated by gender: Percentage of people living in slums, and percentage of people in urban areas with access to services. ‘Women’ appears eight times in the Results Framework, primarily in the Expected Accomplishments and indicators for Urban Legislation and Urban Economy.
method, manner and understanding of gender mainstreaming differs across the agency. There were many individuals with strong gender focus active within UN-Habitat before and throughout the period. The agency has a number of long-term partnerships that have contributed to improved gender focus over time. However, as a largely project-based agency, UN-Habitat also runs many projects that are only one or two years’ long, making it difficult to ensure that gender focused interventions are sustained. In the absence of an influential, strategic, well-monitored policy and plan, programmatic coherence in relation to gender is unavoidably weak and efforts are fragmented and inconsistent. UN-Habitat’s effectiveness in relation to gender focus is also determined in part by the commitment and depth of understanding of its various partners, who often are the primary funding sources for project work.

Based on gender mainstreaming activities over the past two decades, normative events such as the WUF and Urban Thinker Campuses (UTC), the work to incorporate gender into the SDGs and the NUA, and long-standing partnerships with gender-focused stakeholders and organisations, it is clear WHAT must be done. There is also a fair amount of guidance on HOW to ensure gender equality and women’s empowerment – what may be missing is the dialogue to connect the what and the how and address specific contexts.

The GEAP results framework was not used as a monitoring framework, and the Gender Equality Marker (GEM) appears to be the primary measure of UN-Habitat gender mainstreaming. While this tool has been instrumental in driving gender mainstreaming in project design, it remains fairly generic if not supported by good guidance on ensuring that projects include gender-focused monitoring indicators in addition to requirements to collect sex-disaggregated data. Between 2016 and 2020 a total of 421 projects and concept notes were assessed against the GEM, although it was found that there is no formal follow up process to ensure that projects rated at level 4 have implemented the agreed remedial actions to become more gender sensitive. Consolidating the GEM into the Environmental and Social Safeguarding System may help to ensure more focused project indicators that better guide implementation – this work is planned for 2021.

There was mixed evidence of the usefulness of gender-focused guidelines. Those produced by and for programmes such as the Global Land Tenure Network (GLTN) and the WASH programme are recognised as being very useful and appropriate. Those produced by HQ much less so, largely, it seems, because there is no support process to enable effective use.

Gender mainstreaming within the thematic areas appears to vary, and is very different across the regions. Interviews and documents indicated that the linkages between thematic area experts at Headquarters and country offices is sometimes not good, which further contributes to lack of clarity on how to make projects more gender focused. Where work is directly tied to practical on-the-ground implementation, gender awareness appears to be greater – for example, in land tenure and slum upgrading work addresses the situation people face daily and normative work responds directly to these issues, in planning and design work address the concerns of officials who must ensure citizen safety and access to services. Where things are more abstract as in urban policy, or highly technical as in basic services gender awareness is less consistently evident. This indicates the need for more comprehensive and coherent efforts to embed gender within the institution.

There has been a conscious effort over the period to increase the collection of gender-disaggregated data at a range of levels including via the indicators for global urbanisation monitoring such as the CPI, and within project monitoring. UN-Habitat’s global data picture is based on data from 3,000 cities. Resource constraints limit UN-Habitat’s ability to fully depict the gender picture of cities across the globe, as this requires granular and detailed data from neighbourhoods. UN-Habitat manages nine of the 15 indicators under SDG 11, and data is gathered from a range of sources.

‘Gender at UN-Habitat does not receive core funding, which means that efforts to include it are largely voluntary, or project funded – this hinders long-term behavioural/attitudinal change toward gender mainstreaming’. Opinions varied about the extent or depth of gender awareness and the levels of capability to implement gender mainstreaming within UN-Habitat. There is a group of staff who have an excellent understanding of the importance of gender focus for sustainable urbanisation, and who work hard to ensure this. However, there are still many who see gender as a compliance issue. UN SWAP reports seem to be the only place where internal gender awareness and capacity are tracked.

UN-Habitat projects and programme training increasingly include a gender component, but for the most part this is relatively ‘light’ – gender is mentioned as an important issue and some examples are given, but the sessions do not provide in-depth discussions and inputs as to the centrality of gender in sustainable urbanisation. In the 2018 Voluntary National Reviews of SDG 11, participating countries identified four key areas for improvement. One of these was to ‘Enhance the human resources and capacity of policymakers and technical personnel to implement the NUA and the urban dimension of the SDGs.’

---

3 UN SWAP Report 2017
4 World Cities Report 2020
Global programmes have been fairly consistent in including a gender focus in programme design and implementation, and appear to contribute to a broader understanding of what gender mainstreaming means in practice, often with tracked outcomes showing the benefits for women and girls. The global programmes for Land Tenure, Participatory Slum Upgrading, Public Space and Safer Cities all have substantial gender focus. The review of global programmes suggests that placing a safety and gender lens over any city will of necessity draw on all of UN-Habitat’s areas of expertise. For example, a comparative analysis show that over 20 years of Safer Cities, interventions have been concentrated in four areas: policing, safe urban design involving management of public space and slum upgrading, social and economic inclusion of marginalised and vulnerable groups, and governance and public awareness. Key lessons in all of these programmes is that political leadership or ownership and institutionalisation of the approach is critical for success: the first ensures that action will be taken, the second that the approaches become part of the way the municipality works.

The country context over the period has seen some changes. There is more awareness globally about gender. Many countries now have Ministries of Gender or Women at national level, gender policies or national frameworks, and some have increasing numbers of women ministers and mayors. These changed conditions provide a structural entry point for gender-focused activities, even if beliefs and behaviours lag behind. A most significant finding in this evaluation is the impact achieved by having a full-time senior gender advisor in the country office, and it appears the cost benefit of this post is large. This post – established in 2017 – is funded from office core funds and is responsible for all gender-related work in programmes and in the office. The five-year Gender strategy outlines how gender issues will be addressed in programmes and in the running of the Afghanistan Country Office.

Efficiency

A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results

| How efficiently has UN-Habitat harnessed its resources (financial, human and partnerships) to achieve gender mainstreaming? |

Efforts to assess the budgets and resources allocated to gender mainstreaming was not possible as no information was provided. Despite this it was clear from documents and interviews that the function was poorly resourced. This lack of resourcing, together with an absence of a centralised coherent vision with strong goals and targets, meant gender mainstreaming implementation was fragmented across UN-Habitat’s various programmes and work areas. There were no gender-specific evaluations in the strategic period, but all evaluations of projects and programmes included a consideration of gender mainstreaming effectiveness. Gender mainstreaming in UN-Habitat was last evaluated in 2011.

The UN-Habitat gender architecture is relatively fragmented and, lacking a clearly articulated vision, and has not effectively enabled the project of gender mainstreaming. The various elements have not had sufficient influence or capacity to demonstrate categorically the benefits of a fully gendered approach to sustainable urbanisation.

UN-Habitat leadership – governance structures and executives – have provided a fair level of support to gender mainstreaming over the strategic period. However, they have consistently failed to allocate and mobilise adequate resources to this strategic function.

The Gender Equality Unit’s role in supporting gender mainstreaming was limited over the period. Many factors contributed to this: too few staff; relatively high staff turnover; a lack of appropriately strategic and specialist gender skills; and severe resource constraints which precluded having any of their own projects. These constraints meant that the unit was primarily responsive, focusing on reviewing project proposals against the Gender Equality Marker, addressing to corporate requests where these did not require additional expenditure, and contributing to key advocacy and policy events.

The extent to which gender focal points are effective must depend on how important they believe gender mainstreaming is, as the work is required on top of overstretched post requirements, and also on the individual’s level of influence. The survey found that gender focal points were either somewhat effective, or had little effect. Interviews showed that often focal points are fairly junior staff.

The AGGI was vibrant and definitely added much value in the first half of the strategic period spotlighting gender issues in global forums. Its influence and efficacy appear to have declined after Habitat III. Slow member turnover, a fixed gender analysis and a lack of clarity and structure in its engagement with the Secretariat may be key contributors to this situation. This structure would benefit from new members and fresh ideas across a wider spectrum of stakeholders to enhance both internal and external dialogue on gender mainstreaming.

UN-Habitat is making efforts to address gender parity within a difficult and shifting context, and there are different perceptions between the genders about the agency’s level of commitment. There are also very different perceptions
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between the genders about the level of women’s influence in decision making and whether this changed. In the six years from 2014 the gender ratios have seen some changes, but parity is some way off. In the G2-7 and the P4-5 levels, the percentage of women employed increased by 2%: G2-7 from 68-70%; and P4-5 from 34-36%. The P1-3 levels saw a decrease of 5% from 51% in 2014 to 46% in 2020. The National Officer and ASG/USG-D levels both saw a 12% increase: National Officers from 30% in 2014 to 42% in 2020; ASG/USG-D levels from 18% to 30%. Monitoring of gender parity has been the responsibility of the Gender Equality Unit. This internally focused function would be better placed with Human Resources and Talent Management.

The GEAP Results Framework is not strong: it does not address the GPP’s goal statements or foreground gender, focusing rather on the substantive work of the corporate Strategic Plan. Many of the expected accomplishments are very similar or identical with those in the corporate Strategic Plan, with ‘gender’ or ‘women’s empowerment’ added. Some of the linked indicators were very similar, but others were very different from those in the corporate Strategic Plan, and it is not clear where this data would have been gathered. It must be noted that the previous Action Plan covering 2008-2013 was a much more focused gender plan with six action areas and very specifically gender focused outcomes. If the Strategic Plan EAs and indicators are a comprehensive reflection of the UN-Habitat strategy, then the GEAP results framework would not have systematically ensured a comprehensive gender focus throughout the strategy. This made it easy to ignore. Rather than adding gender words, a more strategically focused set of EAs and indicators that held the agency to account might have been more powerful. Some GEAP indicators under the Office of the Executive Director, if implemented, would have contributed to highlighting gender as a strategic priority within UN-Habitat.

The UN-Habitat Strategic Plan Results Framework had a few indicators that tracked gender mainstreaming, although these related mainly to tracking planning information. Gender mainstreaming activities and outcomes were reported in Annual Progress Reports in the section covering cross-cutting issues. Reporting was consistent but fragmented, and incomplete, as the Annual Progress Reports and project evaluations only reflect a sample of activities or achievements. The Gender Equality Action Plan was not monitored. The Results Framework did not reflect the goal statements – the biggest gap being how Goal 1 (support to gender mainstreaming) would be measured – but rather covered work that was directly the responsibility of focus areas and country offices. Most importantly, the results frameworks for both the Strategic Plan and the GEAP were not designed to measure impact. Also, there are no standard review mechanism to prompt revision and adjustment during project implementation if monitoring information indicates this is necessary.

Aside from evaluations, UN-Habitat primarily measures its capacity to achieve gender mainstreaming by ensuring project compliance with the Gender Equality Marker at the planning and design stage. While the GEM is a good quality control and process measure for project approval, it should not be confused or conflated with rigorous gender-focused design, implementation or outcomes monitoring.

Gender is reflected with varying degrees of robustness in programme monitoring, depending very much on how individual programmes or projects focus on gender. There are no mechanisms to review progress and prompt project refocus or adjustment to take account of identified weaknesses. There is also no consolidation of project data to high level to show agency performance. UN-Habitat is reportedly weak at establishing firm evidence-based baselines. The different regions track and process information very differently. The Arab States Region stands out in terms of the way it documents gender achievements.

Awareness of gender monitoring data in programming seems to have relatively little traction among partners, with half of survey respondents being unaware, and a further 18% stating that gender is not monitored. Programme monitoring data, and to a lesser extent, global surveillance data were widely reported to be used for planning, with some sources of other data. Partners used Global Surveillance Data significantly more than staff, while programme monitoring data and other data were used to similar extents by staff and partners.

UN-Habitat is making efforts to address gender parity within a difficult and shifting context, and there are different perceptions between the genders about the agency’s level of commitment. There are also very different perceptions between the genders about the level of women’s influence in decision making and whether this changed. The global picture shows that staff survey respondents felt that women and men had equal influence (42%), with 20% stating that this influence had increased, and 19% that it had stayed the same, suggesting that these respondents felt women had also had equal influence before the gender initiatives of the project period. A very different picture emerges (P<0.05), when the perceptions of different genders are compared. Respondents who identified as male felt far more strongly (63%) that women and men had equal influence, with 37% indicating that this was achieved through increasing influence during the strategic period. In contrast, 38% of women and ‘other gender’ felt women still have less influence than men even after the project interventions in the last six years, and that this remains unchanged (41%). This pattern of far more optimistic views on gender among men than women in UN-Habitat suggests hidden biases, unmet expectations among women, and a need for further gender blindness engagement internally.
Impact

Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended

What transformational changes did the implementation of gender mainstreaming bring? What were the key factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of goals?

The hypothesis in the Theory of Change devised for this evaluation states: ‘That UN-Habitat’s strategic results and expected accomplishments will be significantly and more sustainably achieved if all programmes, activities and results have gender equality and women’s empowerment focus as a fundamental underpinning principle’. This evaluation did find – across a wide range of sources – that where gender equality and women’s empowerment have been substantial components of programming, good results have been achieved in many contexts. It appears that these may be more sustained results, but this cannot be validated in the absence of sustained and detailed monitoring of results.

The overall picture gained of gender mainstreaming is fragmented and lacks coherence. There are interventions where gender is included in project design documents, but much less so in implementation: perceptions about impact vary widely across the regions but this cannot be confirmed from hard data, although there are consistent but under-resourced efforts to gather better gender-disaggregated data to demonstrate situations and progress. Gender mainstreaming during the 2014-2019 strategic period was a direct continuation of the work done in the previous strategic period. Many of the excellent initiatives and products produced in that prior period were continued into the new period. There was less evidence of the development of innovative products, guidelines or interventions.

Aside from patriarchal attitudes, Gender-Based Violence is one of the persistent barriers to successful community engagement and sustainability. Other barriers to effective implementation included resources for gender-focused ‘how to’ support and poor monitoring systems.

Sustainability

The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits.

What changes have occurred as a result of implementation of gender mainstreaming during 2014-2019 that may contribute to the achievement of the SDG 5 and the New Urban Agenda?

UN-Habitat has provided route maps that are gender-friendly to achieve Agenda 2030 through the work done on SDG 11, in the Habitat III process as well as the outcome document, the New Urban Agenda. Global platforms such as the WUF and the WUC, as well as Expert Group meetings and other dialogue platforms provide further substance to what gender transformed cities need to look like – this normative conversation is ongoing and consistently includes gender as an important focus area.

The GPP period has seen variable but definite increases in gender awareness among staff and partners, and the gender focus in project and programme work is increasing. Ensuring sustainability is difficult when projects are one or two years long, and when donors push for technical completion – here evidence of progress as a result of women’s participation becomes critical. However, long-term programming over different project phases shows how gender focus can mature and evolve, resulting in improved and more transformative approaches and tools.

UN-Habitat’s global reports and data sets – including the World Cities Report and the CPI – also provide gender disaggregated trend analysis that appears to be more frequently used in planning at national and local levels. UN-Habitat’s work at national level around urban policy development has the NUA as a framework which means that gender is part of what is included. The extent, depth and impact of gender mainstreaming work in thematic areas is difficult to quantify, but there is evidence of good practices as well as changes to the lives of beneficiaries and communities. It appears that gender parity and women’s empowerment within UN-Habitat country teams acts as an example and influences counterparts’ attitudes towards women and the inclusion of women in decision-making.

There are a wide range of barriers to making progress in ensuring gender-friendly cities and human settlements. Contextual barriers included local cultural and religious imperatives that prevent women’s participation in various stages of project life cycles. Political instability and deeply patriarchal governments also presented a challenging terrain within which to drive gender content in policy and projects. Frequent changes in postholders in government also present a challenge as each new cadre needs orientation and training. Internal barriers include a poorly structured GPP, an under-resourced gender mainstreaming function, poor monitoring and consolidation of evidence about good gender results, and a lack of practical support to implementation.
Conclusions

What strategic, programmatic, structural and management adjustments should be undertaken to improve performance in the implementation gender mainstreaming in view of the Strategic Plan 2020-2023?

UN-Habitat General Assembly resolutions, the Strategic Plan and the GPP indicate that gender equality is regarded as a strategic issue in line with UN guidance and resolutions. While the intention may be there, there is limited evidence that the agency is standing by the assertion that addressing gender equality and women’s empowerment is one of the key requirements for achieving sustainable urbanisation that benefits all. There are a number of reasons for this: The GPP and the GEAP were not directly implemented; the gender mainstreaming function was poorly resourced; mainstreaming was ensured in planning but not in implementation; and there was no monitoring of gender-specific outcomes. Progress was made in terms of the GPP goals, but this was often due to a range of other factors: Gender mainstreaming programme work continued from the previous period; externally there was increasing awareness within the UN about gender, particularly in the transition from MDGs to SDGs, UN-Habitat stakeholders such as the Huairou Commission continued to push gender as an issue, and preparation for Habitat III included active involvement of UN Women and others focused on making gender significant in the New Urban Agenda (NUA).

The implementation of gender mainstreaming across UN-Habitat is fragmented and of variable rigour. This is a result of the ongoing highly siloed way of working within the agency, the lack of any structure or person coordinating and consolidating an agency-wide picture, and lack of both vertical and horizontal communication of implementation plans and achievements, and a void in the area of using information to improve content, focus and usefulness of tools and support. Introduction of the Gender Equality Marker for project approvals was an important signal internally that gender mainstreaming had become a basic requirement, but the gender function needed to influence far beyond that, and opportunities were missed to highlight gender messaging in thematic forums.

The Gender Equality unit was not able to drive gender mainstreaming based on an overarching view of how gender was being embedded in the structures, functions and practices of UN-Habitat. This meant that very often the extent of gender focus was a result of partner requirements and the level of understanding and prioritisation of the project or programme designers. It also meant that normative tools were not consistently and comprehensively made gender friendly. Also, it meant that the notion of gender mainstreaming remained at the planning level in terms of compliance. Importantly, this meant that there was no process to look horizontally across programmes and projects to identify good practices that might be usefully be utilised elsewhere, or identify potential cross project/programme engagement – to enhance and deepen the quality, to optimise use of resources, to share learnings, to build internal understanding of the intersectionality of gender.

UN-Habitat’s global data gathering efforts are pushing for disaggregated data for gender, location, age, and disability. Programme monitoring has also seen improvements in gathering sex-disaggregated data – but these attempts are ad-hoc. Although there is evidence of good practice in a wide range of projects and programmes, UN-Habitat’s fragmented monitoring systems mean the full picture of breadth, depth and sustained impact of these interventions is not known. This means that it is difficult to make a fair evaluation of achievements. Importantly key learning opportunities are lost if the full picture is not evident. The initiatives to establish monitoring dashboards in the office of the Chief of Staff could contribute significantly to help build an agency-wide picture of gender mainstreaming – as long as the appropriate indicators and monitoring activities are put in place for the 2020-2023 period.

Member states’ commitments to supporting gender focused work is not aligned to intent expressed in the 2013 and 2016 Assembly resolutions. An important consequence of the lack of resources and sufficient staff in the Gender Equality Unit, was that the unit was not proactive in providing implementation support to regional and country offices – the complaint about a lack of ‘how to’ support was loud, despite many written guidelines. This means that despite the existence of many guidance documents, the most significant gap in gender mainstreaming is practical guidance, dialogue and support to implementation that helped to ‘localise’ gender focused activities to take account of local conditions and contexts. This person-to-person process cannot be filled by documents. A good practice databank, however, would not go amiss. Critically, the opportunity was lost to build confidence across the agency about the usefulness of the gender unit as a good source of normative and practical guidance.

While the Advisory Group on Gender Issues was active and influential in the first half of the GPP strategic period, it seems to have declined in influence after Habitat III, with low member turnover and a lack of clarity and structure in its engagement with the Secretariat and the agency as a whole. It was clear that this structure requires a process of active renewal, and this would best be done alongside a focused gender strategy. It was generally agreed by all those interviewed that a gender policy or strategy is a good idea, as it keeps the issue on everyone’s radar.
Looking internally, the interviews did not reveal vastly different perceptions between males and females about UN-Habitat’s internal commitment and actions aimed at gender equality and empowerment of women. The survey, however, revealed significant differences in opinion regarding the level of influence that women have internally and whether this has changed over the period. Opinions also differed about whether capacity building had improved people’s ability to implement internal guidelines on gender with males being much more positive and the majority of female respondents feeling that there had been no or very little improvement.

**Lessons Learned**

Having a Gender Strategy was an important signal regarding UN-Habitat’s intentions for gender mainstreaming. However, while the policy’s existence was an important indicator of commitment, the document itself was not inherently strategic, and the GEAP results framework almost mirrored the corporate results framework – which meant that delivery of the strategy was largely out of control of gender-focused staff. The next Gender Strategy should be focused, simple and direct, aiming to challenge and support the agency to improve its gender focus, with a results framework that measures improvements to the gender focus of UN-Habitat work.

Improving gender parity in Country Offices impacts counterparts’ thinking and attitudes to women’s inclusion and empowerment over time. There was evidence of this in Egypt and Iraq.

While it is very important to work towards achieving parity among training course participants, it is also important that the gender content and messaging of the courses themselves is robust and challenging and relevant to participants’ context. This would contribute to sustainability.

Similarly, participatory consultative processes that include women are critical. However, the project or programme must ensure that the views of women and other excluded groups are heard and then reflected in the implementation planning, and continue to inform implementation reviews. This is particularly important where counterparts such as local governments take over implementation. This indicates the importance of obtaining initial agreements about the nature and extent of gender content and desired results, and ensuring that these are included in monitoring and reporting frameworks.

Informants indicated that baselines are very seldom identified for gender-focused work. Outcome quality would be improved by ensuring that a clear baseline is established at project inception, and building in review points and feedback loops enabling improvements to be made during implementation. This process would contribute to improved monitoring data and to building a consolidated corporate picture of gender mainstreaming.

The more information and evidence there is about the benefits of taking a gender-focused approach, the more likely it is that counterparts and partners can understand how this is beneficial to them – practically and politically. Pragmatically, this might be finding the ‘what’s in it for everyone if women are more empowered’. This in turn could potentially generate additional resources for gender-focused programming.

Guidelines and toolkits are useful to the extent that implementers are directly supported to adapt and use the content appropriately for their context.

**Recommendations**

These recommendations arise from the findings and conclusions of this evaluation. Many are inter-related. More detail is suggested in the main recommendations section of the report.

1. **Make the Drivers of Change and flagship programmes gender focused.** To give substance to UN-Habitat’s commitment to gender equality and the empowerment of women, gender must be positioned more strategically. This evaluation recommends that:

   a. Each of the Drivers of Change is enhanced to include a gender focus;
   
   b. Each of the flagship programmes is enhanced to include a specific gender focused outcome for which targeted funds are sought. These outcomes should be drawn from or directly complement the Gender Strategy.
   
   c. The new Gender Strategy goals and indicators are included as a dashboard that is monitored by the Office of the Executive Director.

   These two actions would place a gender lens over each of the 2020-2023 Domains of Change, with the desired impact that UN-Habitat’s way of working and thinking is gender transformative. UN-Habitat’s budget is more than 80% project based, and its core resources will not stretch to supporting a meaningful gender function. It is more likely that a flagship programmes could attract earmarked but flexible funding to support the programme’s gender outcome.
2. **One big and many small Gender Strategies**: If the Strategic Plan 2020-2023 demonstrates visible commitment to a gendered approach, a Gender Strategy becomes the mechanism to support this. **This evaluation recommends**:

   i. **Development of a UN-Habitat Gender Equality and Empowerment Strategy** that is based on a Theory of Change, and has a Results Framework that measures the depth and extent of gender mainstreaming, with **clear baseline information**. The Gender Strategy would support the gender content of the Strategic Plan’s Drivers of Change and the gendered content of the Flagship Programmes.

   a. **The development of context driven Country Gender Strategies** that support and contribute to the main strategy. The Afghanistan example of a local country-focused gender strategy is a good practice that should be replicated in all country offices.

   b. **Implementation of the Gender Strategy** should be the responsibility of an executive staff member. The Gender Strategy would seek to implement gender mainstreaming through language, indicators, monitoring, methodologies, knowledge production collation and dissemination, and very practical day-to-day assistance to project and country implementation staff and partners to ensure local context and issues are effectively addressed, and providing methodologies and support approaches that enable and capacitate UN-Habitat staff, partners and counterparts. Its vision would describe a gender friendly result for sustainable urbanisation – sharing that goal with the corporate Strategic Plan. However, **Expected Accomplishments and indicators** would be very different from those in the corporate strategy. They would measure the extent to which people, projects and processes are gender transformative – holding UN-Habitat to account for its stated commitment – and provide the framework for technical and advocacy support to facilitate this growth.

3. **Make the Gender Focal Point role meaningful**: Part of the reason for many gaps in effective gender mainstreaming is that some roles are implicit or dependent on the level of commitment of individuals to pursue gender-focused activities, or the roles are given – in the case of Gender Focal Points – to junior staff. **This evaluation recommends**

   a. Gender Focal Points are appointed from staff at **P3 level and above**

   b. Gender Focal Point responsibilities, **targets and deliverables** formally account for 20% of their time against the Gender Strategy outcomes.

   c. **Focused internal Capacity Building opportunities** aimed at enhancing gender transformative capabilities are provided for **Gender Focal Points**. Joint training opportunities should be explored with other agencies to make this cost effective.

   d. The Boliva Country Office Gender Focal Point is a partial secondment from UN Women. UN-Habitat should explore whether similar arrangements are possible in other countries.

   e. Where possible, **country level Gender Focal Points or advisors posts** are funded by the member state or main project donor.

4. **Revitalise the Advisory Group on Gender Issues (AGGI)**: The Advisory Group on Gender Issues (AGGI) is a key structure that brings voices from the grassroots into the sustainable urbanisation dialogue. These voices should be current and should be reflected in how the agency responds ‘to persistent and new development problems’. **This evaluation recommends**

   a. **The advisory pool of potential AGGI members** is expanded, drawing on both existing long-term partners, but also seeking advisors from a wider range of organisations, networks or groups that have potential to introduce new ideas and innovation, taking account of current international trends and debates around gender.

   b. **The Secretariat must facilitate** timeous replacement of members of AGGI every two years in line with the Terms of Reference for this structure, ensuring that there is some overlap for continuity.

   c. **Revise the AGGI Terms of Reference** to clearly outline minimum expectations of members in terms of advisory functions, review tasks, participation in international forums such as WUF and Expert Groups.

5. **Gender-focused resource mobilisation**: Gender mainstreaming was constrained by many things in the 2014-2019 period, but one of the most critical gaps was a lack of resources. **This evaluation recommends that**

   a. **A Gender Function Resource Mobilisation Strategy** is implemented as part of the Gender Strategy. This would include:

---
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i. Where possible, replication of the Afghanistan model in countries with larger programmes: a full-time senior gender advisor,

ii. Mobilising resources for gender-focused programmes linked to specific gaps identified in countries identified through programme monitoring,

iii. Engagement of member states through the Executive Board, the Committee of Permanent Representatives and the UN-Habitat Assembly: the advocacy message would be for support to give substance to the 2019 Assembly Resolution on gender, confirming their commitment to making the resolution’s provisions a reality, globally and in their home countries.

6. **Advocacy in all forums to elevate gender-transformative messages:** Enable constant, coherent gender messaging in all forums to build UN-Habitat’s reputation as a gender transformed agency. This can be achieved by harnessing the evidence of gender results from projects and programmes for use in advocacy and general corporate messaging, as well as into forums at all levels where dialogue takes place on how best to achieve the SDGs and the NUA.

7. **Ensure capacity building includes meaningful gender content and monitoring:** Provide input into UN-Habitat training materials to ensure meaningful gender content as well as desired gender-focused learning/behaviour/implementation outcomes, and monitor achievement of these outcomes. Ensure that both internal and external capacity building and training interventions provide evidence of the benefits of gender-focused implementation for sustainability.

8. **Provide gender focused ‘how to’ design and implementation guidance:** There is a need for more direct support to project and programme implementation to support building in a meaningful gender focus. Most frequently the need is to have direct engagement and dialogue with another person with gender-specific expertise. Some specific activities could include:

   a. **Identify which guidelines/tools need to be updated and plan for this through a consultation process with users.**

   b. To avoid ‘in-house fees or charges for gender support establish communities of practice among internal gender experts and external partner organisations and individuals who can offer implementation advice to enhance UN-Habitat’s gender mainstreaming capabilities and as part of building gender focused sustainable urbanisation in different country contexts. Ensure tight coordination and management to link requested support to relevant expertise via on-line platforms. Advertise the service and monitor use. Offer learning and dialogue spaces/platforms for people from both groups as well as those receiving support.

9. **Gender focused monitoring and knowledge management:** This evaluation recommends that

   a. UN-Habitat implements a Gender Knowledge Management and Monitoring Plan to support wider corporate initiatives such as the expansion of the ESS v3 that will guide design processes, the Integrated Planning, Management and Reporting (IPMR) module of UMOJA, and the monitoring dashboards being set up by the Executive Director’s Chief of Staff.

   b. **Prioritise the process of harmonizing indicators across the agency: ONE central bank of gender indicators that is relevant across UN-Habitat normative functions and focus areas.**

   c. Continue with the work to **expand the scope of the ESS v3 to enhance the Gender Equality Marker.**

   d. Establish a **knowledge bank of good practices**, up to date guidelines, knowledge products. Include links to global data sets to show gender related trends in urbanisation.


1 Introduction

1.1 Background

UN-Habitat is the lead United Nations agency responsible for promoting sustainable urbanization. The agency is mandated by the UN General Assembly to promote socially and environmentally sustainable towns and cities with the goal of providing adequate shelter for all and sustainable development. UN Habitat’s approach to mainstreaming gender draws on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) of 1979, the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action where the international community established a strategy of gender mainstreaming, and the 2001 Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) elaboration of the gender perspective in the UN system, which led to the creation of the system-wide gender strategy and accountability mechanism (SWAP).

UN-Habitat implements its work in consecutive strategic plans. The new strategic plan 2020-2023 began in January 2020 and coincided with an organisational restructuring of UN-Habitat. UN-Habitat’s strategic plan 2014-2019 was structured around seven major strategic areas. The plan was jointly implemented by three Divisions and seven Branches aligned to the seven focus areas. These Branches were under the overall coordination of the Programme Division, which also oversaw the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues. Branches were coordinated with the regional and country level through four Regional Offices, three liaison offices, and Project Management Coordination Desks (UN-Habitat Programme Managers) at country level. Country Offices coordinate national and local-level activities.

UN-Habitat implemented the Strategic Plan through its biennial programme of work until 2019, after which the programme of work has become annual. Integrated within the seven focus areas, UN Habitat coordinated and delivered globally focused programmes such as the Water and Sanitation Trust Fund, Participatory Slum Upgrading Programme, National Urban Policy Programme, Public Space Programme and Safer Cities Programme.

In 2018, UN Habitat introduced significant institutional and governance reforms, in line with the General Assembly Resolution 73/539 adopted in December 2018. These aimed to make the agency ‘more focused relevant, transparent, efficient and results focused’, and included replacement of the UN-Habitat Governing Council with the UN-Habitat Assembly, which in turn would elect an Executive Board. In line with making the agency more focused, in early 2020, UN-Habitat was restructured to reflect its global normative role and regional programme focus. The 2020-2023 Strategic Plan identified four domains of change, which are presented in a Theory of Change. In the new strategic period, in addition to the global programmes, UN-Habitat introduced Flagship Programmes (FPs), one for each of the four domains of change, and one flagship programme that covers all four domains: FP1: Urban regeneration, FP2: Smart cities, FP3: Climate resilience, FP4: Urban migration, FP5: Urban 2030.

Key external influences into the UN-Habitat strategy were, until 2015, the Millennium Development Goals and the Habitat Agenda, and from 2015 the Sustainable Development Goals: UN Habitat leads and supports implementation of SDG 11 and co-leads other urban-related targets and indicators. The other key driver for UN-Habitat over the 2014-2019 strategic period was the New Urban Agenda: the HABITAT III outcome document recognises UN-Habitat as a focal point in the UN System on sustainable urbanisation and human settlements. In 2018, SDG 11 was among the six SDGs under review. UN-Habitat’s analysis of the 46 Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) for SDG 11 reveals that Member States have adopted varied approaches towards achieving the goal to ‘make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable’ in line with their specific national challenges.

UN-Habitat’s gender focus takes account of a number of international agreements, including:

- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) 1979
- Declaration of Violence Against Women (DEVAW) 1993
- SDG 5: achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
- Goal 11: make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable, specifically targets 11.1, 11.2, 11.5, 11.7, and 11.a, and
- NUA advocates the inclusion of women in urban decision-making, and promotes gender responsive financing, safety, basic services and urban planning.

---
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1.2 Context

The past decade has been defined by rising income and wealth inequality leading to the polarisation of societies, protests in many countries and an increasing international awareness of the extent of Gender-Based Violence, sexual abuse and harassment at every level of society. Participants in the recent protests and riots in various cities of the world (Cairo, Madrid, London, New York, Istanbul, Stockholm, Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo) were demanding more equality and inclusion. In 2015, China overtook the United States as the world’s largest economy, the platforms of social media are changing the way society deals with information and communication, and intensified natural disasters all around the globe that can widely be linked to climate change have resulted in increased environmental consciousness. The period has also been characterised by increasing levels of migration and displacement. Migration is a driving force in urbanisation: ‘One in every seven people on the planet is a migrant. Currently, there are 763 million internal migrants and 272 million international migrants in the world.’

The world is becoming increasingly urbanised. In 1990, 43% (2.3 billion) of the world’s population lived in urban areas; by 2015, this had grown to 54% (4 billion). The highest urban growth rate between 1995 and 2015 was ‘clearly in the least developed parts of the world with Africa being the most rapidly urbanizing’. The world will further urbanize over the next decade, from 56.2% today to 60.4% by 2030. Ninety-six per cent of urban growth will occur in the less developed regions of East Asia, South Asia and Africa.

Gender inequality persists within the trend towards greater urbanisation, with systematic gender discrimination, inequality and exclusion evident in cities globally. Women at the bottom of the economic ladder provide 12.5 billion hours of unpaid care work every day, which is three times more than men do. Worldwide, men own 50% more wealth than women, income inequality has increased since 1980. It is widely argued that achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls (SDG 5) requires more vigorous efforts, including the implementation of legal frameworks, ‘to counter deeply rooted gender-based discrimination that often results from patriarchal attitudes and related social norms. Human development could not be conceived without gender equality and women’s and girls’ empowerment. Moreover, SDG 10, on reducing inequalities within and among countries, and SDG 11, on Making cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable, together with the New Urban Agenda, are also additional frameworks that strengthen the gender focus within the global human development agenda. Gender equality is not only a fundamental human right, but a necessary foundation for a peaceful, prosperous and sustainable world. Providing women and girls with equal access to education, health care, decent work, and representation in political and economic decision-making processes will fuel sustainable economies and benefit societies and humanity at large.’

Currently, the main contextual issue is the Covid-19 pandemic, which will define many aspects of future activity. At the Live Learning Series hosted by UCLG, Metropolis and UN-Habitat Gender session, the Executive Director made three key points:

- Women are more engaged in unpaid care work, and the burden to them has significantly increased with COVID-19, which include looking after the sick, the elderly and the children who are home schooling
- The spike in domestic and gender-based violence must be highlighted. Women and girls are facing increased risk due to reduced family income and increased poverty, alcoholism and substance abuse, desperation as a result of lost jobs.
- Women need to be at the center of decision making and must have a seat at the table, to ensure their needs and concerns are factored into the response mechanisms and interventions

---

14 Global Activities Report 2015
15 https://riskmagazine.nl/article/2019-12-17-the-2010s-a-decade-divided
16 World Cities Report 2020
17 World Cities Report 2016
18 World Cities Report 2020
19 World Cities Report 2020
20 City Resilience Profiling Programme – Gender Enhancer, 2018, p12
2 Evaluation Approach and Methodology

2.1 Purpose, objectives and scope

In the context of the ongoing reform and restructuring of UN-Habitat, gender equality and gender parity are priorities of the organisation. Further, UN-Habitat has recently embarked on its new strategic plan 2020-2023 aimed at effectively advancing transformational changes in sustainable urbanisation. A Resolution taken by the first UN-Habitat Assembly in May 2019 – Achieving gender equality through the work of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme to support inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable cities and human settlements – builds directly on the 2013 GC Resolution. It requests that the Executive Director utilises available resources – to the development of an updated Gender Policy and Action Plan as well as for gender-mainstreaming across all programmes and activities. It also encourages engagement with other UN entities and civil-society organisations, and women leaders across a wide range of sectors, that optimal use is made of the AGGI and other relevant networks.

This evaluation is mandated by UN-Habitat Management as a corporate evaluation of strategic importance that will inform future work on gender equality and women’s empowerment.

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide UN-Habitat and its key stakeholders with an independent assessment of the implementation of UN-Habitat Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements (GPP) 2014-2019. Evaluation findings will be used for strategic decisions, organisational learning and accountability. The findings will also:

- Provide insight about what works and what does not work to advance gender mainstreaming in UN-Habitat
- Feed into UN-Habitat efforts to promote the gender equality in the SDGs and implementation of the New Urban Agenda as well as the Decade of Action announced by the UN Secretary-General
- Inform the revision of the Gender Policy and Plan in line with the new Strategic Plan 2020-2023.

The targeted users for the evaluation are the UN-Habitat Executive Board, the UN-Habitat Management and staff, donors, partners and other key stakeholders.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

(i) Assess progress and achievement on the goal and expected accomplishments of the gender policy and plan for 2014-2019
(ii) Assess the relevance of the UN-Habitat gender policy and plan in view of 2014-2019 and looking forward for 2020-2023
(iii) Assess extent to which UN-Habitat approach towards gender mainstreaming has been effective, efficient, sustainable and impactful on delivery of programmatic result
(iv) Assess the institutional arrangements and processes, including the added value of the Advisory Group on Gender Issues as it is presently structured and recommend any amendments to its structure and mandate, for greater impact
(v) Identify lessons learned, good practices and examples of innovations of the gender mainstreaming work supported by UN-Habitat at global, regional and country levels
(vi) Recommend strategic, programmatic and management considerations for future gender mainstreaming.

Overarching evaluation questions, each of which will be operationalized by a series of sub questions have been identified and are organized around evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and coherence. The following questions will further be expanded upon by the evaluator:

- **Performance in terms of results achieved**: To what extent has UN-Habitat achieved its goals and expected accomplishments, through illustrative actions and indicators of achievement for gender mainstreaming for the period of 2014-2019?
- **Relevance**: To what extent was the UN-Habitat Gender Policy and Plan 2014-2019 known, understood, accepted and acted upon internally and externally for maximum contribution to gender mainstreaming? To what extent was the GPP aligned with the UN System-wide Action Plan on gender equality and the empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP), thus being relevant to UN system-wide expectations?
- **Efficiency**: How efficiently has UN-Habitat harnessed its resources (financial, human and partnerships) to achieve gender mainstreaming? How clearly aligned has UN-Habitat gender mainstreaming been in terms of clarity and coherence of linkages between agency’s operational and normative work streams at global, regional and country levels and institutional arrangements? What is the added value of the Advisory Group on Gender Issues?
- **Effectiveness**: What transformational changes did the implementation of gender mainstreaming bring? What were the key factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of goals?
The scope of the evaluation is the assessment of UN-Habitat Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements (GPP) 2014-2019 and the GEAP that operationalized the policy and plan, as well as the role and results of the UN-Habitat Advisory Group on Gender issues.

2.2 Evaluation Questions

The evaluation was based on gender principles and adhered to the United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards for evaluation in the United Nations System. The evaluation examined to what extent UN-Habitat has achieved its goals and expected accomplishments, through illustrative actions and indicators of achievement for gender mainstreaming for the period of 2014-2019. The evaluation criteria used follow UN guidelines, which are aligned with the OECD DAC evaluation criteria. The evaluation process considered GPP institutional arrangements, procedures, collaboration, coordination, partnerships and targeted beneficiary needs. Overarching evaluation questions were supported by a series of sub questions for the interview process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance in terms of results achieved</th>
<th>Achievements against the three goals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) To what extent has UN-Habitat achieved its goals and expected accomplishments, through illustrative actions and indicators of achievement for gender mainstreaming for the period of 2014-2019?</td>
<td>1: Programme technical and normative assistance to improve gender equity and the empowerment of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) To what extent was the UN-Habitat Gender Policy and Plan 2014-2019 known, understood, accepted and acted upon internally and externally for maximum contribution to gender mainstreaming?</td>
<td>2: Internal UN-Habitat Gender Parity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) To what extent was the GPP aligned with the UN System-wide Action Plan on gender equality and the empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP), thus being relevant to UN system-wide expectations?</td>
<td>3: UN Habitat Institutional arrangements that support 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coherence: The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution</th>
<th>4) To what extent did UN-Habitat implement its gender mainstreaming approach in coherence and synergy with other development programmes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Was mainstreaming the optimal approach to addressing policy objective of achieving gender equality and women’s empowerment? Why/why not? Has this contributed to overall coherence and integration (thinking and doing) in programmes and result areas? Why do you say this?</td>
<td>• Was UN-Habitat’s Gender Policy and Plan relevant to the changing global context over the period 2014-19. Did it enable flexible priority setting to meet changing needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How have cross-cutting requirements for gender been integrated in planning, topics, programmes or results areas? Progress reports show how focus area programmes reach their targets, and includes a section on mainstreaming of gender and other cross-cutting issues, but do not reflect integration of gender into programming. Is this integration happening?</td>
<td>• To what extent, in what ways and with what outcomes did the gender mainstreaming focus or gender lens identify and address the specific challenges faced by women in different contexts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How have global programmes/approaches contributed to increased awareness and purpose of interventions aimed at reducing inequality and empowering women? Do the tools developed by these global programmes support and improve practical approaches to reducing inequality and empowering women?</td>
<td>• As relevant to the sampled programme – to what extent are the programme targets and objectives relevant to women in different contexts?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies | 22 These definitions have been taken from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance, Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use, adopted by the DAC at its meeting on 10 December 2019 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness:</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were</td>
<td>▪ Overall, how effective has the Gender Marker been in ensuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their</td>
<td>integrated approaches to gender equality and empowerment of women in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative importance</td>
<td>planning and implementation of UN-Habitat programmes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Does UN Habitat provide any normative direction or guidance to ensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that priority setting at global, regional, country, city and project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>levels included specific results around equality and empowerment of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>women? Were there any other drivers of this agenda?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) What transformational changes did the implementation of gender</td>
<td>▪ Where has gender-responsive programming and implementation been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainstreaming bring? What were the key factors influencing the</td>
<td>achieved? Where has it not worked well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement or non-achievement of goals?</td>
<td>▪ To what extent have the achievements in this region/country/city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>against programme targets and objectives been equitably achieved for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>women? What were the key success factors/barriers to success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ How well has a mainstreaming approach worked, (national/local levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and what would be required to strengthen effectiveness for gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ What were the limits and challenges to making a difference? How were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>these mitigated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Have equality and empowerment initiatives within UN Habitat staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structures changed demographics/leadership/culture – what are these?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Is the achievement of outputs 2 and 3 of the Action Plan driven by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>executive leadership? How does the agency believe this would impact on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programmatic gender mainstreaming?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Into the future, do we need a separate gender policy and plan or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should this be included in main strategic framework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency:</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time,</td>
<td>▪ Do UN-Habitat’s implementation arrangements support gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.) are converted to results</td>
<td>mainstreaming and encourage meaningful implementation? How is this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>measured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) How efficiently has UN-Habitat harnessed its resources (financial,</td>
<td>▪ To what extent are UN-Habitat’s business processes adapted to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human and partnerships) to achieve gender mainstreaming?</td>
<td>achieving internal and external equality and empowerment of women? Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) How clearly aligned has UN-Habitat gender mainstreaming been in terms</td>
<td>barriers are?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of clarity and coherence of linkages between agency’s operational and</td>
<td>▪ How have UN-Habitat’s and partner resources been applied to generate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normative work streams at global, regional and country levels and</td>
<td>results that contribute to decreased inequality and increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional arrangements?</td>
<td>empowerment of women? e.g. is the piggy-back approach strategically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) What is the added value of the Advisory Group on Gender Issues</td>
<td>planned, or opportunistically responsive to emerging opportunities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Expenditure on specifically gender-focused programmes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Expenditure on the gender mainstreaming components of general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programmes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Do you know about the Advisory Group on Gender Issues (AGGI)? Can you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comment on their role in promoting and enhancing UN-Habitat’s focus on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gender equality and the empowerment of women (internally/externally).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact:</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced</td>
<td>▪ How influential is UN-Habitat globally in driving the agenda of gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or</td>
<td>equality and women’s empowerment (within the sustainable urbanisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unintended</td>
<td>sector)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) What changes have occurred as a result of implementation of gender</td>
<td>▪ Are UN-Habitat programmes achieving transformative results in terms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainstreaming during 2014-2019 that may contribute to the achievement of</td>
<td>gender? Are UN-Habitat’s systems and institutional arrangements geared to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the SDG 5 and the New Urban Agenda?</td>
<td>delivering transformative results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Where agency and self-determination are seen as transformative, how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deeply and meaningfully have women been involved? (see Figure 1 below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability:</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The continuation of benefits from a</td>
<td>▪ How have the lessons learned from implementation of gender mainstreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjustments should be undertaken</td>
<td>and gender-focused programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) What strategic, programmatic, structural and management</td>
<td>▪ How have the lessons learned from implementation of gender mainstreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjustments should be undertaken</td>
<td>and gender-focused programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time to improve performance in the implementation gender mainstreaming in view of the Strategic Plan 2020-2023? been communicated across UN-Habitat and infused into programming?

· To what extent has gender integration and mainstreaming – as evidenced by increased levels of equality and empowerment of women – been institutionalized into practices and policies by UN-Habitat at country / city level? And by implementing partners? How do you know this?

· How has national, city or local level policy or legislation improved to address social and economic drivers of gender inequity in the long-term?

2.3 Sampling

The following respondents or sites were identified for the evaluation sample:

- The seven branches responsible for the strategic focus areas. The Strategic Plan provides a results framework reflecting these seven areas. The results framework for the Gender Action Plan is also organised according to these strategic focus areas: this latter framework has apparently not been directly tracked or monitored, but it does provide a description of the agency’s original intent.

- Representation from global to local level of the global focus areas in the global programmes.

- A sample of countries was selected for interviews against the following criteria:
  - Countries where at least two of strategic or global programmes have significant presence and longevity, ensuring coverage and preferably duplication of kind of activity.
  - Countries where one programme is particularly extensive, i.e. with exceptional longevity and spend at national, local government and community levels.
  - At least one site where there are targeted interventions focused on equality and women’s empowerment.

The following countries were identified after a scan of the website, documents and discussions with the Evaluation Reference Group and the Regional Gender Focal Points. Most have a spread of programme activity across most of the seven focus areas. The intention was to choose one country for in depth interviews and a second country per region for a lighter touch.

- Arab States
  - Iraq: Has the biggest programme in the region, which is also long term, and which has generated extensive learnings into knowledge and normative work;
  - Egypt: Impact of the unit within the Ministry of housing that focuses on gender sensitive urban mobility.

- Africa
  - Mozambique: UN-Habitat presence from 2002. A fair-sized portfolio including public spaces as well as climate impact and disaster recovery implementation

- Asia & Pacific
  - Afghanistan: Largest and most comprehensive programme in the region
  - Sri Lanka: in 2018 rated the 2nd most vulnerable country to climate change disasters

- Latin America
  - Bolivia: This is a relatively new programme but has involved one of the largest consultative processes for development of its National Urban Policy.
  - Mexico: national and local government decision-making based on CPI evidence – work directly with counterparts.

2.4 Data collection

This evaluation utilised three primary methods of data collection: A document review, interviews, and two surveys.

2.4.1 Document Review

The document review involved a review of around 100 documents. These included all of the major corporate documents and reports covering the strategic period, UN SWAP reports, a sample of 18 evaluations covering most of the thematic areas, reports and evaluations of global programmes, regional progress reports where these were available, a range of gender-focused implementation guidelines, documents from Habitat III, reports from World Urban Forums and the World Urban Campaign, Executive Director speeches across a wide range of events. A number of additional documents were scanned briefly for relevant information.
2.4.2 Interviews

A total of 61 interviews were conducted: with UN-Habitat staff at Headquarters in Nairobi and across eight countries, and with a sample of partners and stakeholders at global, regional, national and local levels. Quotes from stakeholders, partners and staff are used throughout the analysis where these words best represent the ideas, but are not referenced to ensure confidentiality.

2.4.3 Partner and Staff Surveys

Two surveys were conducted, one targeting partners and another for staff, with similar or identical capacity building, outcomes and impact questions. In addition to these staff were asked internally relevant questions about gender institutionalization, parity and equity within UN-Habitat.

Language: The survey was offered in five languages, although the primary design was in English. Other languages were produced through SurveyMonkey translation, and only Arabic thoroughly reviewed for translation. Most responses were received in English, and the next highest number of respondents (32%) used the English version. 29 people only completed the first question, and left most of the survey incomplete. Respondents came from across all language groups in approximately the same proportions as those shown in the pie chart.

Data presentation: A total of 149 partners and 165 staff responded to the survey. In the report survey data is colour coded depending on whether results came from the staff or partners’ survey, or combine both sources:

- Staff-only data are in blue (backgrounds, data points, outlines)
- Partners data are shown in red (backgrounds, data points or outlines)
- Combination graphics are backgrounded in purple.

Respondent gender and age distribution: A total of 149 partners responded with almost equal numbers of male and female respondents. Of the 165 UN-Habitat staff respondents, twice the number of female as opposed to male staff responded to the survey. Age distribution was fairly even for partners, although there were fewer younger participants. In contrast, the staff respondent group was younger.

Partners responses by level: The survey identified whether respondents’ professional landscape was global, national or local. Over half of responses were local level partners, suggesting strong relationships and engagement on the ground.

Functional work areas: Staff indicated which of the main units of the agency they worked in (see Figure 2). An larger response was received from Urban Planning and design (the largest in terms of staff, consultants and interns), and substantial numbers also from Programming, Gender Coordination and M&E.
Country experience and representation: Figure 3 shows that staff with experience in Africa responded most, followed by staff working in Asia and the Pacific. In contrast, most partner responses were from the Arab States region, largely due to an exceptional number of people contributing from Syria, while partner responses from Africa were low. Staff and partners in Latin America and Eastern Europe\(^\text{23}\) were among the lowest response rates, although partners from Bolivia responded in reasonable numbers.

Country representation: Staff listed their country experience, giving a total of 45 countries. Partners each gave their primary country of operation, and apart from the six who worked globally, 26 countries were represented by partner survey respondents.

Partner Affiliation: Respondents were asked to show their affiliations (Figure 3). 16% had more than one affiliation. Most came from local government, and approximately equal numbers from national government and local NGOs.

Financial contributors: Sixty one respondents (41%) stated that their organisation/s contributed financially to UN-Habitat programmes. International partners and UN partners were major contributors. 37% of government and 39% of non-profits provided financial contributions. Within these, it is interesting to note that a substantial proportion are local partners. Contributions by government and NPOs at national level suggest sustainability and engagement. Internationally, all except private sector responses had high rates of financial contribution, although very small sample sizes for some of these sectors make this inconclusive.

2.5 Analysis

The information collected from the survey, the interviews and through the extensive document review have been triangulated and assessed against the evaluation questions and the evaluation criteria to reach the conclusions set out in this report.

2.5.1 Reconstructed Theory of Change

The evaluation Terms of Reference required a Theory of Change approach. The UN-Habitat Gender Policy did have a results framework, but not a clear Theory of Change (TOC). A Theory of Change was developed at the inception phase of the evaluation. It was based on the Gender Policy and Action Plan Results Framework, a review of the 2014-2019 Strategic Plan and the 2020-2023 Strategic Plan. However, subsequent analysis of the Results Framework confirmed that it covered the substantive work of the agency rather than gender mainstreaming (see Section 4.1.2 and 6.3.1 below). It was felt that this evaluation should rather concentrate on the evaluation criteria so as to remain focused on how gender mainstreaming had unfolded over the strategic period.

The reconstructed TOC diagram is shown below. It was based on a primary hypothesis, identified required drivers for change, and outlined the underpinning assumptions and possible pathways to the strategic result.

- **Hypothesis:** That UN-Habitat’s strategic results and expected accomplishments will be significantly and more sustainably achieved if all programmes, activities and results have gender equality and women’s empowerment focus as a fundamental underpinning principle. The 2013 GC, and the 2019 UN-Habitat Assembly Resolutions on gender both infer that gender mainstreaming is a ‘tool’ to be employed to achieve gender equality and women’s empowerment. This evaluation is based on this understanding of gender mainstreaming.

- **Drivers:** The growing recognition that a gender equality and women’s empowerment focus into urban policy dialogues, design and implementation ensures increased safety for citizens and urban design that facilitates compact, sustainable and resilient cities. The main institutional actors are international organisations focused on

\(^{23}\) No regional language was provided for Eastern European partners
local government and sustainable urbanisation, global and national partners, national, regional and local governments.

- **Assumptions:** That UN-Habitat Executive leadership champions the implementation of the Gender Policy and Action Plan; that the agency allocates sufficient resources to implement robust mainstreaming activities across the agency; that all partner agreements contain explicit requirements for gender mainstreaming; and that part of implementation focuses on cultural and behavioural barriers to equality and the empowerment of women. Achieving the desired result is also dependent on significant political will at all levels of government in partner countries to bring a gender lens to their urban policy environment.

- **Pathways:** The TOC posits that the Gender policy contributes to the strategic result by supporting and capacitating national, regional and local authorities, and global, national and local partners to actively include evidence-based gender-focused content into national and local urban policy, to monitor implementation and adjust as necessary. Training, capacity building and technical assistance support would build stakeholder knowledge and understanding.

---

**Figure 5: Reconstructed Theory of Change**

### 2.5.2 Survey analysis

Quantitative analysis has been provided using the Auckland University online package, Inzight\(^24\), for statistical tests. Data are largely presented using graphs generated in Excel. Many of the survey questions offered a Likert scale from, for example, ‘worsened’ to ‘much better’. In some cases, to compare these multi-level scales between regions, genders and staff groupings, a scoring was calculated. Graphs or tables which use these weighted scores highlight the differences between groups of respondents in terms the numbers of negative or positive responses.

---

\(^24\) [https://lite.docker.stat.auckland.ac.nz](https://lite.docker.stat.auckland.ac.nz)
Table 2: Examples of low score and high score calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert option</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weighted average</th>
<th>Likert option</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weighted average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It does not</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Gender is not relevant to my work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite well</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes, a little</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes, a lot</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># respondents</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># respondents</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Limitations to the Evaluation

Covid-19 travel restrictions meant that this evaluation did not include any fieldwork missions. All of the interviews were conducted remotely via on-line platforms.

A sample of key countries was identified for a more in-depth exploration via interviews. However, the timeframe for the interviews, access to stakeholders as all interviews were conducted remotely, and limited capacity for translations, meant that the full set of planned interviews per country was difficult to achieve. The reduced access to interviews with external stakeholders means that the per country picture may have missed critical views or opinions about UN-Habitat projects or programmes.

The evaluator is aware that, aside from independent evaluations, many of the documents are internal self-reports – these documents on their own admission tend to highlight the particular successes of the project or the period – although there are sections listing challenges or barriers, these are more limited.

A limited budget meant that for the survey, translations into Spanish, Portuguese and French were via the Survey Monkey Google translate function. This means the translations were not of a high standard, and ambiguity in the questions were raised by respondents.
### 3 Evaluation Findings

#### 3.1 Summary of achievements against the GPP goals

UN-Habitat’s Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements (GPP) for 2014-2019 listed three goals. These dealt with normative and operational programmatic work, with gender parity and with institutional arrangements. This is a very brief summary indicating the extent to which the goals were achieved. The achievements are considered in terms of the evolving situation over the strategic period 2014-2019 with regard to gender mainstreaming, and not directly in relation to the GPP as the action plan was not implemented or monitored.

**Table 3. Achievements against GPP goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) At Programme level, technical and normative assistance provided to national, regional and local authorities and other stakeholders, to improve policies, plans and programmes that achieve clearly articulated, timebound and measurable gender equality and women's empowerment results in the areas of UN-Habitat's strategic priorities, identified on the basis of gender analysis and assessed against clear defined baseline data disaggregated by sex and age.</td>
<td>Implementation of gender mainstreaming across UN-Habitat was variable, depending to a large extent on existing gender focused initiatives. The Gender Equality Marker was important in signalling the agency's commitment to gender mainstreaming. There is evidence of many effective practices across a wide range of countries and focus areas. It has become the norm at country level to push for inclusive participatory consultation processes that include women, and this is slowly yielding good results – good examples were found in Iraq, Bolivia, Somalia. Focused local coherence across a country programme was evident in Afghanistan, where there is a full-time gender advisor. Land Tenure tools and processes were identified as increasingly gender focused, and the work around Public Space and Safer Cities is achieving change in the daily lives of women at community level – an important element is ensuring that leaders can see the benefits of including women's concerns and interests. However, poor monitoring systems at the institutional level means that the many good practices, as well as the learning from more challenging situations, has not been consolidated into an agency-wide picture of results.</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Progress towards internal gender parity at all levels, particularly at the P5 levels and above clearly demonstrated, according to the defined United Nations formula, as an objective indicator of organizational commitment to gender equality and women's rights, and of an organizational culture with the capacity to advance them.</td>
<td>In the six years from 2014 to 2020, the gender ratios have changed, but gender parity is not yet achieved. In the G2-7 and the P4-5 levels, the percentage of women employed by UN-Habitat increased by 2%: G2-7 from 68-70%, and P4-5 from 34-36%. The P1-3 levels saw a decrease of 5% from 51% in 2014 to 46% in 2020. The National Officers’ as well as the ASG/USG-D levels both saw a 12% increase: NOs from 30% in 2014 to 42% in 2020; ASG/USG-D levels from 18% to 30%. Gender bias training has taken place and there are initiatives to address recruitment parity. There are also ad-hoc gender focused initiatives at head office which were considered useful. However, the survey revealed significant gender differences in opinion regarding the level of influence women have internally and whether this has changed over the period, and the extent to which capacity building has improved internal gender focus. It is important to note that gender parity among country office staff has positively influenced counterpart attitudes about women’s empowerment in countries like Egypt and Iraq.</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Internal institutional arrangements fully enabling two objectives, 1 and 2, and progressive compliance with the performance standards of the System-Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and The Empowerment of Women (SWAP).</td>
<td>The Gender Equality Unit was understaffed and under resourced for the whole GPP period, which limited its ability to provide active support to gender-focused implementation. The allocation of 5% time for Gender Focal Points to undertake gender mainstreaming work is not sufficient to support critical area of work. The AGGI was active and influential from its establishment in 2012 and during in the first two years of the GPP period, but has declined in influence, with low member turnover and a lack of clarity and structure in its engagement with the Secretariat and the agency as a whole. Member states’ commitments to supporting gender focused work may not be fully aligned to intent expressed in the 2013 and 2016 Assembly resolutions. UN-Habitat has consistently reported to UN SWAP, although the ratings achieved in some cases may not reflect the full picture.</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Programme technical and normative assistance to improve gender equality and the empowerment of women: has the agency provided appropriate technical and normative assistance that contributed to gender equity and the empowerment of women. This goal was partially achieved.

The previous strategic period had established a range of approaches for providing technical and normative support to gender mainstreaming. This work and the tools developed during that time were continued into the 2014-2019 strategic period. However, the provision was fragmented and depended to a large extent on various factors: these included the level of individual commitment and understanding of leaders and managers in different programmes or unit as well as the extent of donor insistence on gender focused project and programme design. An important external factor that kept the notion of gender mainstreaming on the radar was the increasing awareness and focus on the issue within the United Nations system as a whole. This included UN Women’s brief to monitor gender mainstreaming through the UN SWAP, the UN response to #MeToo, and the emphasis on safeguarding within multilaterals.

The Advisory Group on Gender Issues (AGGI) also contributed to the level of gender mainstreaming awareness within UN-Habitat, particularly during the first half of the strategic period. Their inputs into Habitat III were instrumental in ensuring gender-focus within the New Urban Agenda (NUA).

Consultative and inclusive processes at country level have generally contributed to ensuring that the needs of women as well as vulnerable groups have been considered and addressed, and equity targets for participation in training have been consistently pursued. There have been improvements to awareness of the importance, as well as the collection of sex-disaggregated data. Afghanistan is the one country office with a dedicated post for a senior gender advisor: With this real shifts become visible.

However, while it was widely acknowledged that gender is a central issue that must be addressed if equitable and sustainable urbanisation is to be achieved by 2030, the function was not appropriately resourced at any point over the strategic period. The biggest gap in gender mainstreaming support over the period was sustained and substantial advice about ‘how to’ ensure meaningful gender focused programming – despite many guideline documents, what was clearly missing was the person-to-person dialogue and engagement. In addition, because UN-Habitat monitoring systems have been fragmented over the strategic period, gender mainstreaming was not consistently monitored and despite evidence of effective work in numerous countries, it is not possible to present a clear and comprehensive agency-wide picture of achievements, nor is it possible to determine sustainability. There could be far more coherent, ambitious and forthright advocacy around gender and practical support to gender mainstreaming implementation.

2) Progress towards internal gender parity at all levels, particularly at the P5 levels and above clearly demonstrated, according to the defined United Nations formula, as an objective indicator of organizational commitment to gender equality and women’s rights, and of an organizational culture with the capacity to advance them. This goal was partially achieved.

UN-Habitat responded to the UN’s push for achieving gender parity, particularly at higher levels: the gender ratios increased significantly in the ASG/USG-D levels and National Officer levels (from 18-30%, and 30-42% respectively); increased very slightly at the in the P4-5 levels from 34-36%, but the P1-3 levels saw a decrease of 5% from 51% in 2014 to 46% in 2020. There is evidence of initiatives to afford greater access for women, and there are opportunities for skills development, and the Secretary General’s resolution that all agencies should achieve parity at the top by 2027 has recently generated more urgency, with an action plan focused on initiatives to improve parity figures.

However, a range of factors make the achievement of the set targets difficult. There is a relatively low turnover at higher levels, which means reduced opportunities for promotion. This has been exacerbated by freezing posts as part of rationalisation. The practice of sourcing external candidates at higher levels further limits opportunities for internal promotions, and raises problems of retention of both men and women. As a technical agency the number of women applicants are sometimes limited, and many people are also not keen to take on hardship postings. However, it is also clear that gender bias and blindness is a factor, although the impact is difficult to measure.

3) Internal institutional arrangements enabling outputs 1 and 2, and progressive compliance with the performance standards of the System-Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and The Empowerment of Women (SWAP). This goal was partially achieved.

The unit focusing on gender issues continued from the previous strategic period. Located in the Programme Division, the Gender Equality Unit (GEU) might have been expected to drive gender-focused work but few resources and lack of staff limited this opportunity.

The implementation of the Gender Equality Marker through the Programme Advisory Group from 2015 was a key signpost that gender mainstreaming was becoming institutionalised. Since implementation in 2016, 421 projects and concept notes have been reviewed against the Gender Marker criteria. Useful as it was, the Gender Marker only covered the planning approval phase and there were no similar points for gender-focused implementation to be assured.

1) Programme technical and normative assistance to improve gender equality and the empowerment of women: has the agency provided appropriate technical and normative assistance that contributed to gender equity and the empowerment of women. This goal was partially achieved.

The previous strategic period had established a range of approaches for providing technical and normative support to gender mainstreaming. This work and the tools developed during that time were continued into the 2014-2019 strategic period. However, the provision was fragmented and depended to a large extent on various factors: these included the level of individual commitment and understanding of leaders and managers in different programmes or unit as well as the extent of donor insistence on gender focused project and programme design. An important external factor that kept the notion of gender mainstreaming on the radar was the increasing awareness and focus on the issue within the United Nations system as a whole. This included UN Women’s brief to monitor gender mainstreaming through the UN SWAP, the UN response to #MeToo, and the emphasis on safeguarding within multilaterals.

The Advisory Group on Gender Issues (AGGI) also contributed to the level of gender mainstreaming awareness within UN-Habitat, particularly during the first half of the strategic period. Their inputs into Habitat III were instrumental in ensuring gender-focus within the New Urban Agenda (NUA).

Consultative and inclusive processes at country level have generally contributed to ensuring that the needs of women as well as vulnerable groups have been considered and addressed, and equity targets for participation in training have been consistently pursued. There have been improvements to awareness of the importance, as well as the collection of sex-disaggregated data. Afghanistan is the one country office with a dedicated post for a senior gender advisor: With this real shifts become visible.

However, while it was widely acknowledged that gender is a central issue that must be addressed if equitable and sustainable urbanisation is to be achieved by 2030, the function was not appropriately resourced at any point over the strategic period. The biggest gap in gender mainstreaming support over the period was sustained and substantial advice about ‘how to’ ensure meaningful gender focused programming – despite many guideline documents, what was clearly missing was the person-to-person dialogue and engagement. In addition, because UN-Habitat monitoring systems have been fragmented over the strategic period, gender mainstreaming was not consistently monitored and despite evidence of effective work in numerous countries, it is not possible to present a clear and comprehensive agency-wide picture of achievements, nor is it possible to determine sustainability. There could be far more coherent, ambitious and forthright advocacy around gender and practical support to gender mainstreaming implementation.

2) Progress towards internal gender parity at all levels, particularly at the P5 levels and above clearly demonstrated, according to the defined United Nations formula, as an objective indicator of organizational commitment to gender equality and women’s rights, and of an organizational culture with the capacity to advance them. This goal was partially achieved.

UN-Habitat responded to the UN’s push for achieving gender parity, particularly at higher levels: the gender ratios increased significantly in the ASG/USG-D levels and National Officer levels (from 18-30%, and 30-42% respectively); increased very slightly at the in the P4-5 levels from 34-36%, but the P1-3 levels saw a decrease of 5% from 51% in 2014 to 46% in 2020. There is evidence of initiatives to afford greater access for women, and there are opportunities for skills development, and the Secretary General’s resolution that all agencies should achieve parity at the top by 2027 has recently generated more urgency, with an action plan focused on initiatives to improve parity figures.

However, a range of factors make the achievement of the set targets difficult. There is a relatively low turnover at higher levels, which means reduced opportunities for promotion. This has been exacerbated by freezing posts as part of rationalisation. The practice of sourcing external candidates at higher levels further limits opportunities for internal promotions, and raises problems of retention of both men and women. As a technical agency the number of women applicants are sometimes limited, and many people are also not keen to take on hardship postings. However, it is also clear that gender bias and blindness is a factor, although the impact is difficult to measure.

3) Internal institutional arrangements enabling outputs 1 and 2, and progressive compliance with the performance standards of the System-Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and The Empowerment of Women (SWAP). This goal was partially achieved.

The unit focusing on gender issues continued from the previous strategic period. Located in the Programme Division, the Gender Equality Unit (GEU) might have been expected to drive gender-focused work but few resources and lack of staff limited this opportunity.

The implementation of the Gender Equality Marker through the Programme Advisory Group from 2015 was a key signpost that gender mainstreaming was becoming institutionalised. Since implementation in 2016, 421 projects and concept notes have been reviewed against the Gender Marker criteria. Useful as it was, the Gender Marker only covered the planning approval phase and there were no similar points for gender-focused implementation to be assured.
The AGGI, set up in 2012, was an important structure bringing in voices of grassroots women’s organisations and networks to the notion of sustainable urbanisation. However, the influence of this group appears to have declined after Habitat III: importantly, there does not appear to have been sufficient turnover of members to introduce new ideas and energy into the function.

There is an internal action plan to address gender bias and blindness as well as parity-related recruitment issues, but information on implementation progress and impact was not obtained.

3.2 Ratings against the evaluation criteria

Table 4 provides a very brief indication of how the GPP, as well as achievements of UN-Habitat, perform against the OECD criteria. In some cases two ratings are given – this is to indicate differential performance in relation to the GPP itself, performance in strategic international forums, and at the level of operational delivery. The ratings are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Highly Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Partially Satisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Partially Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence: The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution</td>
<td>Partially Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by an intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended</td>
<td>Partially Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time</td>
<td>Partially Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Ratings against the evaluation criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Rating against the evaluation criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance:</td>
<td>The GPP itself must be rated Unsatisfactory. It stands largely as a symbolic document representing UN-Habitat’s stated commitment to gender mainstreaming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence:</td>
<td>There are areas of clear good practice, and others where things are less clear. The lack of an overarching gender picture, means that opportunities are lost to scale good practices or identify where projects many better complement each other. The lack of ‘how to’ support means that common quality standards cannot be applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact:</td>
<td>Gender-focused programming is variable across the UN-Habitat portfolio. What is not in place is the full cycle from conceptualisation through design, planning, implementation, review and adjustment to address programme/project weakness. Common quality standards and a picture of agency wide performance is therefore not possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability:</td>
<td>Few resources were applied to the gender function, despite asserting its strategic importance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Relevance and Coherence

4.1 The UN-Habitat Gender Policy and Plan 2014-2019

Was the UN-Habitat Gender Policy and Plan 2014-2019 known, understood, accepted, and acted upon internally and externally for maximum contribution to gender mainstreaming?

4.1.1 The Gender Policy and Plan

Despite an overarching statement of commitment to gender equality and women’s empowerment, Gender is not very visible in UN-Habitat’s corporate Strategic Plan 2014-2019 and this may be one of the reasons gender mainstreaming has shown variable success over the period.25 UN-Habitat’s Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements (GPP) for 2014-2019 was relevant to UN-Habitat’s mandate in that it was aligned to the Strategic Plan 2014-2019. It was also very relevant to the broader international UN and development aid context where gender equality and women’s empowerment were increasingly being stressed as critical elements necessary to achieve Agenda 2030. Despite this alignment, the GPP does not appear to have been a useful, strategic or visionary driver of gender mainstreaming. Among staff there was mixed awareness of the policy and few people had knowledge of its content. Despite this, there is good evidence that gender mainstreaming was increasingly recognised as a necessary component of UN-Habitat’s practice over the strategic period. There was consensus among all interviewed that there should be a revised Gender Strategy for the 2020-2023 strategic period.

The UN-Habitat Strategic Plan for 2014-2019 seeks to achieve ‘Environmentally, economically and socially sustainable, gender-sensitive and inclusive urban development policies implemented by national, regional and local authorities have improved the standard of living of the urban poor and enhanced their participation in the socio-economic life of the city’.26 The GPP shares this desired goal. However, despite the overarching commitment, gender, women’s equality and empowerment is not very visible in the corporate UN-Habitat Strategic Plan’s Results Framework. It mentions gender three times only: once in the goal statement and in two of the goal’s indicators which require data disaggregated by gender: Percentage of people living in slums, and percentage of people in urban areas with access to services. ‘Women’ appears eight times in the Results Framework, primarily in the Expected Accomplishments and indicators for Urban Legislation and Urban Economy. Equitable access is mentioned six times under Urban Basic Services.

The GPP responds to the Governing Council (GC) resolution 24/4 of 2013 that requested UN-Habitat to execute two-fold gender strategy comprising of the mainstreaming of gender equality and women’s empowerment in normative and operational programmes, and second, to set up policies and programmes needed to achieve equity and women’s empowerment. Among other things, this Resolution suggests forming partnerships with women leaders across all sectors, and that the Executive Director allocate adequate resources for gender mainstreaming across all programmes and activities.


The Gender Policy and Action Plan is intended to be integral to the broader strategy, and is organised against the agency’s seven focus areas and works to the corporate strategy’s strategic result: ‘Environmentally, economically and socially sustainable, gender-sensitive and inclusive urban development policies implemented by national, regional and local authorities have improved the standard of living of the urban poor and enhanced their participation in the socio-economic life of the city’.27 The GPP set out three gender mainstreaming goals:

1) Programme: Technical and normative assistance provided to national, regional and local authorities and other stakeholders, so that their policies, plans and programmes achieve clearly articulated, time-bound and measurable gender equality and women’s empowerment results in the areas of UN-Habitat’s strategic priorities, identified on the basis of gender analysis, assessed against clearly defined baseline data disaggregated by sex and age.

2) Progress towards internal gender parity at all levels, particularly at the P5 levels and above clearly demonstrated, according to the defined United Nations formula, as an objective indicator of organizational commitment to gender equality and women’s rights, and of an organizational culture with the capacity to advance them.

---

25 The corporate Strategic Plan 2014-2019 mentions gender three times only: once in the goal statement and in two of the goal’s indicators which require data disaggregated by gender: Percentage of people living in slums, and percentage of people in urban areas with access to services. ‘Women’ appears eight times in the Results Framework, primarily in the Expected Accomplishments and indicators for Urban Legislation and Urban Economy.

26 Strategic Result: D: 18.

27 UN-Habitat Strategic Plan 2014-2019
3) Internal institutional arrangements enabling outputs 1 and 2, and progressive compliance with the performance standards of the System-Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and The Empowerment of Women (SWAP).

This evaluation found very mixed awareness of the policy, with very few staff familiar with its content. There were those who had never heard of it, others who knew about it but had never seen it, and a minority who were familiar with the content. However, all UN-Habitat staff was familiar with the idea of gender mainstreaming and that it was a requirement for all of UN-Habitat’s work. This definitely had less to do with the GPP and more to do with the need for project designs to meet the requirements of the Gender Equality Marker (GEM), the recognised obligation by UN-Habitat staff to report against the UN SWAP, and also to do with ‘the gender issues and needs we see on the ground’.

4.1.2 The Gender Action Plan Results Framework

The GEAP Results Framework is not strong: it does not reflect the goal statements or foreground gender, focusing rather on the substantive work of the corporate Strategic Plan. Many of the expected accomplishments are very similar or identical with those in the corporate Strategic Plan, with ‘gender’ or ‘women’s empowerment’ added. Some indicators were very different from those in the corporate Strategic Plan, and it is not clear where this data would have been gathered. It must be noted that the previous Action Plan covering 2008-2013 was a much more focused gender plan with six action areas and very specifically gender focused outcomes.

The Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) was meant to operationalise the Policy and Plan, and the primary tool is the Results Framework. However, the Results Framework does not directly address the GPP’s goal statements. Rather, it sets out results frameworks for each of UN-Habitat’s seven sub-programmes which are very similar and often identical to those in the corporate Strategic Plan. There are also expected accomplishments, indicators of achievement and illustrative actions for the office of the Executive Director. The plan also outlines institutional arrangements, roles and responsibilities. These factors mean that the Action Plan was not explicitly implemented, and the Results Framework was not monitored at all.

Progress was made in terms of the GPP goals, but this was often due to a range of other factors: Gender mainstreaming programme work continued from the previous period; externally there was increasing awareness within the UN about gender, particularly in the transition from MDGs to SDGs, UN-Habitat stakeholders such as the Huairou Commission continued to push gender as an issue, and preparation for Habitat III included active involvement of UN Women and others focused on making gender significant in the New Urban Agenda (NUA); internally the Gender Equality Marker emerged as they key gender monitoring tool for project design, and the Gender Unit did what it could with slim resources. In addition, the UN-Habitat revised Strategic Plan formally adopted in 2017, committed to implementing specific projects against the UN SWAP, and also to do with ‘the gender issues and needs we see on the ground’.

4.1.3 A separate Gender Strategy for effective mainstreaming

The UN’s focus on gender mainstreaming ensures that gender must have a level of visibility. This meant that, as one staff member commented, ‘despite the policy’s lack of visibility, gender mainstreaming did happen’. Despite this lack of visibility, there was almost unanimous agreement that UN-Habitat should have a separate Gender Strategy, as this ‘demonstrates UN-Habitat’s commitment and, ideally, should guide effective gender mainstreaming’. This confirms the feeling of the General Assembly Resolution in 2019 that ‘requires us to review progress through this evaluation’.

Other staff views on what should be included in a new gender strategy included: the need to expand the definition of gender to include ‘all genders, and the issues of LGBT+’; a requirement that each country has specific gender-focused goals – ‘this would be a big change driver, and would ensure we look for the practical elements of what is important to women in that country’.

A small minority felt differently – that the new Strategic Plan 2030-2023 results framework was sufficiently demanding in terms of gender: ‘we should make gender more visible in the main results framework’. However, external views were that UN-Habitat had not done enough to advance the rights of poor urban people and particularly for ‘poor urban women globally’, that UN-Habitat had not amplified the gender lens over time, and ‘the gender content of the new strategy is not very good’. These perceptions suggest that more needs to be done to assert UN-Habitat’s strategic commitment to addressing gender inequality and women’s empowerment as a central element of sustainable urbanisation.

---

28 Revised Strategic Plan 2017: para 47
29 HSP/HA.1/Res.4 Resolution adopted by the United National Habitat Assembly on 31 May 2019
4.2 Gender mainstreaming coherence and synergy with other development interventions

UN-Habitat works coherently with other UN agencies, implementing partner NGOs and country and local governments, and in various global forums. UN-Habitat appears to consistently include gender issues in the content of this work.

In global forums, UN-Habitat consciously incorporates gender mainstreaming as part of its work to build international understanding of what constitutes sustainable urbanisation, and the factors that will enable achievement of the SDGs. The concepts of gender equality and empowerment of women and the need to include a gender lens into the dialogues on sustainable urbanisation have been present in dialogues, debates and content of numerous World Urban Forums, in the Habitat III conference and the New Urban Agenda, in many of the Urban Thinker Campus events. Through a range of partners, UN-Habitat has also ensured that voices of grassroots women have been heard. UN-Habitat’s ongoing push for sex disaggregation of data has been important in understanding what is happening in urbanisation internationally.

In the survey (see Figure 6), 64% of respondents indicated that UN-Habitat was vocal about gender equality and women’s empowerment in global forums, half felt the agency had contributed somewhat, and 20% felt it had definitely contributed to changed attitudes. They are generally well-satisfied, and most feel that that UN-Habitat is vocal, and somewhat influential. The strategic question would be how to raise influence from ‘Somewhat: I have seen some shift in attitudes as a result of UN-Habitat advocacy’ to ‘Yes - I have seen substantial change in attitudes through UN-Habitat advocacy.’

### 4.2.1 Habitat III and the New Urban Agenda

One of the most significant events during the strategic period was Habitat III and the primary product of that event, the document describing the New Urban Agenda (NUA) does include gender-specific indicators. In 2014, preparatory work for Habitat III was underway, and UN-Habitat recognised that the NUA would ‘provide multiple catalytic opportunities to integrate a gender perspective into urban development... Many of the barriers that hinder urban development affect women in particular, and therefore need to be addressed specifically’, and if women ‘are empowered they become an extremely valuable resource for the development of their community’. Twenty four agencies participated in preparations, which involved convening expert groups and producing issues papers in 22 thematic areas. UN Women and AGGI were instrumental in bringing a gender lens to all preparatory policy analysis, and worked particularly on the issue paper on inclusion. AGGI members, who were part of the Huairou Commission were key to engaging women in civil society into the dialogues. Gender-focused preparation also involved lobbying at CSW and ECOSOC events, and importantly engaging city mayors and youth constituencies in discussions about women and city resilience. A special Women’s Assembly was held as part of Habitat III ‘to ensure the New Urban Agenda empowers women and engenders city and community development’. Work during the event also focused on ensuring that the NUA’s language was gender sensitive, and the outcome document ‘includes paragraphs 5, 13 (c & f), 15 (c), 26, 32, 35, 40, 42, 77, 92, 100, 101, 114 and 151 on issues of gender-responsive policies and plans and/or data collection in cities.’

The NUA was adopted at the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III) in Quito, Ecuador, on 20 October 2016, and aims to mobilise ‘Member States and other key stakeholders to drive sustainable urban development at the local level’ and ‘marked a significant gain in terms of gender sensitivity and the empowerment of women’. However, some interviewees felt UN-Habitat has not gone far enough to ensure member states understand what must be done ‘to change and adapt their urban development plans’ to include a gender lens.

---

30 Staff were the primary respondents to these questions as the question was only posed to international level partners.
31 UN-Habitat. 2014. Gender Equality and Women’s empowerment: A New Urban Vision
32 Habitat III Women’s Assembly Concept Note, 23 September 2016
33 Annual Progress Report 2016
34 https://unhabitat.org/about-us/new-urban-agenda
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4.2.2 World Urban Forum and World Urban Campaign

The World Urban Forum (WUF) and the World Urban Campaign are key platforms where UN-Habitat and stakeholders from every level engage around issues of sustainable urbanisation. The Gender Equality Unit has been involved in organising WUF gender-focused events, assisted by key stakeholders such as the Huairou Commission, who were ‘instrumental in finding panellists, and convening women’s grassroots groups to attend and support our gender events’. The contribution of these platforms to building UN-Habitat’s normative gender-focus is discussed in Section 5.1 below.

4.2.3 Partnerships

UN-Habitat works closely with a range of partners at global, regional, national and local levels. The nature of the partners and the partnerships have a significant bearing on the extent to which gender is a central focus. Over time – extending further back than the last strategic period – some partners’ insistence on gender as a central focus has influenced UN-Habitat’s gender approach very positively. A criterium for partnership with UN-Habitat is the potential partners’ familiarity or commitment to a gender approach. Covid-19 saw focused partnership between UN agencies with each bringing its particular expertise to support government responses, including support to deal with Gender-Based Violence and stigma.

As a primarily project-based agency, UN-Habitat works with a wide range of partners. These include sister UN agencies, local and international networks or NGOs, and local and national governments. Some partners are by definition gender focused, and include Grassroots Organizations Operating Together in Sisterhood (GROOTS International), Huairou Commission, UN Women, Women in Cities International (WICI), and Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO). Others, by nature of their work focus with people who are society’s most vulnerable, have a keen understanding of the need to address gender issues in their programming. These include Red Mujer y Hábitat LAC, Plan International, Slum Dwellers International (SDI), Action Aid. In the global programmes run by large international partners such as the Global Land Tenure Network and the WASH Trust Fund there is evidence of focused evolution of gender-sensitive programming. An important grouping of partners are those focused on cities and/or the officials responsible for running cities, such as Cities Alliance, United Cities and Local Government (UCLG), Asociación de Concejalas de Bolivia (ACoBol). Finally, a number of bilateral donors including Sweden, Norway and the EU have contributed substantially to UN-Habitat’s gender mainstreaming work. Sida has a long-standing relationship with UN-Habitat through formal cooperation agreements, and has a seat on the UN-Habitat Executive Board. Many interviews indicated that partners often help to keep gender ‘firmly on the radar’, and make sure that ‘indicators and data is disaggregated from the beginning’.

Partnerships with UN Agencies: There are a number of examples of country-level partnerships with UN agencies where gender focus is either part or the full focus of a programme. Partnering with UNICEF and UNDP, UN-Habitat brings the sustainable urbanisation agenda into programmes like Joint Programme for Local government (JPLG) in Somalia, and contributes to work around making local government more gender sensitive. Safer Cities for Girls, a global programme in seven countries run by PLAN international in collaboration with UN Women and UN-Habitat, is an excellent example of a coherent partnership, which collaborates with different levels of government in different spaces, including policy and through to infrastructure. Good collaboration and joint programming with UN Women have taken place in Egypt, Morocco, Mozambique and Palestine. UN Women also has a good informal collaboration with various UN-Habitat stakeholders such as the Huairou Commission.

Although this does not fall in the strategic period under review, it is worth noting that UN agencies have raised joint efforts to support governments in the response to the Covid-19 pandemic. Each agency brought its own particular expertise to the response, including approaches to address heightened Gender-Based Violence as a result of lockdowns, and stigma around infections in some communities.

UN-Habitat spearheaded the development of a United Nations System-wide Strategy on Sustainable Urbanization working with over 24 organisations. The strategy, adopted by the Chief Executive Board in April 2019 is now a United Nations wide blueprint for sustainable urban development. Gender is identified as one of the key elements to be addressed to achieve sustainable and equitable urban development, including identifying the barriers to equality and indicating the importance of working with governments to realise their gender-friendly policies and frameworks.

UN-Habitat country staff are generally involved in some way in the inter-agency Gender Group or Task Force, which has various benefits for more effective advocacy and discussions about possible national responses to issues like Gender-

---
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Based on Violence. The updated gender equality scorecard was introduced to all United Nations country teams by the United Nations Sustainable Development Group in mid-2018. The enhanced coordination function of Resident Coordinators under UN Reform processes has the potential to consolidate the impetus of gender across agencies, thereby strengthening the position of any one agency in its engagements with the government counterparts. The Mexico office reported that the Resident Coordinator’s office has a strong and clear focus on gender issues.

**Member state partners:** Gender focus is highly variable with government partners. State conservatism and contextual drivers can limit the extent to which fully-gendered programming is possible. Project priorities may also be dictated by the preferences and cultures of the partner, which may compromise positions on gender. Somalia and Mexico are examples raised in the interviews. This is a risk in middle-income countries, where most UN agencies depend on member states to fund urbanisation activities.

Where gender does seem to be more easily addressed across the board is in national strategic and legislative frameworks for urban planning. Informants provided many examples of where these processes had resulted in frameworks and legislation that included explicit gender perspectives. This situation is further enabled with many governments establishing gender-focused Ministries, and many have committed to gender equality and women’s empowerment in national legislation. While this does not guarantee a gender perspective in implementation — and there were many examples of this too — it does provide a public commitment against which governments can gradually be held to account through local advocacy and from the international community. At local level, city authorities often partner with UN-Habitat around local policy and regulation: in the examples found, UN-Habitat had used community participation to identify needs, particularly those of women and vulnerable groups.

### 4.2.4 Alignment with the UN-SWAP

UN-Habitat has consistently reported as required against the UN’s System-Wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN SWAP), but ratings are inconsistent with the gender mainstreaming reality.

UN SWAP was launched in 2012 and all agencies were required to report against the indicators. UN Women holds the brief to collect and analyse reports. In 2018, the indicator framework was amended. UN-Habitat has submitted UN SWAP reports annually, and the reports from 2014 through 2019 were reviewed for this evaluation. The heat map (Table 4) showing ratings in the UN SWAP reports appears to indicate fair performance in terms of gender, but this is somewhat misleading. It is concerning that the 2017 UNSWAP states ‘The Strategic Plan does not explicitly include gender result and activities for the seven thematic areas of UN-Habitat. However, at present, this is mitigated by the GEAP 2014-2019 Gender Results Framework.’ As the GEAP was not implemented or monitored this not valid evidence for gender mainstreaming.

From 2018, UN SWAP introduced new indicators that were focused more on evidence of results, and in particular the alignment of programmes to SDG indicators and evidence of financial resource allocation. UN-Habitat contributes to Goal 5/Target 5.5 Ensure women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life, and Goal 11/Target 11.3/Indicator 11.3.2 Proportion of cities with a direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management that operate regularly and democratically.

However, the 2018 and 2019 reports show that evidence for Strategic Planning and Monitoring and Reporting against SDG indicators is ‘missing’, confirming that UN-Habitat needs to become more targeted in the way it addresses gender. The 2018 report does give one example against Strategic Planning Gender-Related SDG: Innovate Kenya Project (ICT project aimed at young girls) is presented as a contribution to SDG 5, but there is no rationale as to why this as opposed to any other result is particularly strategic, or whether this is the only example of this kind of intervention. It seems that there is little distinction between gender parity and gender equality in the reporting. However, it is noted that UN-Habitat
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**Table 5. UN-Habitat UN-SWAP ratings 2014-2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy and plan in place/ Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018: Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender responsive performance management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018: Strategic planning Gender-related SDG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018: Reporting on Gender-related SDGs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Responsive auditing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018: Audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018: Programmatic Gender-related SDG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource tracking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018: Financial resource tracking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018: Financial resource allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender architecture and parity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018: Gender architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018: Equal representation of women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge generation &amp; communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** No data | Missing | Approaches requirements | Meets requirements | Exceeds requirements
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39 Report of the Secretary-General: Mainstreaming a gender perspective into all policies and programmes in the United Nations system. July 2019
core values now include ‘Respect for Diversity/Gender’, and Senior Managers’ Compacts from 2018 include a commitment to ‘serve as a role model for implementing the Gender Parity Strategy’.

One of the UN Women responses to the 2018 ratings recommends that UN-Habitat: ‘Increase financial and human resources for Gender Mainstreaming. Limited resources restrict the support available for substantive offices which have expressed interest for more collaboration on gender equality issues. The upcoming restructuring in UN-Habitat may provide an opportunity to strengthen the gender architecture and allocate targeted programming and core funding.’

Evidence gathered in this evaluation show that this is definitely one of two key requirements to make gender mainstreaming more effective – the other is to position the function more strategically.

---

Letter from UN Women ED to UN-Habitat ED, 2 September 2019.
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5 Effectiveness

How clearly aligned has UN-Habitat gender mainstreaming been in terms of clarity and coherence of linkages between the agency’s operational and normative work streams at global, regional and country levels and institutional arrangements?

UN-Habitat consciously addresses gender mainstreaming in the planning of its normative and programmatic work. However, implementation is less consistent, although there are a number of excellent practices and results. Also, the method, manner and understanding of gender mainstreaming differs across the agency. There were many individuals with strong gender focus active within the agency before and throughout the period and although UN-Habitat is a project-based agency, many long-term partnerships have contributed to improved gender focus over time. However, the method, manner and understanding of gender mainstreaming differs across the agency. In the absence of an influential, strategic, well-monitored policy and plan, programmatic coherence in relation to gender is unavoidably weak and efforts are fragmented and inconsistent.

UN-Habitat’s effectiveness in relation to gender focus is determined in part by the commitment and depth of understanding of its various partners, who often are the primary funding sources for project work. This means there are areas where excellent coherence is achieved, and others where little gender-focused progress can be made. Because monitoring and tracking of gender mainstreaming is also fragmented (see section on monitoring below), UN-Habitat does not have a comprehensive global picture. Certain regions, such as Arab States and Asia and the Pacific, have developed a gender picture for their region. However, this appears to be the result of individual initiative, rather than as a policy with consistent guidelines across regions for global aggregation. Gender indicators are increasingly part of global data collection initiatives such as the City Prosperity Index and SDG monitoring.

Although the GPP was not implemented directly, it is possible to look at the extent to which gender-focused work within UN-Habitat contributed to achieving its goals. Goal 1 dealt with the provision of normative and technical assistance to stakeholders so their policies, plans and programmes achieve measurable gender equality and women’s empowerment results in the areas of UN-Habitat’s strategic priorities. Gender mainstreaming was already a focus in the previous strategic period and this continued into the 2014-2019 period. The seven focus areas incorporated gender to varying extents, depending on projects and programmes already in place, and on the level of understanding and commitment of key staff. As the Gender Equality Marker became a formal requirement, there was increased attention to the gender content in projects. However, survey data (Figure 7) show that there are significant differences across the regions. Far more respondents from countries in Asia and the Pacific regard gender to be ensured thoroughly or quite well than from other regions, with a far higher regional score. In Latin America, where the regional score was lowest, more than half of respondents felt that there are only ‘a few cases’ where benefit to women is ensured, with a similar pattern in the Arab States where almost half of respondents reported little or no consideration for women. Apart from results from Asia Pacific, Figure 7 suggests that there is considerable room for improvement in efforts to ensure that women are considered and benefit in programming.
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ROAS. 2020. Empowering women and mapping of gender related projects in the Arab Region

Averaged scored used weightings from -1 for ‘None’ to 2 for ‘Thorough’
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5.1 Normative support: The Gender Marker, global forums and guidelines

Based on gender mainstreaming activities over the past two decades, normative events such as the WUF and UTCs, the work to incorporate gender into the SDGs and the NUA, and long-standing partnerships with gender-focused stakeholders and organisations, it is clear WHAT must be done. There is also a fair amount of guidance on HOW to ensure gender equality and women’s empowerment – what may be missing is the dialogue to connect the WHAT and the HOW and address specific contexts. UN-Habitat has the Gender Equality Marker which guides project design. The agency has a plethora of guidelines and issue guides for thematic areas, good practice examples, detailed list from grassroots and other stakeholders of issues that need to be addressed, and lists of key questions with which to interrogate urban policies and implementation plans. None of these guidelines are perfect and many are little known, some are old and could do with updating, some of the lists are buried in reports, and the questions in concept notes. A collate and consolidate exercise would be useful, and then it becomes more about the conversation and ensuring commitment. As one staff member commented: ‘Over the strategic period gender focus in project design has become much more automatic – no one argues with the fact that it needs to be a consideration.’

The understanding of what gender mainstreaming means in practice remains variable across the agency, and gender mainstreaming ranges from being a ‘tick-box’ exercise to thorough and carefully focused implementation. Normative work does not automatically have a gender lens – although the agency is ‘known for its very strong policy and normative work, gender is not yet embedded sufficiently or positioned better across and within its documents’. In this regard, aside from the Gender Marker for project design, there is no internal process to ensure that internal and external documents are gender sensitive. It was clear that the closer operational work got to the grassroots level, and if participatory processes were employed, gender issues were very much part of implementation, with evidence of changed lives in a number of areas. The lack of comprehensive monitoring means the full picture of results is not known.

Less than half of survey respondents (Figure 8) felt that partners’ gender awareness has grown. However, the majority of respondents (Figure 9) felt there had been an increase in gender emphasis in projects and documents, and advocacy or communication for gender awareness. There was general consensus around these conclusions, with no significant differences between genders, staff levels or regions.

5.1.1 Key normative events

Habitat III was the main event in the strategic period that set the vision of the New Urban Agenda as a way to support countries and cities globally towards the SDG targets. Since 2002, the World Urban Forum has brought together most of the key players within urbanisation, making it a key platform for debating and determining global approaches. The World Urban Campaign is an ongoing advocacy and learning mechanism, bringing together thinkers and doers around how to make cities more effective and equitable. Both the WUFs and the WUC have consistently included gender focused activities.

World Urban Forum: The World Urban Forum (WUF) brings together stakeholders and constituencies involved in urban issues, and participation in the event has increased from around 2,000 at the first WUF in 2002 to over 24,000 at WUF9.43 Gender-focused events were well attended at the two World Urban Forums held during the strategic period. The 2014 WUF7 included participants from over 22,000 participants from 142 countries and 39 UN bodies around the theme of growing global inequality. The Gender and Women’s Assembly addressed ways to ensure that women’s empowerment
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43 https://unhabitat.org/world-urban-forum
and gender equality were made an integral part of the work towards urban equity in the SDGs. The WUF7 Report lists 30 specific issues and recommendations to address gender equality and women’s empowerment – the detail and intention of many of these recommendations was evident in reports and evaluations of some of the thematic and global programmes. At WUF7, 16 of the 30 trainings on offer were ‘How to...’ sessions, including the one offered by the Huairou Commission (How to apply the GEC as a tool to enhance multi-stakeholders engagement).

WUF9 concentrated on building awareness and capacity for implementation of the NUA, and participants reported that they felt more capacitated to advance sustainable urbanisation. Gender-focused events included the Expert Group meeting on the Gender Strategy for Implementing Women’s Land Rights, a Women’s Roundtable focusing on climate resilience and gender-responsive urban planning, and a Women’s Assembly which participants reported ‘raised their awareness and identified solutions to specific gender-related issues’. There was no information on which of the 60 trainings were focused on gender. WUF9 acknowledged several trends and challenges ‘typical of our increasingly urbanised world, such as limited opportunities for collective city-making, inequitable access to urban life, gender inequalities in urban economies and leadership, and insufficient protection from human rights violations... These challenges have intensified since 2016 and were further exacerbated by the coronavirus outbreak.’

**World Urban Campaign:** The World Urban Campaign is a global advocacy and partnership platform to promote dialogue around urbanisation. ‘The most affected people in the city are those where the issues of race, class and gender intersect. In the World Urban Campaign there is more space for these intersectional debates.’ Dialogues are conducted with local and international stakeholders through Urban Thinkers Campuses (UTC). Based on 26 UCTs internationally, the World Urban Campaign’s *City We Need* manifesto with input from thousands of individuals from 124 countries identified a set of principles and requirements for cities that were fed into Habitat III and the NUA. The WUC argued that cities must meet the needs of all people, recognise ‘gender differentiated needs and supports women as key actors in planning and decision making’, and ensure that gender is a key perspective for policies, programmes and budgets, policing methods, and local economic development. Hundreds of UTCs have been organised over the past decade, and a fair number focused on gender-related issues. Stakeholders felt that UTCs are particularly important because they bring together stakeholders who would not otherwise talk to each other: ‘it is a more comprehensive approach to addressing the issues of the city’.

**Expert Groups and advocacy:** Over the strategic period there were a number of events where the gender focus within sustainable urbanisation was discussed with various stakeholder groups. A gender forum entitled ‘Engendering sustainable cities’ was held during the 25th session of the Governing Council in April 2015. UN-Habitat’s ‘approaches to housing and livelihoods, safety and security and, spatial planning in relation to gender equality in urban post-conflict contexts’ were refined during the 2015 Barcelona Global Expert Group Meeting ‘Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development: Gender-Sensitive Engagement in Post-Conflict Contexts’. UN-Women, the Huairou Commission and UN-Habitat co-hosted a 2017 event on ‘Improving accountability for the gender-responsive implementation of the NUA’, where member states, UN entities, civil society organisations, academics and other stakeholders discussed how to align SDG 5 and 11 implementation, and ‘good practices, implementation challenges and lessons learned in the gender-responsive implementation of the 2030 Agenda’.

### 5.1.2 The Gender Equality Marker

The GEAP results framework was not used as a monitoring framework, and the Gender Equality Marker (GEM) appears to be the primary measure of UN-Habitat gender mainstreaming. While this tool has been instrumental in driving gender mainstreaming in project design, it remains fairly generic if not supported by good guidance on ensuring that projects include gender-focused monitoring indicators in addition to requirements to collect sex disaggregated data. Consolidating the GEM into the Environmental and Social Safeguarding System may help to ensure more focused project indicators that better guide implementation.

The Project Advisory Group (PAG), which has now become the Project Review Committee (PRC), comprises a group of senior regional and Headquarters staff, and the Gender Unit has a permanent seat on the structure. The PAG was tasked
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44 WUF7 Gender Assembly Concept Note  
48 World Cities Report 2020  
49 The UTC is ‘an open space for critical exchange between urban researchers, professionals, and decision-makers who believe that urbanization is an opportunity and can lead to positive urban transformations.’ https://www.worldurbancampaign.org/utc-background  
50 UN-Habitat. 2016. The City We Need  
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53 Cross-Cutting Issues Report 2018
to ‘ensure that cross-cutting issues are consistently incorporated in all projects at the design stage, during implementation and at completion’. This process was enabled through the Gender Equality Marker (GEM) document, which was finalised in 2015. The GEM is a four-tiered criteria mainstreaming tool designed to measure the degree to which a project addresses gender equality and the empowerment of women. Projects must at minimum meet the criteria for level 1 (Gender Aware), and here would have to include actions showing how the project will achieve level 2a (Gender Sensitive).

Although the Gender Equality Marker was consistently applied by the PAG from 2016, some projects were already using a rating scale for gender – a good example is the 2013 Lake Victoria WASH programme Gender Issue Guide. Interviews suggest that project compliance in using the gender marker increased over the strategic period and Annual Progress Reports confirm that projects meeting all marker requirements rose from 30% in 2015, to 62% in 2016, 77% in 2017, and 85% by 2019. The improvements in mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues ‘across UN-Habitat’s programmes and projects, is mainly as a result of the application of the markers’. Between 2016 and 2020 a total of 421 projects and concept notes were assessed against the GEM, although it was found that there is no formal follow up process to ensure that projects rated at level 1 have implemented the agreed remedial actions to become more gender sensitive.

In the UN SWAP reports from 2015 the GEM Marker seems to be conflated as a tool and a reflection of actual resource allocation. However, the 2017 report acknowledged that ‘GEM currently only works at the project formulation stage. There is no marker for assessing the activities of a Branch or Office within the Agency. Therefore, a tool for mainstreaming gender into the Agency’s institutional structure, beyond capacity development and awareness raising is currently lacking.’ UN SWAP reports acknowledge that there is no feedback loop when approvals are based on agreed actions to make a project document more gender friendly to meet at least GEM level 1.

Interviews suggested the GEM was useful in ensuring design compliance, but more guidance on implementation and monitoring was badly needed. However, survey data (Figure 10) show low awareness of and optimism about the GEM’s effectiveness. Only 30% of staff feel the GEM was an effective tool: half of management respondents (P4 to D2); about a third of Field, NPO and P2-3 staff were positive; other field staff, NPO and P2-3 cadres knew about the GEM but felt it was not effective. Contractors, general services and others had more often not heard of the gender marker. This is appropriate for administrative staff who are not involved in project design, but it is assumed a proportion of contractors would be involved in implementation, and understanding project design parameters would be an advantage.

There was broad agreement that compliance with the GEM does not ensure effective gender-focused implementation and that more robust monitoring requirements could help to ensure that detailed gender focused indicators were developed at the planning stage. UN-Habitat’s increasing work on climate with the Climate Adaptation Fund has meant a much greater focus on better planning and monitoring using the climate focused Environmental and Social Safeguarding System (ESS v3). This system, introduced in December 2016 to ensure social and environmental sustainability of proposed projects, includes gender as a central element and ‘we are now trying to integrate the old markers into ESS v3’. It appears this will require more rigor in the project design to show the detail of and indicators for implementation: ‘moving from “doing no harm” to “doing good”’. This consolidation, together with mandatory implementation of the Gender Catalogue, would give projects additional practical guidance for implementation.

### 5.1.3 Guidelines and normative support

There was mixed evidence of the usefulness of gender-focused guidelines. Those produced by and for programmes were recognised as being very useful and appropriate. Those produced by HQ much less so, largely, it seems, because there is no support process to enable effective use.

There are numerous guidelines for gender across the focus areas and global programmes. A number were quite old but clearly well used: these tended to be produced out of projects in particular areas – some were extremely well focused around gender and others ‘not specific enough …so women’s issues are not addressed fully’. Other guidelines were known about but not used, or not known about at all: these tended to be HQ products, and it appears there were no focused processes to make these guides known and used at implementation level. Interviews confirmed this gap between
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normative work done within the different focus areas at HQ and the field: ‘it’s just a fact of life – it is difficult to break the silos from HQ while we have a whole spectrum of activities.’

In 2012, the Gender Equality Unit facilitated the production of a Gender Issue Guide for each of the seven strategic focus areas. There was varied awareness about these guides: in some cases people had not heard of them, others were aware of them but had not used them, and some found them ‘quite useful and a good starting point for contextualisation and application at the country level’. There is evidence that the guides have been accessed. Data from the Advocacy, Outreach and Communications Division (AOC) – which tracks publication downloads from the UN-Habitat website, show that by 2018, the various guides had been downloaded 14,145 times, indicating a need for this kind of guideline.

Table 5. Gender-focused publications downloaded from UN-Habitat website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report/guide</th>
<th>Date published</th>
<th>Downloads To 2016</th>
<th>Downloads To 2018</th>
<th>Annual average since publication</th>
<th>Average: 2017, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Gender Issues Guides for seven thematic areas</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10,493</td>
<td>14,145</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>1,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGI Progress Report 2015:</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Mainstreaming Brochure:</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Journey: Total Downloads:</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-Habitat’s Gender Equality Marker (GEM)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the rate of downloads for the gender guides appears to have decreased over the 2017-2018 period⁵⁸, indicating reduced interest. The reason is not known, but it might be that potential users are looking for something more current, and interviews indicated that users were looking for toolkits that could address their local contexts and conditions. It was acknowledged that UN-Habitat ‘falls short in the dissemination and monitoring of the use and influence of our normative guidelines.’

UN-Habitat global programmes and thematic areas have developed a range of guidelines and tools that focus on gender:

- GLTN’s land tools are the most frequently mentioned – across reporting documents and in interviews. The Social Tender Domain Model was described as a very useful tool to analyse ‘all the different kinds of rights people can have over land and how this can be used by both genders and all groups. We are looking at using it for refugees.’
- The City Resilience Profiling Programme produced the Gender Equality Enhancer as an addition to the City Resilience Profiling Tool: ‘Achieving gender equality matters greatly to achieving resilient cities. In guiding partner cities to assess and analyse city resilience, it is important that an underlying understanding of the construct of gender equality is shared by the involved actors.’⁵⁹
- 53 countries benefitted from tools and knowledge enabling them to formulate inclusive, integrated gender and climate sensitive slum upgrading strategies.⁶⁰
- UN-Habitat’s tools for developing inclusive public spaces embrace diverse perspectives into public space planning are being enhanced through technologies like Minecraft computer programmes. ‘The technology enables beneficiaries to identify challenges and create public spaces that are inclusive and safe. In Palestine and Afghanistan, for example, the tools were used to create more inclusive public spaces including women-only and child-friendly parks.’⁶¹
- The Block by Block Minecraft methodology, an innovative digital methodology developed by UN-Habitat to support engagement of youth and women slum dwellers in participatory public space design, was used in designing the Dandora street model.⁶²
- In the WASH sector, the Lake Victoria project produced the ‘How to Set Up and Manage a Town-Level Multi-stakeholder Forum: A Step-By-Step Guide’ in 2008, and the ‘Issue Guide for Gender Responsive Policies for Urban Basic Services’ in 2013. Both are still used to ensure equal representation of women and inform agreements of cooperation with local government. The on-line version ‘is used in all new WASH projects’. The Issue Guide covers Energy, Transport and Mobility, and Water and Sanitation, and includes gender marker guides for project design.
- Her City Toolbox⁶³ is a digital platform offering tools to increase the capacity of politicians, city planners, companies, civil society, to create accessible, inclusive and equal public spaces. It is a collaboration between UN-Habitat and an independent Swedish think tank Global Challenge.

Country-level interviews also revealed a number of locally specific tools being used to address gender:
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• Gender Sensitive MinBus Services & Transport Infrastructure for African Cities: A Practical Toolkit. Based on a Mobility of Care Study & Gender Equity Assessment of Nairobi’s Minibus Transport Network.
• Mozambique’s resilience action planning tool was adapted from other countries such as Sri Lanka – and is now being implemented in ten cities in Mozambique.
• TACT in Afghanistan has produced ten manuals covering how to write a business plan, how to market and sell products, income and expenditure management, getting loans from banks, how to register the business.
• The Government of Bolivia’s national urban policy reform process has included use of UN-Habitat tools ‘such as the International Guidelines on Urban and Territorial Planning and the National Urban Policies Guide to integrate social inclusion with the participation of grass-roots organisations and the civil society’.  

There is definitely a need for gender-focused guidelines, as a majority of those interviewed said they lacked tools to guide projects into implementation: ‘We need a practical how-to guide to help with gender focus in implementation’. There was mixed evidence regarding how transportable existing guidelines were, although it is not clear whether this was due to users being unable to adapt the material to local contexts. For example, the Mexico office has struggled to find appropriate ‘best practices and toolkits’ to support their work in the Ministry of Territorial and Urban Planning, which has shown big interest in mainstreaming gender in their policy. This emphasises the need for a person-to-person process to support implementation of guidelines, ‘but UN-Habitat doesn’t allocate resources to this’. A further need expressed was for guidelines and knowledge products to be translated to enable broader use, as generally translations tend to be very poor and are not easily read by local authorities. This seems particularly important where the lack of commitment from the government and conservative cultural values make it harder to find ways to practically reduce inequality.

5.1.4 Gender mainstreaming in the focus areas

Gender mainstreaming within the focus areas appears to be variable, and is very different across the regions. Apparently, the linkages between focus area experts at Headquarters and country offices are not good, and this extends to achieving clarity on how to make projects more gender focused.

A 2011 UN-Habitat study found that ‘when programme/task managers are knowledgeable and interested in gender issues, it almost immediately translates into positive results both at field and Headquarters levels’. This appears still to be the case. This same study found that ‘different contexts require different approaches, ideally tailor-made to local culture and language, but this realisation has not always been translated into practice’ – it appears that this is still the situation. In the Annual Progress Reports gender is not discussed in the focus areas chapters – aside from brief assertions that attention is given to cross-cutting issues. Where work is directly tied to practical on-the-ground implementation, gender awareness appears to be greater – for example, land tenure and slum upgrading work addresses the situation people face daily and normative work responds directly to these issues, in planning and design work must address the concerns of officials who must ensure citizens’ safety and access to services. Reports describe projects relevant to focus areas that include a gender focus from Cambodia, Kenya, Mongolia, Sri Lanka, Philippines, Morocco, among many others. Where things are more abstract as in urban policy, or highly technical as in basic services gender awareness is less consistently evident. This indicates the need for more comprehensive and coherent efforts to embed gender within the institution. It appears that UN-Habitat does not have an internal process to ensure gender sensitive or transformative language in documents – this would be a key intervention to embed a culture of gender focus.

The 2019 Expert Group on Socially Inclusive National Urban Policies reported that UN-Habitat was working with 41 countries to develop National Urban Policies, and that the agency worked closely with women and women’s organisations in cities ‘ensuring that women have a strong voice in policies and programmes that affect them’. Survey respondents were asked about national and city policy improvements that addressed empowering women (Figure 11a). There have been policy changes, but most notably in national policy, suggesting that UN-Habitat is making progress in its efforts to include a gender focus into national urban policy. Scores provide a comparison (Figure 11b) between different groups of respondents and regions. Respondents who reported the most substantial changes in policy reform were from the Arab States and Asia and the Pacific, particularly at national level, but also substantially in cities. Respondents who experienced the least progress in policy reform were from Africa and Latin America, and especially for city policies. Regional variation was fairly strong, suggesting strategic or contextual differences which may need to be considered for Africa and Latin America.
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67 There was no significant difference between staff and partners responses, and the data from the two surveys are combined.
68 Scores were calculated using a weighting of -1 for ‘worsened’, up to 2 for ‘much better’.
Figure 12 shows that around half of staff and partners feel that things have improved for women in the areas of tenure legislation, basic services, urban economies and urban design in the period 2014-2019. The other half is strongly divided between conditions remaining the same, and improving greatly – this is due to very different views across regions. Staff and partners also have very different views about UN-Habitat impact on slums and disaster risk systems (Figure 13). Over half of partners feel conditions for women in slums have not improved, and 19% report worsening conditions; over half of staff see at least some improvement, and only 4% note deterioration.

5.1.5 Collecting gender disaggregated data to monitor sustainable urbanisation

There has been a conscious effort over the strategic period to increase the collection of gender-disaggregated data at a range of levels including via the indicators for global urbanisation monitoring such as the CPI, and within project monitoring. However, resource constraints have limited UN-Habitat’s ability to fully depict the gender picture of cities across the globe, as this requires granular and detailed data from neighbourhoods.

UN-Habitat manages nine of the 15 indicators under SDG 11, and data is gathered from a range of sources: For example, in Public Space UN-Habitat looks after data on Access and UN Women looks at Gender-Based Violence. The two data sets are then brought together, helping to track gender mainstreaming globally. This was described as important normative work, helping UN-Habitat to report against the SDGs. In 2015, UN-Habitat’s work around SDG 11 resulted in some gender-focused indicators being approved by the Inter-Agency and Expert Group of the SDGs (e.g. indicator on public spaces, 11.7.1), and in the guidelines recently produced for the monitoring of SDG 11 indicators, UN-Habitat ‘created metadata indicating how to disaggregate information based on gender, sex, social status and location’.69

UN-Habitat’s global data picture is based on data from 3 000 cities. Resource constraints limit UN-Habitat’s ability to fully depict the gender picture of cities across the globe, as this requires granular and detailed data from neighbourhoods:
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‘Presenting a picture of progress towards Sustainable Development Goal 11 and other urban indicators require spatial data for reporting, and we fall short... and we definitely don’t get 100% coverage on gender indicators.’ In fact, many countries still struggle to produce basic data as opposed to disaggregated data. This means that data from a globally representative sample is used to provide a picture of global trends, but regional or country pictures are not possible. UN-Habitat is encouraging countries to take the same approach – identify a sample of representative cities to get a country-level trend. Good examples from the global South where countries have made an effort to collect disaggregated data are Colombia, Botswana, Tunisia, Mexico, Ghana, and Ecuador.

The City Prosperity Index (CPI), increased the number of gender focused indicators for data collection through its local urban observatories – ‘urban observatories are important because they show local data which can be used for local decision-making’. Work with national statistical agencies over the period included inputs on the importance of disaggregated data for national planning: In 2014, UN-Habitat was working with 19 national statistical offices, and by 2019 73 national offices had begun to use UN-Habitat tools and guidelines to produce urban data that enables monitoring and reporting on the SDGs. However, funding constraints have limited the amount of training that UN-Habitat is able to provide to national statistical agencies.

UN-Habitat reported that between 2014 and 2017, national and local governments increasingly used the World Cities Report for policy formulation and engagement, and the survey showed that staff also find this report useful. Figure 14 shows staff use a wide range of UN-Habitat publications. Staff seldom use the Urban Data digests. A third of partners use the SDG11 reports some are familiar with the City Prosperity index. Few staff and partners were familiar with the Global Urban Indicators Database. Familiarity with reports was even across regions, although ‘none’ was reported more often in the Arab States and Asia-Pacific. Global level staff were most likely to use reports. International readers were generally familiar with multiple reports, while national respondents tended to be familiar with only one. Local respondents were more likely to be unfamiliar with any reports. Asked for feedback on gender disaggregation, partners were slightly more satisfied with what they found in reports. Overall, however, the majority of staff (74%) and partners (60%) concur that more disaggregation is needed.

5.2 Building capacity for gender mainstreaming

5.2.1 Staff-focused capacity building

‘Gender at UN-Habitat does not receive core funding, which means that efforts to include it are largely voluntary, or project funded – this hinders long-term behavioural/attitudinal change toward gender mainstreaming’. Opinions varied about the extent or depth of gender awareness and the levels of capability to implement gender mainstreaming within UN-Habitat. There is definitely a group of staff who have an excellent understanding of the importance of gender focus for sustainable urbanisation, and who work hard to ensure this. However, there are still many who see gender as a compliance issue. UN SWAP reports seem to be the only place where internal gender awareness and capacity are tracked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN SWAP indicators</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The UN SWAP requires agencies to determine the capacity of their staff for gender-focused activities, and to report on training. In 2014 the agency’s capacity was assessed as ‘exceeding requirements’: This is based on a gender training survey in that year. For the next five years the assessment was ‘missing’. However, over the strategic period UN SWAP reports record an increase in gender awareness within the agency, as well as an increased focus on gender. Despite this assertion, the agency admitted that it has not had resources or mechanisms to train and assess staff capacity in relation to gender mainstreaming. ‘On-going obligatory training across the Agency would help …and it would be fundamental that there is a centralised system for collecting internal data on staff capacity.’74 The 2018 UN Swap report assesses capacity as ‘meeting requirements’, and it appears that there have been increased initiatives to raise awareness around gender in recent years: It is mandatory to do the UN gender training, and Headquarters staff indicated that recent gender awareness activities such as brown bag meetings and documentaries had been instructive. There have been internal awareness raising activities, and externally, the SGs commitment to gender parity further raised awareness.

Over the strategic period, only 14% of staff respondents reported that they had not received some form of gender capacity building (Figure 15). The mandatory UN gender training was undertaken by 73% of the 139 staff respondents. In addition to mandatory and other training, staff benefitted most from technical assistance.

Not portrayed in these graphs, we found significant differences between staff types in terms of capacity building experiences, with the following key findings:

- Mandatory training had been provided to 94% of D1-2/P4-5 respondents; compared with around 80% of field, P2-3 and general service staff; and around 60% of contractors and NPOs (difference p<0.05).
- Significantly more D1-2/P4-5 staff (55%) had used tools, guidelines and manuals than any other staff category, compared with around 30% of contractors and NPOs; and less than 25% of field/P2-3 staff and general service staff (p<0.05).
- Although higher proportions of senior managers had consistently undertaken other forms of capacity building, the differences were not statistically significant different.

In 2018, UN-Habitat, UN Environment and UN Office in Nairobi (UNON) collaborated to provide training on unconscious bias: ‘The training explores the biases against different gender and groups that are ingrained in our sub-conscious. It aims not to change these biases, but to improve awareness and understanding of colleagues’.75 The completion rate for the UN-wide online gender course were not provided, and there does not appear to be a follow up assessment for this or for the unconscious bias training.

Staff were asked to indicate whether capacity building had improved their abilities. Staff felt that capacity had been very slightly enhanced with respect to abilities to draft, revise and implement guidelines on gender, and also for their ability to provide on the job support around gender (see Figure 16). Capacity building did not improve
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abilities to address gender issues in recruitment and retention – this might be due to the many external factors that have a bearing on this item, and that it is the preserve of a very few staff. Technical assistance was found to be very helpful, especially around revision of guidelines. Mandatory UN-Habitat gender training was rated lowest in terms of the value it provided in building capacity, although most people had participated.

Staff differed significantly by gender in their opinions of whether or not capacity building had improved capacity to draft and review internal UN-Habitat guidelines. Male, other and ‘would rather not answer’ respondents were in agreement, and were far more positive on all aspects of capacity, apart from on-the-job support.

Almost 60% of male/other respondents felt that on average, internal capacities had improved a little or a lot, compared with less than half of female respondents. Over a quarter of female respondents saw no improvement.

Differences between male and female respondents were not significant around recruitment.

In contrast to other aspects of capacity, female respondents had seen improvement in capacity for on-the-job support and/or to address gender equity concerns, where male/other respondents were less likely to see improvement in this regard.

Interviews did confirm that there was a core of people within the agency who were fully committed, and made important efforts to ensure gender focus, particularly in programmes that dealt directly with local communities (eg slum upgrading, public space, safer cities, land rights). However, there were a number of opinions which stressed that, particularly among technical staff, there was a level of ‘obligatory or tickbox compliance’ and gender blindness, and at times even active resistance.

5.2.2 The impact of staff and partner capacity building

UN-Habitat projects and programme training increasingly includes a gender component, but for the most part this is relatively ‘light’ – gender is mentioned as an important issue and some examples are given, but the sessions do no provide in-depth discussions and inputs as to the centrality of gender in sustainable urbanisation.

The 2019 draft UN-Habitat Capacity Building Strategy recognises that at the end of the 2014-19 strategic period the ‘prevailing absence of a collaborative environment in capacity building activities prevents the agency from attaining resource efficiency and taking full advantage of the in-house expertise.’

In the 2018 Voluntary National Reviews of SDG 11, participating countries identified four key areas for improvement. One of these was to ‘Enhance the human resources and capacity of policymakers and technical personnel to implement the NUA and the urban dimension of the SDGs.’ Building country capacity to plan and manage equitable urbanisation is critical for sustainability and achievement of the NUA, and in processes seeking to achieve gender parity among elected politicians and government officials capacity building is even more important.

It was pointed out that women’s capacity ‘might be less’, making capacity building support even more critical. Reports and evaluations show that capacity building of local officials has taken place, and in many cases gender parity of participants was achieved. In some country contexts, parity is not possible yet, but staff spoke of various strategies to get women to attend. However, Figure 17 shows that that a higher proportion of international respondents (57%) had participated in training than national or local respondents. Significantly more local (48%) and national (39%) respondents had not participated in any of these capacity building experiences.

Table 7. Gendered views about capacity improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes, a little</th>
<th>Yes, a lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/other</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review &amp; draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidelines*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/other</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement guidelines *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/other</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/other</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for gender *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/other</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly different p<0.1

Almost 60% of male/other respondents felt that on average, internal capacities had improved a little or a lot, compared with less than half of female respondents. Over a quarter of female respondents saw no improvement.

Almost a third of females had not seen improvement in drafting or implementing of gender guidelines, while most male/others saw a little or a lot of improvement.

In contrast to other aspects of capacity, female respondents had seen improvement in capacity for on-the-job support and/or to address gender equity concerns, where male/other respondents were less likely to see improvement in this regard.

Interviews did confirm that there was a core of people within the agency who were fully committed, and made important efforts to ensure gender focus, particularly in programmes that dealt directly with local communities (eg slum upgrading, public space, safer cities, land rights). However, there were a number of opinions which stressed that, particularly among technical staff, there was a level of ‘obligatory or tickbox compliance’ and gender blindness, and at times even active resistance.

5.2.2 The impact of staff and partner capacity building

UN-Habitat projects and programme training increasingly includes a gender component, but for the most part this is relatively ‘light’ – gender is mentioned as an important issue and some examples are given, but the sessions do no provide in-depth discussions and inputs as to the centrality of gender in sustainable urbanisation.

The 2019 draft UN-Habitat Capacity Building Strategy recognises that at the end of the 2014-19 strategic period the ‘prevailing absence of a collaborative environment in capacity building activities prevents the agency from attaining resource efficiency and taking full advantage of the in-house expertise.’

In the 2018 Voluntary National Reviews of SDG 11, participating countries identified four key areas for improvement. One of these was to ‘Enhance the human resources and capacity of policymakers and technical personnel to implement the NUA and the urban dimension of the SDGs.’ Building country capacity to plan and manage equitable urbanisation is critical for sustainability and achievement of the NUA, and in processes seeking to achieve gender parity among elected politicians and government officials capacity building is even more important.

It was pointed out that women’s capacity ‘might be less’, making capacity building support even more critical. Reports and evaluations show that capacity building of local officials has taken place, and in many cases gender parity of participants was achieved. In some country contexts, parity is not possible yet, but staff spoke of various strategies to get women to attend. However, Figure 17 shows that that a higher proportion of international respondents (57%) had participated in training than national or local respondents. Significantly more local (48%) and national (39%) respondents had not participated in any of these capacity building experiences.

Figure 17: Capacity interventions for partners
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Excluding the training provided to the relatively small sample of international respondents, Figure 18 looks at the frequency of different types of training experienced at national and local levels, by the major partner groups. Non-profits, especially at local level, reported the highest rates of capacity building. Global Urban Lectures and training were the most frequently reported, with training being exceptionally popular among non-profits (31%). Tools and TA were also far more often used by non-profits. Slightly fewer government respondents had received training, with higher training rates at national than local levels. High rates of ‘none’ were reported across all groups, with the largest response being from local government respondents who had not received any of the listed training options.

Interviews with Latin American respondents indicated that Urban Thinker Campuses played some role in promoting the NUA and making the connection to the SDGs for country officials: ‘The Campus provides the possibilities to co-create methodologies and tools.’ In Mexico, some city officials had reported that as a result of UN-Habitat training they are creating baselines for each of these groups: women, vulnerable groups, people with disabilities. The PSUP now has a gender training module which looks at how to measure issues in urban development. However, gender parity in attendance does not demonstrate capacity built or ability to implement, and this is a gap that needs to be addressed.

The survey asked respondents firstly whether national and city policy had improved with regards to gender (Figure 11 above), and then asked about the current gender responsiveness of national and local officials capacity (Figure 19). More than half of respondents felt that officials implemented for gender either ‘not very well’ or ‘not at all’. Around 40%, however, felt that officials at both national and local levels now implement ‘quite well’ or ‘very well’, suggesting likely improvements in a proportion of spaces. To understand where the higher performing officials (in terms of gender) are located we used the scale calculation. Figure 20 shows that respondents reporting most commitment to gender-sensitive implementation were from both levels in the Arab States and at national level in Asia-Pacific. City officials in Asia-Pacific were far less well-regarded. African and Latin American respondents felt national officials performed poorly in gender-focused programmes, and Latin American city officials were very poorly rated. This marked regional variation may highlight a lack of political will or sufficient awareness raising among decision-makers as a cause for weaker policy reform in Africa and Latin America.

Significant proportions of staff and partner respondents felt they had improved abilities from capacity building (Figure 21). The strongest outcome was improved ability to ensure that women participate meaningfully in programmes and projects, with 42% noting ‘a lot’ of improved capacity. Capacity building also improved implementation (31% said ‘a lot’). Although significant benefit was seen, capacities for research and policy work increased least. Partners were generally more positive
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than staff, contributing to the ‘a lot’ responses, where more staff members considered capacities to have improved ‘a little’, and far more staff than partners gave responses of ‘no change’ in capacity. More staff also reported not having covered the aspects in their training, even though only staff who reported having received capacity building were included in the analysis.

Figure 21: Did capacity building improve staff and partner ability for gender-focused programming? (n=180)

The weighted scores²⁷ in a heat map in the table below the graph more clearly reveal these relative benefits, confirming that enhanced participation of women has improved most as a result of capacity building, especially for partners; while research and data management capacity has improved least, confirming the overall weakness perceived in UN-Habitat regarding the agency’s ability to effectively monitor and report gender-focused programme data. Around 18% of all staff stated that none of these topics had been included in their training (mostly mandatory UN training).

5.3 Global programming enhanced gender mainstreaming with practical implementation tools

Global programmes have been fairly consistent in including a gender focus in programme design and implementation, and appear to contribute to a broader understanding of what gender mainstreaming means in practice, often with tracked outcomes showing the benefits for women and girls. The global programmes for Land Tenure, Participatory Slum Upgrading, Public Space and Safer Cities all have substantial gender focus. It is not clear whether global programmes have had more success in regions where gender has been afforded strategic centrality (e.g. Arab States) – comprehensive, coherent monitoring would contribute to understanding progress.

Global programmes are central to delivery of UN-Habitat’s mandate, addressing key issues of urbanisation in many countries. These programmes have enjoyed funding over a long period, which has enabled the incremental specialised knowledge base and phased implementation review and reflection cycles. Global programmes have developed evidence-based analysis of what works and does not work in their specific areas of focus and made improvements to tools and approaches, addressing practical realities on the ground. These realities ensured that, aside from agency and broader UN imperatives to implement gender mainstreaming, gender inequalities emerged as key barriers to implementation success. The methodologies and partnership with the main implementing partners have grown and evolved, and the global and flagship programmes are regarded as places where gender partners can influence the overall agenda.

5.3.1 Land tenure

UN-Habitat is the Secretariat of the Global Land Tool Network (GLTN), which completed its second six-year programme in 2018. One Phase II goal was to increase global knowledge and awareness of pro-poor and gender-appropriate land policies, tools and approaches. Land tools are the GLTN’s ‘signature’ product and its most valued contribution on a global scale – this was confirmed by the number of times the programme and the tools were mentioned in interviews. Phase I of the programme saw the introduction of gender evaluation criteria for use by countries, cities or municipalities (some

²⁷ From ‘gender is not relevant to my work’ (-1) to ‘capacity building assisted a lot’ (2)
of the countries mentioned were DRC, Eastern Caribbean Island States, South Sudan and Liberia). Another key gender-focused instrument developed through GLTN is the Social Tenure Domain Model (STDM), which seeks ‘to bridge the gap between formally registered land and land that is not registered’ which is an issue of particular interest to landless women, and in particular returning IDPs. 101 capacity development initiatives involved around 2,259 people (40% women) in 2017, and in 2019 1,600 people from 36 institutions underwent capacity building (45% women) and direct results in obtaining land titles have been recorded for beneficiaries when a range of tenure options are explored, and in more inclusive land policies.

GLTN developed a programme Gender Strategy to cover the period 2019-2030. Many land tenure initiatives take place in traditionally conservative and male dominated societies, despite the fact that national policy may reflect the need for women’s participation. In fragile and post conflict situations where competition for resources can be fierce, the risk of further excluding women is high. UN-Habitat interventions clearly help to give substance to these policies by demonstrating benefits to whole communities or neighbourhoods – there is no data from these post conflict situations on men’s perception of the benefits they derive from greater empowerment of women, and this may be something to track in the future.

5.3.2 Safer cities, accessible public spaces and slum upgrading

The Safer Cities global programme has also continued in serial phases since the early 1996, and has developed, improved and evolved different components based on expanding knowledge about the drivers of urban insecurity, which centrally include gender considerations. The programme approach is to look at safety as a social and governance, rather than a policing issue, involving all levels of government in dialogue with community and stakeholders. Safer Cities is developing a more comprehensive Safer Cities Index, which includes neighbourhood indicators and gender specific issues to be considered – the index is intended to help cities think through their service delivery in a more strategic way. Safety audits and assessments establish baseline knowledge about where safety initiatives should be focused. For example, the eThekwini Metro Municipality’s City Safety Strategy has now integrated gender into its six key thematic impact areas, and has committed to improving street lighting, creating a specialized sexual offences court, revising existing legislation, increasing the number of social workers and police visibility, developing a monitoring framework and safety curriculum for training local municipal officials.

The UN-Habitat collaboration with Plan International, and Women in Cities International has implemented the Safer Cities for Girls programme in Delhi, Hanoi, Cairo, Kampala, Nairobi, Lima, Asunción, Honiara. The programme seeks to influence municipal and national government around policy that is girl-friendly, work with families and communities to create a supportive social environment for girls, and with girls and boys to create active citizens and agents of change – through participatory and girl-led social accountability tools. By 2018, the programme had reached a total of 662,410 direct beneficiaries in Delhi, Hanoi, Kampala, Cairo and Lima. In ‘partnership with local authorities, institutions, communities and families, the safety and access to public spaces for girls has been significantly improved which also benefits boys’. However, a 2017 external evaluation of the programme highlighted the deeply entrenched societal norms that continue as barriers to realising the programme’s desired outcomes. The UN-Habitat Public Space Programme has undertaken research on the gender transformative potential of the Block by Block methodology in the Safer Cities for Girls programme.

UN-Habitat was centrally involved in developing the UN system-wide guidelines on Safer Cities and Human Settlements, launched in 2020, which is ‘strongly gender focused’ – bringing together SDG 5 (Gender Equality, 11 (Sustainable Cities) and 16 (Peace and Justice). UN-Habitat partners Women in Cities International and the Huairou Commission led the civil society process to consolidate the principles and good practices. The central idea is that a ‘safe city for women is a safe city for all, a perspective that changes the approach in terms of how to deliver safety, which must be through multifaceted strategies rather than only policing initiatives.

UN Women has a similar programme called Safe Cities. In 2010 UN-Habitat, UN Women and UNICEF signed a joint programming framework. The agencies appear to have taken different paths, with UN Women focusing more on advocacy.
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and UN-Habitat seeking to influence into local authorities. However, both acknowledge the contribution of the other to the overall agenda with joint programming in countries like Egypt, Morocco, Mozambique and Palestine.

The SDGs emphasise the need for safe and green public spaces – which means there is synergy between Safer Cities and the Public Space global programmes. The Public Space programme is explicit about gender being central to urban planning and in its tools and approaches. Public space projects are generally small and localised, focusing on creating space accessible and useful for local communities. Two key partners in this work are Healthbridge – an NGO working with local partners to ensure that cities develop spaces that address the needs of women, children, the disabled and the poor – and Avina, a Latin American foundation working with public and private partners to create spaces that enhance social cohesion, security, gender equality and living standards. In 2018, UN-Habitat launched the United Nations Public Space Network with six other agencies, the WHO and the World Bank.

The Participatory Slum Upgrading programme has increasingly worked to take advantage of countries having gender equality policies and strategies: This makes Ministry engagement easier, and governments in countries such as Burkina Faso, Niger and DRC have become more open and now have targets for women’s welfare. UN-Habitat reports show that local level work has increased the level of participatory engagement between community representatives and government authorities. For example, 18 countries independently formulated gender and climate sensitive strategies in line with UN-Habitat’s inclusive and integrated slum upgrading approach, and 40 partner countries established diverse multisector teams comprising youth, women and traditional leaders as representatives of slums and informal settlements. Participatory and inclusive processes and links with gender-related projects contributes to increased gender focus: despite the conservativism of many governments, there are a lot more women in decision-making positions, which gets things done! In Ghana, participatory local community involvement, and identification of women- and youth-specific use was shown to halve the cost of construction of an access road.

The review of global programmes suggests that placing a safety and gender lens over any city will of necessity draw on all of UN-Habitat’s areas of expertise. For example, a comparative analysis show that over 20 years of Safer Cities, interventions have been concentrated in four areas: policing, safe urban design involving management of public space and slum upgrading, social and economic inclusion of marginalised and vulnerable groups, and governance and public awareness. Key lessons in all of these programmes is that political leadership or ownership and institutionalisation of the approach is critical for success: the first ensures that action will be taken, the second that the approaches become part of the way the municipality works.

5.4 Gender mainstreaming in country implementation

The country context over the strategic period has seen some changes. There is more awareness globally about gender. Many countries now have Ministries of Gender or Women at national level, have gender policies or national frameworks, and some have increasing numbers of women ministers and mayors. These changed conditions provide a structural entry point for gender-focused activities, even if beliefs and behaviours lag behind. In the Philippines, ‘...we can usually reach 50% of women participants at the higher levels. There are many women mayors, and local government and technical departments headed by women’. However, traditional and religious leaders – particularly in Muslim countries – are often deeply opposed to women’s participation.

The policy statement that introduces the GPP states that: ‘... for a range of cultural, social, economic and historical reasons, special measures may be needed in some situations’ and commits to taking these measures where needed to achieve ‘greatly improved and more sustainable urban development for all’. However, UN-Habitat does not have a systematic, commonly applied methodology to assess the situation across different countries: it is possible to identify the portfolio regionally and per country, but the gender components such as expenditure, activities and results are not visible. Also, even when projects include gender in the design they might not collect monitoring data on gender – or if there are gender indicators and data is collected, there is no one to pull the information together. Below are brief extracts of the gender-focused part of programmes in the countries sampled in this evaluation.

5.4.1 Iraq

In Iraq, the UN-Habitat country programme has continued to ‘push beyond the traditional ways. The programme has not achieved equal benefits for women – except in areas like shelter provision where the whole household benefits – but benefits are more than what was originally expected. It was clear that gender issues presented themselves naturally from the situation on the ground. In the first part of the strategic period from 2014, with the capture of Mosul by ISIL, UN-
Habitat work focused primarily on providing emergency shelter in IDP camps in north and central Iraq. After the liberation in 2017, work then focused on rehabilitation of houses damaged in the war, regularisation of IDP camps and liberated areas. Local staff with legal expertise have supported IDP women to approach the courts to obtain identification and documentation for their houses, and to get access to their homes abandoned during the occupation: Most women don’t have money to get to courts, so the support process gathers relevant information and places it before the appropriate authorities.

Key government counterparts are from a range of Ministries including Planning and Justice, and Construction, Housing, Municipalities and Public Works. Gender mainstreaming discussions are particularly important with the Ministry of Justice in relation to protecting women’s rights: officials tend to agree that the issue is important, but ‘in reality, it will take a very long time to change people’s minds’. This situation makes it difficult to determine the pressures women participants or staff may experience in work or training situations.

However, project work has pursued equity targets with some success. For example, UN-Habitat trained a cadre of young people to run mediation sessions around property disputes in Nineveh plains. Half of the group were young women: The community and families of potential mediators were consulted with some success. In implementation, it appears that men did agree to work with women mediators, and an additional benefit was that women headed households tended to approach the female mediators.

In Mosul, a recent project to establish safer spaces included dialogues with local authorities and different community groups: Women and girls and religious and tribal and civil society and community people were involved: ‘they are end-users to enable safer communities, so it is necessary to get agreement around where women can spend time. This discussion between community and local authority is important in achieving sustainability’. There was a strong feeling that stakeholder collaboration over time – from the design through to implementation – ‘makes it more likely to last’.

UN-Habitat support has also focused on building capacity. The Local Area Development Programme (LADP Phase II) training programme for Ministry of Planning officials was run by UNDP in partnership with UN-Habitat and funded by European Union. The training focused on building local authority capacity to plan for rehabilitation and reconstruction of cities, industrial and mobility planning. The trainers – four women – delivered 45 workshops throughout the country, and counterparts were also encouraged to include women as participants. The workshops included a gender focus. However, while most participants agreed on the need to be inclusive in terms of women needing access to basic services and jobs, the reality was that getting them to recognise the access barriers for poor people was more difficult. More often than not, the discussion had to cover how to prevent poor families from being evicted from informal settlements, rather than talking about girls’ access to school.

5.4.2 Somalia

In Somalia, UN-Habitat works primarily at the municipal level where progress around building gender awareness and capacity is slow: ‘Our Somali culture does not favour women’. UN-Habitat capacity building training (aimed at improving urban planning, revenue collection, and water systems) includes gender issues, conflict resolution, consultation, leadership. Participants were vocal in saying that gender-focused ideas ‘are not my culture’. However, slow changes in some of the male participants’ thinking was observed. But there was a view that UN-Habitat’s interventions around gender were not robust enough. Politically, female representation remains limited; of 380 councillors elected in the region, only ten are women.

UN-Habitat is one of five agencies delivering the Joint Programme on Local Governance and Decentralised Service Delivery (JPLG), in partnership with government ministries in Somaliland and Puntland. The JPLG aims to promote improvements in local governance quality that can contribute to peace consolidation, development and equitable service

The RIGHT TO THE HOUSE

The Iraq Country Office regards the documentation of 6,000 households as one of its greatest successes – ‘with final occupancy certificates that include both men and women’s names – this is huge’. The Yazidi people, a religious minority who were first removed from their land in the 1970s and again as a result of the ISIL invasion, returned in 2017 to find their houses occupied by other people. ‘Yazidi returns had to be addressed with gender as a critical part – without this the overall objective of sustainable returns cannot be achieved. A survey of neighbours to prove and verify and cross verify original occupants, a GIS map with linked photographs resulted in the issuing of occupancy certificates endorsed by UN-Habitat, the local authority and community leaders. These certificates include both men and women’s names – giving both the right to the house. ’ Ideally this should be acknowledged by ministry of justice, but in the meanwhile these documents prove their claim.’

Source: Iraq staff interviews

---
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delivery. Phase II of the programme ran from 2013-2017, with UN-Habitat leading on the Municipal Finance aspect. UN-Habitat’s district profiling with data gathered from various ministries and districts, was described as a critical element in the programme. A Gender Review\(^\text{92}\) undertaken in 2017 found increased awareness of policies that integrate gender equality, gender focal points within ministries, improved capacity for gender sensitive service delivery, and more inclusive planning practices where the needs of women, girls and vulnerable groups are considered – more than 5,000 women were involved in the consultations across nine districts – although activist groups were less positive about the level of women’s inclusion. The review found that while the women-focused ministries (WFMs) play a critical role and are important partners in advancing gender equality in public administration, women in local government still face high levels of discrimination. As a result of this review, the JPLG III programme has a gender inclusion strategy and a separate outcome for gender. A primary barrier to successful implementation, however, remains the cultural situation, a challenge which all of the agencies face in Muslim countries.

UN-Habitat in Somalia has impacted women’s lives: Specific changes have included getting access to shelter, water, and rehabilitated open markets for women street vendors. Also, women get skill/ vocational trainings i.e. tailoring, cooking, and beautification skills, and they are given equipment (tailoring equipment, oven, utensils), and start up grants to help them establish livelihoods.

5.4.3 Bolivia

In line with global trends, 67.5% of Bolivia’s population live in urban areas, despite persistent views that the country is predominantly rural. Bolivia is acknowledged to be very macho culture: social violence and abuse of power is ever present in gender relations; femicide and Gender-Based Violence is common; and women politicians often face extreme pressure and at times violent opposition. Responding to a government request, in 2018 UN-Habitat initiated a two-year process of discussions and participation – 250 events with 7,000 people – to develop Bolivia’s National Urban Policy, which was presented to the newly elected government in October 2020. The process included close collaboration with UN Women through a seconded staff member into the Bolivia UN-Habitat team and establishing collaboration with numerous mayors and city councillors who were recognised as key actors in implementation. Development of the policy involved consideration of how each element might affect women and what the specific trigger issues might be. Policy indicators ‘include gender, issues of inclusiveness and a multi-dimensional approach’. The gender focus within the policy builds on work done by local organisations. A city analysis in 2013 saw the establishment of a national Secretariat of Women and Family which has supported municipalities to develop policies on drug and alcohol abuse, prevention of teenage pregnancies and women’s health. For example, civil society and other groups have lobbied government over many years, arguing that that the main crime nationally is violence in the home. ACoBol, an association of mayors and deputy mayors working across 339 municipalities in the country have worked for many years to introduce policies that promote women’s rights. While these initiatives started before UN-Habitat had a continuous presence in Bolivia, the agency engaged closely with both government and civil society organisations over the urban policy development process to ensure that there was a strong component on violence prevention. ACoBol is now working with UN-Habitat and UN Women to develop gender-focused tools aimed at ensuring gender sensitive implementation of the new National Urban Policy. Stakeholders interviewed stressed that the partnership with UN-Habitat has contributed to policies that promote women’s rights, and had contributed to enriching the gender content of the work and understanding of municipal authorities.

5.4.4 Afghanistan

Over the strategic period, work in Afghanistan has included community mobilisation at the neighbourhood level, focusing on the most vulnerable population such as women, youth, IDPs, population in informal settlements, as well as increasing levels of support into policy and capacity development within government.\(^\text{93}\)

The Afghanistan country programme is the largest in UN-Habitat and has spanned decades. There are examples across the country of projects where women’s issues have been highlighted and addressed. In particular, the Community

\(^{92}\) Gender review: UN Joint Programme on Local Governance and Decentralised Service Delivery, Somalia

\(^{93}\) Bi-Annual Programme Activity Report June 2016
Development Councils (CDC) are local representative bodies elected by communities: UN-Habitat has over 500 CDCs and in many CDCs women are chairs or key leaders. Women’s and girls’ needs are prioritised in discussions. Gradually, the numbers of women decision-makers at community level has increased. Project evaluations confirm that projects work hard to ensure women’s participation and empowerment. For example, in the Project for City Resilience – which supports government efforts to make cities safe, resilient and sustainable by reducing impacts on the lives of women, girls and vulnerable people – the people-centred approach was effective in ensuring stakeholder inclusion, participation and ownership – including women and youth, although ‘inclusion of women is a challenge where the low number of people with the necessary technical and engineering skills are mostly men’.94

A most significant finding in this evaluation is the impact achieved by having a full-time senior gender advisor in the country office, and it appears the cost benefit of this post is large. This post – established in 2017 – is funded from office core funds and is responsible for all gender-related work in programmes and in the office. The five-year Gender strategy95 outlines how gender issues will be addressed in programmes and in the running of the Afghanistan Country Office. The strategy describes the situation of women in Afghanistan, including traditional and cultural issues, health considerations, education, security, and constitutional and legal provisions affecting women. It also describes the specifics of UN-Habitat’s contribution to advancing gender equality in Afghanistan through six key programmes.96 The strategy references UN-Habitat’s GPP, and has used the 2016 Afghanistan Gender Audit and the 2016 Country Programme evaluation as a baseline. It also provides a detailed analysis gender parity data from 2014-2017. The strategy identified 13 key activities, with most being implemented by 2020, including:

- The young female Professional Practice Programme which is one strategy to improve gender parity: since 2018, 60 female students have been employed by UN-Habitat on six-month contracts – four are now permanent staff.
- Support to gender-focused aspects of project implementation, including supporting the Ministry of Women’s Affairs in M&E, publishing women-focused newspapers; gender-related training for civil society partners.
- Delivery of gender-related trainings, compliance mechanisms, processing harassment or complaints cases.
- Participation in the country Gender team run by UN Women
- Acting as the gender focal point for engagement with other UN agencies and NGOs
- Managing a team of 11 volunteer gender focal points – one in each of the 11 field/provincial offices. In addition to the focal points, a gender volunteer team was established in 2020. Anyone interested can be a volunteer, and their role as change agents is to highlight gender issues in discussions within their teams.

### 5.4.5 Egypt, Mexico, Sri Lanka, Mozambique

**Egypt:** UN-Habitat has an active programme in Egypt. In 2015, the CIP database was established to monitor urban indicators including gender equality, service provision, and environmental resilience. There are various public space projects, including ‘Utilizing digital technology to promote human rights and develop safe and inclusive public spaces in Gaza Strip’ which improved youth and adolescents’ civic participation and awareness of their rights.97 The Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project has been in preparation since 2016 with construction planned for 2021, and will connect central

---

94 End of Project Evaluation of the Project for City Resilience in Afghanistan
95 UN-Habitat’s Gender Strategy for Programmes and Staff in Afghanistan 2017-2020
96 City for All (CFA), Clean and Green Cities (CGC), Afghanistan Urban Peace-Building Programme (AUPP), Local Integration of Vulnerable and Excluded Uprooted People (Live-Up), Community-Led Urban Infrastructure Programme (CLUIP), and the Citizen’s Charter National Priority Programme
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Cairo to the new cities. A collaboration with UN Women enabled detailed research including an on-line survey, interviews and focus groups with a range of women about travel patterns, safety concerns, and the needs of disabled women. The research revealed big differences between how women and men use public transport. Important results in this planning phase include a ‘Gender Brief’, which presents the research findings and solutions, and identifies stakeholders who need to cooperate to achieve a safer, more accessible transportation system – this information can inform possible BRT systems in other cities. Safety and pervasive harassment were the biggest problem found. City officials were initially sceptical, but the results of the research were reported to be instrumental in shifting their perspectives; the report showed that around 60% of women face harassment on public transport. Research findings have also encouraged the incorporation of a more rigorous gender focus in the bike sharing project in downtown Cairo.

**Mexico**: In some countries, gender issues are downplayed or receive reduced focus because they are not prioritised by the partner – this is a particular risk where a national governments is the primary partner paying for specific project services. The government generally determines the project focus, and although gender may be included as a cross-cutting issue, it is rarely prioritised or afforded specific funding. The government is also reluctant to embrace participatory processes that highlight ordinary people’s voices: this is an add barrier in a society where women rarely participate in decision-making. It was also mentioned that often gender input in the policy development process is lost during implementation by the counterpart. On the other hand, UN-Habitat is working with the Ministry of Territorial and Urban Affairs on a national policy which includes focus areas on women’s participation, methodologies for gender audits, and creation of safe public spaces. The National Institute for Women was described as a strong organisation which is having an influence on the way the national government addresses women’s issues.

**Sri Lanka**: In the first part of the strategic period, UN-Habitat continued its work to support government post tsunami and post conflict reconstruction efforts. ‘After the war there were lots of single parent households. We developed criteria to help the government target support: women or child headed households got higher rating’. What started as a process to address the need for housing ‘morphed into the development of human settlements with all the related elements’. A central feature of UN-Habitat’s approach was involving communities in the design and construction of their homes using tools for planning, budgeting, building and maintenance: ‘Community Action Planning ensures upgrading interventions are decided equitably and inclusively, while ‘Community Contracting’ ensures that local groups carry out the upgrading works’. Families were involved in design: ‘we looked at safety and security of women in the design, including lockable doors and rooms to ensure girls’ safety’. Community engagement in construction involved skills development for men and women: skills certification in carpentry and masonry ‘would give women certification, but importantly they would have the skills to monitor construction of houses – at least 40% of the construction committees were women’. In the north and east open defecation practices meant bathrooms were first used as storerooms: there was a slow process of community discussions around WASH, menstrual hygiene, and safety for women and girls, and gradually the bathrooms were used. Since the houses were designed and built by the community there was a sense of ownership. Additional community processes were supported to ensure a more sustainable and holistic approach: this included identifying livelihoods projects and home gardens and ‘helping vulnerable women with small children who could not spend time building’; all projects included savings groups with revolving funds. Importantly, training around financial literacy was undertaken when the foundations were built, and households were given money to do further construction. Initially men had the accounts, ‘but they used money for liquor’. UN-Habitat insisted on joint accounts, but this resulted in increased Gender-Based Violence. Self-help groups, police stations with women constables and government department Gender-Based Violence officers were deployed to address this.

UN-Habitat work on housing and infrastructure in the central province also faces community engagement in an extremely patriarchal community where Gender-Based Violence and alcoholism are rife. Training for women tea pickers, government officials and plantation management includes addressing Gender-Based Violence and child abuse. ‘A lot of negotiation was needed, but ‘men understood that the conditions for the house was joint ownership and they did begin to see benefits for their children’.

UN-Habitat recently completed the socio-economic survey for a railway reconstruction project. Reconstruction will involve the resettlement of a squatter community. ‘We made sure the survey included all gender options, gave due attention to female-headed households and had discussions with many different groups include women only, male only, children only’. Women were most concerned about losing the social support of their community, access to schools, safety of children, ‘so these issues were highlighted in the resettlement plan recommendations’.

**Mozambique**: Projects delivering resilient housing have involved women in both design and building. The country team worked hard to demonstrate that including women would benefit the project, ‘because while men were doing one thing, women could be doing another’. The community participation identified how to address placement of toilets to reduce...
violence against women, but also to meet cultural requirements. The learnings from this process are being included in Technical Assistance that will be provided into much larger projects funded by the World Bank, the EU, Japan and China. The new Safer Hospitals project also has specific gender outcomes and the gender specialist been recruited through this project will be able to provide support to other interventions in Mozambique.
6 Efficiency

How efficiently did UN-Habitat harness its financial, human and partnerships resources to achieve gender mainstreaming?

Efforts to assess the budgets and resources allocated to gender mainstreaming was not possible as no information was provided. Despite this it was clear from documents and interviews that the function was poorly resourced. This lack of resourcing, together with an absence of a centralised coherent vision with strong goals and targets, meant gender mainstreaming implementation was fragmented across UN-Habitat’s various programmes and work areas. There were no gender-specific evaluations in the strategic period, but all evaluations of projects and programmes included a consideration of gender mainstreaming effectiveness. Gender mainstreaming in UN-Habitat was last evaluated in 2011.100

6.1 Expenditure on gender mainstreaming

A scan of the Programmes of Work over the strategic period indicates that the GEAP was not specifically funded. Some funds were committed for staff in the Gender Equality Unit and apparently the unit had an annual budget each year for gender mainstreaming activities. However, these budgets were not obtained and the 2018 report to donors101 of the unit’s activities did not include financial information. The only mention found of an amount allocated to mainstreaming activities was in the 2018 UN SWAP Report: ‘Gender Unit USD133 000 budget for mainstreaming, capacity building, and advocacy’. The Programmes of Work budgets for the thematic areas include allocations for enhancing capacity to address gender issues. Gender-related activities were also carried out through projects and programmes implemented by regional and country offices.

Gender Equality Unit (GEU) and the Finance Unit (FU) have developed a Gender Catalogue for tracking gender expenses of projects passed by the GEM. Gender Catalogue is a list of gender-related activities, at programme- and project-level, which incur financial costs. Although this catalogue was not seen, it may provide a baseline for the 2020-2023 strategic period, and its mandatory use in project design could help to make implementation planning more gender focused. Information was also not received about the Catalogue’s use.

6.2 Gender Architecture 2014-2019

The UN-Habitat gender architecture is relatively fragmented and, lacking a clearly articulated vision, has not effectively enabled the project of gender mainstreaming. The various elements have not had sufficient influence or capacity to demonstrate categorically the benefits of a fully gendered approach to sustainable urbanisation.

The gender mainstreaming function within UN-Habitat is undertaken at a number of levels. Resolutions from the Governing Council in 2013 and the UN-Habitat Assembly in 2019 task the Executive Director with implementing and resourcing a gender mainstreaming strategy. An advisory function provided by external stakeholders is through the Advisory Group on Gender Issues (AGGI). A separate unit existed to carry out functional gender mainstreaming work – this unit was supported by gender focal points in the five regions, some countries, and at Headquarters.

6.2.1 Leadership

UN-Habitat leadership through governance structures and executives has provided a fair level of support to gender mainstreaming over the strategic period. However, it has consistently failed to allocate and mobilise adequate resources to this strategic function.

In the first part of the strategic period, the Executive Director devolved responsibility for gender mainstreaming oversight to the Deputy Executive Director. A lot of significant work was done over this time: on the global stage most notably the work going into the Habitat III conference and the crafting of the New Urban Agenda, and the development of the SDGs; internally the development of the Gender Equality Marker, and continued development of gender-focused tools in a number of the larger programmes.

The Executive Director’s profile states that ‘She is a champion of Gender Responsive Participatory Budgeting and Planning, integrating gender perspectives into the governance process’.102 Her opening remarks at the Gender Forum (UN-Habitat Assembly May 2019) pointed to the evolving understanding of gender, and the need to bring a broad gender perspective: ‘Achieving gender equality will benefit all genders and address all inequalities... Women are not one homogenous group, ... We must recognise the different challenges that different women, and different genders, face. In order to achieve

100 Evaluation of Gender Mainstreaming in UN-Habitat 1/2011
101 Presentation: Human Rights and Gender Mainstreaming: Donor Consultations April 2018
102 https://unhabitat.org/about-us/leadership/executive-director
gender equality, we also need men who believe in the same principles". This advocacy message to member states was noticed by staff, as was the ED’s prioritising gender focused training and the suggestion that there should be a gender focal point in each UN-Habitat unit. However, a scan of ED speeches on the UN-Habitat website shows that this strong gender messaging is only evident in gender-specific events – in other forums the gender message tends to be muted and presented as ‘one of many’ issues, rather than a lens through which to look at all aspects of sustainable urbanisation, be it in climate, city planning, tenure, mobility or basic services.

In the survey, staff were asked to rate senior management in terms of their efficacy as gender champions (Figure 19). Views were primarily divided between seeing senior management as strong a champion internally and in programming (28%); and senior management as not championing gender (30% overall). The reason for this is that views were polarised: half of all male respondents were positive about UN-Habitat leaders championing gender mainstreaming; with less than 20% of female respondents being positive. There were no significant differences between staffing levels in this regard. Management levels (P4 to D2) responded evenly from ‘Senior management does not champion’ (33%) to ‘senior management strongly champions internally and externally’ (30%).

![Figure 22: Staff views regarding senior management as gender champions](image)

More men than women felt leadership focused more on internal equity than programming, while more women than men felt programming received more gender focus from leadership. These differences are reflected in the views about gender parity in section 6.4 of this report. The 2020 World Cities Report states that sustainable urbanisation has a key role to play in the Decade of Action for accelerating sustainable solutions towards eradicating poverty, reducing inequality, addressing climate change and enhancing gender equality. Leadership with a gender lens will no doubt be a most necessary element to achieve this.

### 6.2.2 Advisory Group on Gender Issues (AGGI)

The UN-Habitat Advisory Group on Gender Issues (AGGI) has played an important role in spotlighting gender issues in global forums, but its value add to the gender mainstreaming work of UN-Habitat has declined. Slow member turnover, a fixed gender analysis and a lack of clarity and structure in its engagement with the Secretariat may be key contributors to this situation. This structure would benefit from new members and fresh ideas across a wider spectrum of stakeholders to enhance both internal and external dialogue on gender mainstreaming.

AGGI is an independent advisory body to the UN-Habitat Executive Director on all issues related to gender equality and women’s empowerment, including gender mainstreaming efforts. Established in 2012, AGGI’s mission is ‘Advancing women’s empowerment and gender equality in sustainable urban development; through the provision of strategic guidance and advice, across policies, programme of work and budgeting at global, regional, national and local levels, taking note of gender evaluations, resolutions and the wider UN context for coherent work on women’s empowerment and gender equality.’

AGGI meets officially once a year. It has a Chairperson, a Secretariat and an annual work plan approved by the Executive Director. The Gender Equality Unit is the official AGGI secretariat, and is responsible for convening AGGI meetings and supporting activities. Members of AGGI are volunteers and serve in their own capacity for two years, which can be extended for two more years. The number of AGGI members has fluctuated over the period 2012-2020, and some current

103 [https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2019/05/executive_directors_opening_remarks_at_the_gender_forum_during_the_un-habitat_assembly_28_may_2019_0.pdf](https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2019/05/executive_directors_opening_remarks_at_the_gender_forum_during_the_un-habitat_assembly_28_may_2019_0.pdf)

104 Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the UN-Habitat Advisory Group on Gender Issues (undated)
members were first appointed in 2012 — it was acknowledged that UN-Habitat has not enforced the two-year term of service for members.

A key intention of AGGI was to ensure that it brings the voices and views of grassroots women to the table. AGGI members were therefore chosen from NGOs and networks representing local women across the world. Members are recognised as gender activists and experts, amplifying the notion of gender and the importance of a gender perspective as part of sustainable urbanisation.

AGGI worked towards the Governing Council’s 2013 resolution\(^{105}\) and was then involved in drafting the Gender Policy and Action Plan, which it was hoped would strengthen accountability. AGGI was very active in dialogues and forums leading up to Habitat III and the formulation of the New Urban Agenda, and in 2015 reported six working groups covering these and other issues such as gender perspectives into post conflict situations and the SDGs. Members attend World and Regional Urban Forums, Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) meetings and Expert Group meetings on Gender. AGGI also plays a role reviewing key UN-Habitat documents with a view to ensuring rigorous gender-focused content. However, this role seems to be inconsistent as there is not a formal process or requirement for this review. Interviews suggest that UN-Habitat does not have a clear position on AGGI’s role, and there is a lack of clarity and structure in its engagement with the Secretariat and the agency as a whole. As a result UN-Habitat does not use the group effectively: some examples of the more blurry areas are when/how often should formal advisory sessions be held with the Executive Director, when/whether AGGI should be asked to review documents for gender focus, how AGGI members could be used to advocate for gender planning in member states.

The lack of clarity, together with the Gender Unit’s burden of work means the secretariat function has been less effective. In addition, while ‘initially there was a lot of internal energy around AGGI’, opinions were divided as to the value added of AGGI engagement over the latter part of the strategic period. A number of reasons were given: that the group was reactive rather than proactive and did not provide strategic leadership around gender, ‘helping to make the connections across the thematic areas’; insufficient turnover of members — a vibrant advisory body needs ‘new blood’ which is more in touch with current issues, as ‘The issues facing women have not changed, but the way they manifest in society have changed’. It was also argued that the AGGI analysis of gender has become limited and excludes consideration of gender diversity and inclusion of non-binary people. The consequence is that AGGI cannot ‘enable improved understanding of gender diversity at the senior levels of UN-Habitat — we need to talk about intersectional issues’ and how this exacerbates exclusion. One suggestion was for UN-Habitat to expand the pool of gender experts they could use as advisors.

The General Assembly Resolution in 2019\(^{106}\) has again urged the Executive Director to ‘make optimal use of the Advisory Group on Gender issues as well as other relevant networks to facilitate the mainstreaming of gender within UN-Habitat...’.

However, unless AGGI’s role is clearly agreed, and the problems hampering the group’s effectiveness are addressed, AGGI’s advisory role will likely continue to decline.

6.2.3 Gender Equality Unit

The Gender Equality Unit’s role in supporting gender mainstreaming was limited over the strategic period. Many factors contributed to this: too few staff; relatively high staff turnover; a lack of appropriately strategic and specialist gender skills; and severe resource constraints which precluded having any of their own projects. The lack of strategic positioning and leadership meant that gender mainstreaming struggled to make progress.

A unit dedicated to the gender function was continued from the previous strategic period. The Gender Equality Unit, also termed the Gender Coordination and Support Unit, was situated in the Programme Division, one of three divisions reporting to the Office of the Executive Director. The unit had a wide range of responsibilities.

The primary activity over the period was commenting on project proposals coming to the Project Advisory Group (PAG) — since 2015 against the provisions of the Gender Equality Marker. However, the majority feeling of interviewees was that while this input was useful to a degree, it remained very generic and did not help to make the detail of implementation more gendered. It was broadly acknowledged that a more substantial approach would be to have input at the concept or initial design phase of a project: ‘Deep thinking around every project and the impact it would have on women’s lives would go a long way to helping make the gender dimension more real’.

Other unit functions included coordination of gender focal points, provision of gender-focused support to implementation partners and country offices, AGGI secretariat, support to gender-focused activities into the annual UN-Habitat Assembly and the CSW meeting, and into the bi-annual World Urban Forum, internal and external gender mainstreaming capacity building, and reporting on gender parity figures. In 2018, the unit was tasked, together with UNON and UN Environment, to contribute to UN Secretariat functions for the International Gender Champions: UN-Habitat’s ED is a board member.

---

\(^{105}\) Resolution 24/4: Gender equality and women’s empowerment to contribute to sustainable urban development. 8th plenary meeting 19/04/2013

\(^{106}\) HSP/HA.1/Res.4 Resolution adopted by the United National Habitat Assembly on 31 May 2019
However, for an issue of supposedly key strategic importance, the unit was consistently under-staffed and under-resourced for the full strategic period – for most of the period there were two to four staff, with the majority being interns or junior consultants. There was also a high staff turnover, and UN-Habitat found it difficult to find replacements with equivalent capacity. While the Mid-Term Review of the 2014-2019 Strategic Plan found that the location of the Gender Unit was useful in enabling access to senior management, in this evaluation, staff, partners and stakeholders were unanimous in identifying the unit as poorly positioned, understaffed, under-resourced, and generally not able to exert effective influence. Substantive gender input into the normative functions was described as ‘invisible’. The requirement was also that country offices should provide some of the resources if they requested support: with little evidence of how this might add value countries preferred to source local gender expertise. Despite the overall poor rating, there is evidence that the unit worked hard across the range of its responsibilities. In particular, staff have noticed and valued recent capacity building and advocacy efforts to raise awareness and understanding of gender mainstreaming.

If gender mainstreaming is to gain significant traction across UN-Habitat, the gender function needs ‘more clout than it had’ under the 2014-2019 period. A fair majority of those interviewed felt the gender function would be diluted further under the new structure implemented in 2020, where gender is a thematic issue (together with Human Rights, Children, Youth and Older Persons, and Disability) addressed by the Human Rights and Social Inclusion Unit, which falls under the Urban Practices Branch in the Global Solutions Division. It is likely that gender will be seen to compete for resources with other crosscutting and inclusion issues.

The General Assembly Resolution in 2019 requested that the Executive Director should ‘utilize available resources for gender mainstreaming within the programmes and activities of UN-Habitat, as included in its strategic plan for the period 2020–2023’, and in addition, that the ED should ‘... secure additional voluntary resources wherever possible’. This, together with a clearer gender strategy could add significant value to building the gender focus of sustainable urbanisation.

6.2.4 Gender Focal Points

The extent to which gender focal points are effective depends to a certain extent on how important they believe gender mainstreaming is, as the work is required on top of overstretched post requirements. The survey found that gender focal points were either somewhat effective, or had little effect. There was consensus on this viewpoint, with no significant differences across gender, region or staff level. Gender focal points take on this responsibility in addition to their full-time job. Focal points have a brief Terms of Reference to guide their activities, but there is no standardised process to appoint, and there is no process of orientation – it appears that often junior staff are given the role. There is a gender focal point in each of the five regional offices, and in 2020 there were 15 across UN-Habitat’s sub-programmes. No information was available on how many countries had gender focal points. Only one country office – Afghanistan – has a gender advisor post. The extent of effort expended by gender focal points appears to depend on the individual’s level of enthusiasm and commitment, although the Terms of Reference indicate that ‘a minimum of 5% of their time’ should be allocated to gender mainstreaming, and the work should be included in the staff’s annual performance review i.e. ePAS (Performance Appraisal System)\(^\text{107}\). In a poorly resourced agency, where staff often have two or even three different roles, gender mainstreaming can often take a backseat and reduced to ‘possibly 1% of my time?’ It was clear from the interviews that even 5% of one person’s work time is not sufficient to effectively implement a gender mainstreaming agenda – 20% or one day per week would be a more effective allocation.

6.3 Monitoring gender mainstreaming

6.3.1 Gender Action Plan indicators

The GEAP’s Expected Accomplishments (EAs) and the indicators under each of the thematic areas are confusing in relation to the Strategic Plan 2014-2019 results framework: some are the same, others slightly different, and still others totally different. Because of this overlap, the GEAP looks more like a mirror of the main strategic plan results framework with gender words added – seeking to measure the substantive work of the agency, which should not be the remit of the gender policy.

\(^{107}\) TOR for Gender Focal Points (Undated)
If the Strategic Plan EAs and indicators are a comprehensive reflection of the UN-Habitat strategy, then the GEAP results framework would not have systematically ensured a comprehensive gender focus throughout the strategy. This made it easy to ignore. Rather than adding gender words, a more strategically focused set of EAs and indicators linked to the GPP’s goal statements, and that held the agency to account might have been more powerful. Some GEAP indicators under the Office of the Executive Director, if implemented, would contribute to highlighting gender as a strategic priority within UN-Habitat.

Some of the elements found in the GEAP are:

- EAs that were allocated to the Office of the Executive Director, if implemented, would have contributed to a better positioning of gender mainstreaming.
  - For example, a well implemented gender focused communication and advocacy strategy could have provided a strategic approach and standard actions. Examples could include ensuring that every speech of the ED includes a meaningful point about the centrality of gender to UN-Habitat work; that communication and advocacy messages to staff and implementing partners address (previously identified) gaps in gender-focused planning and implementation; or that the UN-Habitat evidence-based and gender-focused success stories for cities are consistently inserted into global forums, reinforcing the need to place gender as a central element of urban policy.
  - A comprehensive approach to gender knowledge management would be to harmonise approaches and probably help to identify generic support interventions.

- The EA and indicators related to resource allocation for gender mainstreaming was not achieved, as the function was under funded for the entire strategic period. Gender-focused project and programme work was resourced to the extent that projects, programme designers and donors identified gender-focused work as a requirement for success.

- EAs around Habitat III and the NUA were largely achieved as gender was profiled at Habitat III and gender is clearly embedded in the NUA.

- Under Urban Legislation, Land and Governance the EAs and indicators are not very systematic. Some indicators are clearly the preserve of particular Global Programmes such as Safer Cities or GLTN, others clearly the remit of UN Women. The job for gender would surely be to support the creation of and ability to monitor gender information within these programmes and thematic areas.

- The EAs for Urban Planning and Design, Urban Basic Services, and Research and Capacity Building are rewrites of some of those in the Strategic Plan, with the addition of limited gender terminology or reference to sex disaggregated data.

- For Urban Economy, the GEAP’s EAs and indicators are quite different from those in the Strategic Plan 2014-2019. But they cover the substantive work of this thematic area rather than reflecting gender outcomes, and would have been better placed in the Strategic Plan’s Urban Economy results framework.

- In Housing and Slum Upgrading, the EAs are a few of those in this focus area in the Strategic Plan 2014-2019, with gender terminology added. However, the GEAP indicators are quite different, reflecting quite a detailed picture of what gender content might look like. Outputs are primarily capacity building support. As with the rest of the thematic areas, it is not clear how these indicators – which here are heavy on sex disaggregated data – could be programmable, or who would be responsible for monitoring.

- The Risk Reduction and Rehabilitation EAs and indicators focus on the gender-responsiveness of disaster risk reduction and resilience and recovery. This element is not evident at all in the Strategic Plan 2014-2019.

The GEAP results framework did not push UN-Habitat to be more gender transformative and did not seek to monitor key elements such as impact of gender TA or support to implementation, the usefulness of gender-focused capacity building, or establishment and use of a process to ensure gender transformative language within normative tools and knowledge products.

6.3.2 Corporate and programme monitoring of gender mainstreaming

The UN-Habitat Strategic Plan Results Framework had a few indicators that tracked gender mainstreaming, although these related mainly to tracking planning information. Gender mainstreaming activities and outcomes were reported in Annual Progress Reports in the section covering cross-cutting issues. Reporting was consistent but fragmented, and incomplete, as the Annual Progress Reports and project evaluations only reflect a sample of activities or achievements. The Gender Equality Action Plan was not monitored. The Results Framework did not reflect the goal statements – the biggest gap being how Goal 1 (support to gender mainstreaming) would be measured – but rather covered work that was directly the responsibility of focus areas and country offices. Most importantly, the results frameworks for both the Strategic Plan and the GEAP were not designed to measure impact. Also, there are no standard review mechanism to prompt revision and adjustment during project implementation if monitoring information indicates this is necessary.
The Programme Division was responsible for three corporate mainstreaming indicators, but only one was monitored beyond 2015. This was *Increased percentage of human settlements programmes and projects reflecting gender and other cross-cutting issues* which increased from 40% in 2014 to 85% in 2018. Two thematic areas had an indicator that explicitly tracked benefits for women: *Number of partner cities that have adopted programmes supporting increased employment opportunities for women*, which increased from 16 in 2014 to 61 in 2019 (Urban Economy), and *Cities, National Authorities, and Habitat Agenda Partners increasing capacity for participatory and accountable pro-poor and gender sensitive urban planning* (Urban Legislation, Land and Governance) but no specific monitoring information was included in the annual reports. It is acknowledged that the indicators for the other branches implicitly include women. For example, *Percentage of consumers in partner cities with access to sustainable water and sanitation services*, but this does not ensure gender sensitive implementation or results.

The 2017 UN SWAP states ‘At the time of reporting, the Strategic Plan does not explicitly include gender result and activities for the seven thematic areas of UN-Habitat. However, at present, this is mitigated by the GEAP 2014-2019 Gender Results Framework.’ But it was acknowledged that the GEAP was never monitored. The Gender Unit indicated that the extent of their monitoring was to ‘rely on gender focal points in the various offices and regions to keep us updated on their efforts and actions as well as periodic reports from programme managers especially when requiring inputs to the annual reports and periodic statutory reports’.

The final evaluation of the implementation of the UN-Habitat Strategic Plan 2014-2019 found that: ‘Weaknesses in UN-Habitat’s monitoring and reporting mechanisms led to a gap in verifiable data and subsequently inadequately illustrates the benefits of activities...’ and ‘There is some general and emergent outcome-related data but effective and credible trend data in relation to UN-Habitat’s strategic result indicators is sparse.’ This was confirmed in interviews for this evaluation, for example: ‘If leadership is not asking for it, monitoring it, asking for reports and results....then nothing will move forward...political will is all’, and ‘Have we changed lives? The Strategic Plan was activities based, so there was not clear measurement of impact.’ In this situation, gender-focused project monitoring was unlikely to be any more rigorous than general monitoring. This suggests that for the new strategic period a key area of work in a revised gender strategy should focus on support to monitoring processes to ensure that project indicators include gender focus – ensuring that the ESS v3 is rigorously applied. Follow on work would be to support implementation and partner capacity building.

Aside from evaluations, UN-Habitat primarily measures its capacity to achieve gender mainstreaming by ensuring project compliance with the Gender Equality Marker at the planning and design stage. While the GEM is a good quality control and process measure for project approval, it should not be confused or conflated with rigorous gender-focused design, implementation or outcome monitoring.

UN SWAP reports acknowledge a lack of continuity between the GEM via the PAG and the PAAS system. In 2018, ‘it is planned that the GEM will be digitised through the projects portal (PAAS), which will aid the collection of data on gender mainstreaming in the programme review process’. This is three years after the initial implementation of the GEM, which reflects a very slow process to integrate gender tracking into overall agency monitoring systems.

Where projects are of short duration, careful monitoring is important to ensure that the limited time and funds are optimised. Longer projects benefit from mid-term reviews but would also benefit from better monitoring. Gender is just one element that would benefit from this form of continuous improvement.

Gender is reflected with varying degrees of robustness in programme monitoring, depending on how individual programmes or projects focus on gender. There are no mechanisms to review progress and prompt project refocus or adjustment to take account of identified weaknesses. There is also no consolidation of project data to high level to show agency performance. Discussions about project monitoring confirmed that UN-Habitat is weak at establishing firm evidence-based baselines. The different regions track and process information very differently. The Arab States Region stands out in terms of the way it documents gender achievements.

There have been improvements in monitoring over the strategic period, and specifically in attempts to gather sex disaggregated data. However, monitoring of programme data takes place in a number of ’own systems’ and indicators are not standardised. Importantly, UN-Habitat monitoring processes do not consolidate project data to show trends in agency performance. This is now being addressed to some extent with the introduction of dashboards reflecting performance against strategic plan indicators – this would require a concerted effort to bring all programme and project monitoring into one standard system. Some of the achievements with regard to improved programme monitoring communicated in this evaluation process include:
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109 Evaluation of the UN-Habitat Strategic Plan 2014-2019
110 UN SWAP Report 2018
111 in 2020 the Regional Office produced a publication mapping gender-related projects across the region
GLTN was excellent with their specific tools showing results for direct beneficiaries, Public Spaces has well disaggregated data, Slum Upgrading shows good integration of gender. In WASH, the pro-poor approach is evident but not much gender disaggregation. Urban mobility programmes have become much better at explicitly showing gender, and youth focused programmes tend to have good, disaggregated data. Housing programmes don’t have much gender disaggregation.

The Mozambique country programme has increased the number of gender indicators in all projects since 2018.

The quality of data collected for the Iraq country programme has improved over the past five years: this is particularly important for analysis as each region has a different profile in terms of religion, refugees, IDPs, and vulnerable groups.

Saudi Arabia and Colombia National Statistical Offices have started collecting disaggregated information on youth and gender.

Awareness of gender monitoring data in programming seems to have relatively little traction among partners, with half of survey respondents being unaware, and a further 18% stating that gender is not monitored (Figure 23). UN-Habitat staff respondents are rather more conscious of the need to monitor gender results: less than a quarter were unaware, and almost half indicated that gender practices are monitored. This suggests that UN-Habitat’s internal emphasis on gender mainstreaming, compared with peers and partners, has had some results. However, both staff and partners agree that more disaggregation of data is needed to inform decision-making. Figure 24 shows that around a third of both partners and staff felt that disaggregation of data was sufficient. Both groups felt strongly that further disaggregation was needed.

Data usefulness was largely similar across local, regional and international respondents. Figure 25 shows respondents from the Arab states reported the highest usefulness ratings against all three sources. Programme monitoring data is used more effectively than global surveillance in all regions. The least frequent users of these data are global level planners, who find other sources of data more valuable. Programme monitoring data, and to a lesser extent, global surveillance data were widely reported to be used for planning, with some sources of other data. Partners used Global Surveillance Data significantly more than staff (p<0.05), while programme monitoring data and other data were used to similar extents by staff and partners (Figure 26). Several respondents listed alternative data sources, which included other UN agencies, World Bank, national statistics offices, women’s organisations, local councils, and municipal surveys.
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6.4 Gender parity and internal women’s empowerment

UN-Habitat is making efforts to address gender parity within a difficult and shifting context, and there are different perceptions between the genders about the agency’s level of commitment. There are also very different perceptions between the genders about the level of women’s influence in decision making and whether this changed.

UN Secretary-General António Guterres’s oath of office in 2017 included a specific commitment to gender parity, and in mid-September 2017 he launched a UN System-wide Strategy on Gender Parity with ‘three target dates addressing international staff, FS, P-1 to USG levels, on Permanent/Continuing and Fixed-term appointments: 2021, 2026 and 2028’. The Strategy stresses that parity ‘... is not just about hitting the numbers. It is about modernizing the organization and shifting its institutional culture so that the United Nations can access and capitalize on its full potential.’

UN Women published a guidance document to amplify the UN’s enabling environment guidance document which provides very practical guidelines and good practice for parity-focused human resources, including workplace flexibility, family friendly policies, and standards of conduct.

Goal 2 of the GPP seeks to make progress ‘towards internal gender parity at all levels, and particularly at the P5 levels... as an objective indicator of organisational commitment to gender equality and women’s rights, and of an organisational culture with the capacity to advance them’. Achieving parity involves recruitment, availability, internal biases, responses to external environments and posting conditions, skills, and access. The whole of the UN is shrinking and there are many frozen posts, and UN-Habitat relies on project funding for many posts.

UN-Habitat has a staff quota of around 350: these are staff employed directly by the agency, and it is this quota that must show improved gender parity. A large number of additional project staff are employed by project partners. In the six years from 2014 the gender ratios have seen some changes, but parity is some way off. Figure 28 shows that in the G2-7 and the P4-5 levels, the percentage of women employed increased by 2%: G2-7 from 68-70%; and P4-5 from 34-36%. The P1-3 levels saw a decrease of 5% from 51% in 2014 to 46% in 2020. The National Officer and ASG/USG-D levels both saw a 12% increase: National Officers from 30% in 2014 to 42% in 2020; ASG/USG-D levels from 18% to 30%. Recruitment involves a set of competing considerations: external candidates to make up parity versus internal candidates, which gives qualitative
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promotion but no quantitative parity changes. International staff mobility also keeps the numbers fluctuating. It also becomes difficult to retain male staff in a context where there are few prospects for promotion. Hardship postings are less attractive: ‘people are taking less risks and considering their welfare and sacrificing professional development’. Talent management is possible through the Junior Professional Officer programme, which enables member states to fully fund positions for two to four years, with an additional amount for training annually. The programme is available to candidates from those member states that can afford to fund the post, and few countries in the global South can do this. The secretariat also offers general annual training to all women at P4 and P5 levels seeking to advance. There is an informal What’sApp group of female personnel across the world, which serves as a support network and a platform for sharing ideas for addressing gender parity in-house.\textsuperscript{116}

The Gender Equality Unit has been responsible for reporting gender parity figures. The logic of this is not clear as recruitment processes and staff numbers information lies with Human Resources and UNON. This responsibility was definitely incorrectly placed:

- Reporting on gender parity is an inward looking function and the primary focus of the Gender Equality Unit is outwards into programming,
- Successfully addressing issues of gender parity – particularly at higher levels – requires careful talent management, processes that ensure gender-aware recruitment, as well as skills retention and capacity building. These are responsibilities that should lie with the Human Resources Talent Management function.

Despite this, the unit is implementing an action plan around gender parity\textsuperscript{117} and a limited number of the proposed actions are in process, including: Executive Director vetting of recruitment from P4 upwards; recruitment interview panels are strictly gender balanced; male appointments must be motivated as per the SG’s guidance; and vacancies are communicated internally, externally, with member states, and women are specifically encouraged to apply. The UN Women response\textsuperscript{118} to UN-Habitat’s 2018 UN SWAP ratings recommends that UN-Habitat takes targeted action towards Gender Parity and provides tailored training for senior managers.

The staff survey explored perceptions and experiences of gender parity, bias and women’s empowerment within UN-Habitat. 60% of staff were aware of initiatives to address recruitment parity, with significantly higher awareness among senior respondents (80% of P4 and above) (Figure 29). There was no significant difference between male and female respondents around awareness of gender parity initiatives.

Only 42% of staff were aware of ‘any initiatives to address gender bias or blindness at work’, with least awareness among contractors, although these differences were not statistically significant. Significantly fewer female respondents (34%) were aware of bias and blindness initiatives, than male and other gender respondents (56%) (p<0.05). Besides decreasing levels of responsibility, these comparisons might also be a result of a parallel trend in mandatory training on gender. (Figure 27)

\textsuperscript{116} Cross-cutting Issues Report 2018
\textsuperscript{117} Presentation: Gender mainstreaming and parity at UN-Habitat. Proposed Actions (undated)
\textsuperscript{118} Letter from UN Women ED to UN-Habitat ED, 2 September 2019.
The global picture shows that staff survey respondents felt that women and men had equal influence (42%), with 20% stating that this influence had increased, and 19% that it had stayed the same, suggesting that these respondents felt women had also had equal influence before the gender initiatives of the project period.

Table 8. Staff perceptions about changes in women’s influence between 2014-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE: Women have:</th>
<th>CHANGES IN INFLUENCE - Women’s influence has:</th>
<th>Total influence (excl ‘don’t know’)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less influence than men</td>
<td>Decreased: 7%</td>
<td>Stayed the same: 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal influence</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More influence or power than men</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall changes in influence</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A very different picture emerges (P<0.05), when the perceptions of different genders are compared. Respondents who identified as male felt far more strongly (63%) that women and men had equal influence: 37% indicated that this was achieved through increasing influence during the strategic period. In contrast, 38% of women and ‘other gender’ felt women still have less influence than men even after the project interventions in the last six years, and that this remains unchanged (41%). This pattern of far more optimistic views on gender among men than women in UN-Habitat suggests hidden biases, unmet expectations among women, and a need for further gender blindness engagement internally.

Table 9. Gendered perceptions about changes in women’s influence between 2014-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE that women have:</th>
<th>CHANGES IN INFLUENCE: Women’s influence has:</th>
<th>Total influence (excl ‘don’t know’)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female, Other and ‘would rather not say’ respondents (n=92)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less influence than men</td>
<td>Decreased: 9%</td>
<td>Stayed the same: 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal influence</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More influence or power than men</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in influence according to women and other</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Male respondents (n=43)** | | |
| Less influence than men          | 5%  | 5%  | 7%  | 0%  | 16% |
| Equal influence                  | 5%  | 21%  | 37%  | 9%  | 63% |
| More influence or power than men | 0%  | 0%  | 12%  | 0%  | 12% |
| **Changes in influence according to men** | 9%  | 26%  | 56%  | 9%  |

*Gender responses ‘Other’ (n=2) and ‘I would rather not say’ (n=2) were calculated as being more closely aligned with female than male respondents. Differences between regions and staff levels for these responses were not statistically significant.

Gender determined perceptions about barriers to gender parity and about the level of women’s influence in decision-making. Two thirds (63%) of male and other respondents felt there were no barriers to achieving parity at supervisory and management levels, compared with 14% of female respondents (Figure 31). Most respondents agreed that achieving parity was not a priority for managers, and that there were biased promotions and appointments. Most women felt females in senior positions lacked equal influence with their male counterparts, while a far higher proportion of the non-female respondents believed there to be a lack of skilled women.

Figure 31: Gender determined perceptions about barriers to gender parity

*Figure 31: Gender determined perceptions about barriers to gender parity

*In this case ‘Other’ and no answer respondents were more closely aligned to male responses.
7 Impact

What transformational changes did the implementation of gender mainstreaming bring?

7.1 Did UN-Habitat change lives?

UN Women’s 2018 global monitoring report on the SDGs confirms that gender-based discrimination is still deeply rooted and present across all countries, with gender inequalities remaining pervasive in each and every dimension of sustainable development ‘threatening the transformative potential of the 2030 Agenda in real and measurable ways’.  

The hypothesis in the Theory of Change devised for this evaluation states: ‘That UN-Habitat’s strategic results and expected accomplishments will be significantly and more sustainably achieved if all programmes, activities and results have gender equality and women’s empowerment focus as a fundamental underpinning principle’. This evaluation did find – across a wide range of sources – that where gender equality and women’s empowerment have been substantial components of programming, good results have been achieved in many contexts. It appears that these may be more sustained results, but this cannot be validated in the absence of sustained and detailed monitoring of results.

The overall picture gained of gender mainstreaming is fragmented and lacks coherence. There are interventions where gender is included in project design documents, but much less so in implementation: perceptions about impact vary widely across the regions but this cannot be confirmed from hard data, although there are consistent but under-resourced efforts to gather better gender-disaggregated data to demonstrate situations and progress. Aside from patriarchal attitudes, Gender-Based Violence is one of the persistent barriers to successful community engagement and sustainability.

Gender mainstreaming during the 2014-2019 strategic period was a direct continuation of the work done in the previous strategic period. Many of the excellent initiatives and products produced in that prior period were continued into the new period. There was less evidence of the development of innovative products, guidelines or interventions, and significantly, it appears that none of the primary normative tools (under the purview of headquarters) were reviewed, updated or enhanced in this period (e.g. the Gender Issue Guides).

Given that monitoring data from the Strategic Plan is limited, and the GEAP was not monitored, impact can be determined anecdotally, for example, generate a library of good practices to support implementation work in different contexts. In some places, the feedback loop is improving, but it was felt that more could be done to in terms of quicker management response to information from the field.

There were some excellent examples of gender focused approaches, such as the mediation process in Iraq, the community building processes in Sri Lanka, and women’s leadership and influence in Community Development Councils in Afghanistan. Work around tenure and ownership validation processes for returning IDPs has resulted in changed lives for women in Somalia and Iraq where ownership documentation now includes women’s names. Evaluations of GLTN show that the programme’s gender focus in tools and implementation has evolved and improved over time – it was the most frequently mentioned programme by interviewees.
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**Figure 32: Impact of UN Habitat work on women’s lives**

The survey asked respondents to rate the impact of UN-Habitat interventions on women’s lives in each of the focus areas – whether things had got worse, stayed the same, or improved (a little or a lot) (Figure 32). Scores\textsuperscript{120} were used to

\textsuperscript{119} UN Women. 2018. *Turning Promises into Action: Gender Equality in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* Chapter 3 Why Gender Equality Matters Across All SDGs.

\textsuperscript{120} Scores were calculated using a weighting of -1 for ‘worsened’, up to 2 for ‘major improvement’. 

---

67
Global level staff respondents were generally positive, compared with their colleagues in most regions. However, survey data showed that there is considerable room for improvement in terms of consistent effort to ensure that women are considered and benefit from programming in all regions except for Asia and the Pacific. There were very different views about whether gender is an assured part of project content and approach, confirming the regional variations in Figure 32:

Many respondents from countries in Asia and the Pacific regard gender to be ensured thoroughly or quite well, but in Latin America almost half of respondents feel that there are only ‘a few cases’ where benefit to women is ensured. This is confirmed by the data in Figure 33 which shows that 41% of respondents felt that few or no programmes had ensured benefit for women at country level. However, progress has been made, with 60% of respondents feeling that many programmes do ensure benefit for women at country level.

What the country interviews show is that one of the biggest issues to be addressed in all contexts is Gender-Based Violence: in Bolivia, for example, domestic violence has been identified as one of the biggest areas of crime. Gender-Based Violence is addressed in some of the reported training, but where it begins to be addressed effectively, the issue required collaborative efforts from UN-Habitat, government and policing and other authorities. Work on public spaces and safety also consistently addresses mitigation of Gender-Based Violence through participatory inquiry around needs and increasing awareness among decision-making officials at local levels.

Country staff involvement in their respective UN Country gender task forces has also had an impact, with offices reporting that this allows for more comprehensive advocacy around gender issues and particularly Gender-Based Violence at national levels, and this can have a knock-on effect in terms of different ministries being more open to discuss gendered approaches. Training of counterpart officials does appear to have results, but progress is slow and often cultural and contextual issues remain barriers. It was also stressed that country team score card indicators needed to be tailored to each country’s specific cultural and situational differences, and that there needed to be support to translate normative frameworks into locally useful ones.

Many interviews mentioned the General Assembly’s commitment to gender mainstreaming, and the lack of resource allocation in annual budgets to support this. One person made a slightly different point, asking whether UN-Habitat was doing enough to push back at member states by providing evidence of what might need to improve in terms of gender focus in each focus country, and arguing that to address these issues, funds were needed to support implementation. This advocacy is happening: In 2019, at the Gender Forum during the first UN Habitat Assembly under the new governance structure, the ED said ‘...gender equality is an investment. Achieving gender equality requires financial resources. But it is the ultimate investment that will reap substantive benefits, both socially and economically. Investing in gender equality will benefit all of society, men and women, boys and girls, and others. But it requires continued and sustained investment. gender equality is a long-term struggle, but it is a struggle worth fighting for’. This statement was clearly aimed at member states, and in future it could be amplified based on evidence of where gender mainstreaming has contributed to measurable results. Targeted messaging could also be informed by the regional variations shown in Figure 269, as well as country offices undertaking a realistic scan of key gender-specific barriers to sustainable urbanisation efforts.

A most significant impact achieved was the creation of a full time senior gender advisory post in the Afghanistan office: this has resulted in significant embedding of understanding of gender mainstreaming through day-to-day work and direct support for the cohort of gender volunteers across the provincial offices. The numbers volunteering to work on gender in their units confirms that there is no substitute for direct person-to-person support processes. A focused country gender strategy with an annual action plan provides an excellent monitoring tool.
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8 Sustainability

8.1 Has gender mainstreaming contributed to gender-friendly sustainable urbanisation?

What changes have occurred as a result of implementation of gender mainstreaming during 2014-2019 that may contribute to the achievement of SDG 5 and the New Urban Agenda?

UN-Habitat has provided route maps that are gender-friendly to achieve Agenda 2030 through the work done on SDG 11, in the Habitat III process as well as the outcome document, the New Urban Agenda. Global platforms such as the WUF and the WUC, as well as other dialogue platforms provide further substance to what gender transformed cities need to look like – this normative conversation is ongoing and consistently includes gender as an important focus area. The strategic period has seen variable but definite increases in gender awareness among staff and partners, and the gender focus in project and programme work is increasing. Ensuring sustainability is difficult when projects are one or two years long, and when donors push for technical completion – evidence of progress as a result of women’s participation is critical. However, long-term programming over different project phases definitely shows how gender focus can mature and evolve, resulting in improved and more transformative approaches and tools.

UN-Habitat’s global reports and data sets – including the World Cities Report and the CPI – also provide gender disaggregated trend analysis that appears to be increasingly used in planning at national and local levels. UN-Habitat’s work at national level around urban policy development has the NUA as a framework which means that gender is part of what is included. The extent, depth and impact of gender mainstreaming work in thematic areas is difficult to quantify, but there is evidence of good practices as well as changes to the lives of beneficiaries and communities. It appears that gender parity and women’s empowerment within UN-Habitat country teams do influence counterparts attitudes towards women and the inclusion of women in decision-making.

8.2 Good practices

Documentation and all interviews confirm that UN-Habitat has institutionalised participatory and inclusive processes. It is also clear that within these processes UN-Habitat makes every effort to secure equal numbers of female participants. Evaluations confirm that these engagement processes contribute to building pockets of progress towards equitable and sustainable urbanisation. However, it was not that clear whether the participatory processes are always transformative: ‘Participation is transformative if it brings about awareness and reflections on a woman’s worth and dignity, and their collective strength to work in partnership with men.’

Many interviews stressed the importance of local authority buy-in, and the need to reach agreement between local authorities, religious and tribal leaders, and civil society and community people to get to a lasting and sustainable solution. Certainly, country staff have seen evidence that collaboration over time from the design to implementation makes the results more likely to last.

In 2012, a study across 30 project case studies of gender mainstreaming initiatives identified a number of good practices across UN-Habitat’s thematic areas of focus. The conclusions of this study are most insightful. For example UN-Habitat’s participatory model for planning and implementation of a wide range of interventions was described as a good first step, but needed to move beyond just getting women participants to meetings: ‘Participation has to be further deconstructed in terms of the agenda, the roles men and women played, and the expected results in terms of material benefits as well as shifts in power relations.’

This point was not specifically found in guidance documents. A comparison of the good practices and lessons against the information collected for this evaluation show that many have contributed to the successes over the 2014-19 period. For example, including gender, social and human rights issues in the design of basic services; increasing the gender awareness of project management and staff in terms of how gender issues present in a particular cultural or religious context; partnerships with other agencies better able to deal with gender issues such as domestic violence, mental health, and sexual and reproductive health.

However, the final lesson has not been learned it seems: ‘Investments in time and resources for periodic staff sharing, reflection, synthesis and documentation have to be provided, particularly on gender mainstreaming processes’: there has been much more learning and sharing, but synthesis and consolidation of knowledge is not evident yet in UN-Habitat.

Long-term programming over different project phases shows how gender focus can mature and evolve, resulting in improved and more transformative approaches and tools – GLTN is one example where these results are confirmed in evaluations. However, it is important to understand what can be achieved in shorter projects: ‘For gender we need to be conservative in terms of what can be achieved over the project period (one-three years). We do set ambitious targets but
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we can’t push things too much and create tensions in very conservative communities – so we need to balance the targets and what is achievable’.

It appears that the gender balance among staff also has an impact on how communities engage: in two countries the point was made that this influenced both government counterparts as well as communities where women traditionally had no voice. ‘So we do this internally and then it starts to reflect in government authorities we work with. Government is wanting to hire good technical women, so it is becoming much more about how qualified you are’. In 2019 UN-Habitat reported that 71 partner local authorities are implementing gender-responsive budgeting.124

Staff reported that when gender issues were promoted as a key part of any work, the impact of results was stronger. It also appeared that it was important to push back against counterparts or donors who insisted on simple numerical delivery (of houses, for example), demonstrating that gender focused, and participatory approaches enhance the outcome. ‘Experience has shown that we need to strike a balance between delivery and the softer aspects that ensure more sustainability – now the donor insists that these issues are included’. The key to the success of these approaches is, of course, hard evidence of good results and benefits for communities as well as authorities. ‘The inclusion of both men and women in Village Reconstruction Committees to participate in village development and housing construction, as well as the inclusion of elderly, youth and people who became differently abled due to the conflict, enhanced the participatory nature of the programme and brought long-term dividends to the region’.125

8.3 Main barriers to progress

There are a wide range of barriers to making progress in ensuring gender-friendly cities and human settlements. Some are internal to UN-Habitat, others are contextual, such as the intense international competition for development funding. Still others are country contextual, which requires carefully formulated localised approaches.

Contextual barriers included local cultural and religious imperatives that prevent women’s participation in various stages of project life cycles: ‘often women have low participation in the planning, monitoring and evaluation stages of projects, and their main role is during implementation’. Political instability and deeply patriarchal governments also presented a challenging terrain within which to drive gender content in policy and projects. Frequent changes in postholders in government also present a challenge as each new cadre needs orientation and training.

Internally focused barriers to ensuring that gender mainstreaming was effectively implemented include:

- The GPP was not well structured with a message that the gender focus should drive sustainable urbanisation, and a results framework that held the agency to account.
- The gender function was not strategically placed and staffed meant that it played some role, but appears to have had limited influence across the agency, and was not able to provide the required support to implementers or normative work.
- Difficulties in translating good gender focus in planning into implementation. This confirms the ‘How to do it’ gap – the lack of guidance and hand holding regarding turning planning into activities that make a difference.
- Inadequate funding of the gender mainstreaming function. Despite resolutions, member states have not ringfenced resources for gender, and core funding to UN-Habitat has declined substantially over the strategic period, sitting now at around 20% of the total budget. The Executive Director argued this point at the 2019 Gender Forum during the first UN Habitat Assembly. However, advocacy around the ultimate dividend of investing in gender equality may not be loud enough, and should not be confined to gender forums.
- The lack of a global big picture of UN-Habitat’s gender-focused results, because of poor monitoring and poor crafting of gender-focused indicators and required review points within project cycles. This lack of concrete evidence means the legitimacy of advocacy messaging is compromised. Creating regional pictures would be a good start.
- As a project-based agency, UN-Habitat has to ‘chase the money’. The source of funds can often drive the project focus, its priorities, and the extent to which a gender lens is/must/can be used: Donors and international NGO partners tend to require gender focus; governments may have different priorities and the extent of their willingness to incorporate a gender lens may depend on level of influence of other actors in the mix e.g. other UN agencies, civil society.
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9 Conclusions and Lessons Learned

9.1 The Gender Policy and Action Plan were not strategic or adequately resourced

UN-Habitat General Assembly resolutions, the Strategic Plan and the GPP indicate that gender equality is regarded as a strategic issue in line with UN guidance and resolutions. While the intention may be there, there is limited evidence that the agency is standing by the assertion that addressing gender equality and women’s empowerment is one of the key requirements for achieving sustainable urbanisation that benefits all. There are a number of reasons for this: The GPP and the GEAP were not directly implemented; the gender mainstreaming function was poorly resourced; mainstreaming was ensured in planning but not in implementation; and there was no monitoring of gender-specific outcomes. Also, member states’ commitments to supporting gender focused work may not be fully aligned to intent expressed in the 2013 and 2016 Assembly resolutions.

By identifying gender as cross-cutting rather than as a strategic driver of change, gender could be either supported or ignored, and functioned based on the implicit value (read resources) it enjoyed. The Gender and Equality Unit was placed in the Programme Division, which should have ensured influence. However, it was poorly staffed and had few resources that could be used for improving gender mainstreaming at all levels. As a result, the unit was reactive, with its primary task the application of the GEM to project proposals submitted to the PAG.

UN-Habitat was proactive in mainstreaming gender as part of the overall UN system’s increased focus on the issue, and has contributed to building a vision for sustainable urbanisation. Habitat III and the NUA provided a coherent global approach to urbanisation under the SDGs, and the gender language and messaging in the NUA provides a good enough accountability framework. The risk is that this aspect becomes lost without a strategically coherent and adequately resourced gender mainstreaming commitment – through a better focused strategy, supported by adequately resourced institutional mechanisms that could provide practical implementation guidance, while at the same time holding countries to account to their gender policy commitments or helping them to give substance to these.

An evaluation of gender equality in humanitarian situations found that ‘...both high-level strategic expertise and cluster-specific, long-term gender expertise is necessary for the successful operationalisation of Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls at the country level’, and recommended that ‘The IASC should ensure the mandatory placement, and adequate resourcing, of a high-level, inter-agency gender advisor position...’, and that lead agencies providing technical expertise should also allocate a long-term dedicated senior-level gender equality and technical sector specialist, who would ‘connect the operational and strategic levels...’

Although the context is emergency humanitarian relief, the points made about dedicated, resourced gender expertise that is both strategic and operational is applicable everywhere. In the one example where UN-Habitat has allocated appropriate resources, and has a full-time gender advisor in the Afghanistan office – the cost benefit appears to be significant. This can be contrasted with the allocation of 5% of a Gender Focal Point’s time to gender mainstreaming – this is clearly not sufficient to undertake the range and focus of work necessary.

Neither the GPP or the GEAP results were used to push UN-Habitat to be more gender transformative and did not seek to monitor key elements such as impact of gender TA or support to implementation, the usefulness of gender-focused capacity building, or establishment and use of a process to ensure gender transformative language within normative tools and knowledge products. The Gender Equality Unit’s work – to the extent that it had resources – did focus on Goal 1 of the GPP: providing support to gender mainstreaming. Also, the external impetus of increased UN focus on gender mainstreaming and gender parity as well as existing mainstreaming efforts internally ensured that Goal 1 and 2 of the GPP were addressed to some extent. Goal 3, which related to institutional arrangements, was largely not addressed. The GEAP Results Framework was too similar to the framework for the corporate Strategic Plan 2014-2019, and did not have its own clear identity. All told, the 2008-2013 Action Plan was a better example of a gender focused sub strategy aimed at supporting broader corporate strategic action.

Partner and stakeholder comments were mixed about UN-Habitat’s gender mainstreaming efficacy: Some felt UN-Habitat had made good contributions to building understanding about the benefits of including women in processes, and had contributed to ensuring global data better presented the picture of women around the world. Others felt not enough was done to advance the rights of poor urban people and particularly poor urban women globally, and that UN-Habitat has not amplified the gender lens over time. There was also a comment that the gender content of the new strategy 2020-2023 was not very good. These perceptions are concerning, suggesting that more needs to be done to assert UN-Habitat’s strategic commitment to addressing gender inequality and women’s empowerment as a central element of sustainable urbanisation.
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While the AGGI was active and influential in the first half of the strategic period, it seems to have declined in influence, with low member turnover and a lack of role clarity and structure in its engagement with the Secretariat.

The AGGI was initially a very strategic resource, with members well placed to connect UN-Habitat to voices of local women around the globe. AGGI individuals were central to ensuring that gender focused events at global forums were substantial and practically focused around the barriers to equality and empowerment. However, the AGGI’s advisory function was not institutionalised, nor was their role in document reviews clear – this meant advice and support was requested by those who felt it was necessary, not because it was part of a recognised process which aimed to add specific value. There is a strong view that new members across an expanded group of advisors would reinvigorate AGGI. The burden of work carried by the Gender Equality Unit also meant the Secretariat function could not be optimal, and clear roles and processes would further enhance the advisory function.

9.2 Gender mainstreaming had mixed results and lacked internal coherence

In the strategic period, the implementation of gender mainstreaming across UN-Habitat was fragmented and of variable rigour. This is a result of the ongoing highly siloed way of working within the agency, the lack of any structure or person coordinating and consolidating an agency-wide picture, and lack of both vertical and horizontal communication of implementation plans and achievements, and a void in the area of using information to improve content, focus and usefulness of tools and support. Introduction of the Gender Equality Marker for project approvals was an important signal internally that gender mainstreaming had become a basic requirement, but the gender function needed to influence far beyond that, and opportunities were missed to highlight gender messaging in thematic forums.

Gender mainstreaming was ingrained in the 2014-2019 strategic period. However, the understanding of what this meant in practice was variable across the agency. Project design had to meet the Gender Equality Marker criteria, but there was agreement that this did not guarantee a meaningful gender focus in implementation as some still regarded this as a compliance rather than a sustainability issue. Survey data also showed that contractors were largely unaware of the gender marker which means they do not have the full picture of project requirements.

UN-Habitat has developed a wide range of good practices that contribute to gender equality and empowerment of women. UN-Habitat has a long history of engaging with communities in the delivery of their projects. It was clear that participatory processes increasingly seek to include equal numbers of women – although this is not always possible – and include gender-focused issues. These were found throughout documents and in many interviews across the agency. Many of these are noted in this evaluation as examples, which are not exhaustive. Good examples were given about how women were included in training courses, community consultations, policy dialogues and housing design, and a number of partner interviews told of very definite improvements in the lives of women they had worked with in UN-Habitat projects. The different views across the regions about improvements for women in the thematic areas (survey data), indicates the need for a focused exploration about the success factors and barriers:

Around half of staff and partners surveyed feel that things have improved for women in the areas of tenure legislation, basic services, urban economies and urban design. The other half is strongly divided between conditions remaining the same (Latin America), and improving greatly (Asia Pacific). More staff than partners feel there are improvements for women in UN-Habitat’s work in slum upgrading.

Also the translation between relatively siloed normative thematic areas sometimes made mainstreaming difficult as country level implementation required a more integrated approach to deal with different groups of people at city level who might have contradictory needs: examples include indigenous peoples’ claim to land that has gone to make up cities; groups with different cultures and how they seek to access services such as health care or sanitation; different needs of men and women in planning urban transport. ‘There are many difficult contradictions within urbanisation, and we need effective strategies to address these with national and local government’. UN-Habitat states what needs to be done: ‘Cities exhibit social value when they promote gender equality and ensure broad-based civic participation. Empowering marginalised groups like slum dwellers, the homeless, indigenous people, LGBTQ2+ and youth makes cities equitable for all. Ultimately, sustainable urbanisation is experienced through the intangible value of urban culture.’

Missed opportunities to bring gender to the foreground in the thematic areas were evident in a scan across activities, speeches, opening and closing remarks made by the Executive Director in various forums since 2017. There is a strong gender message – but only in gender-focused forums. In other forums the gender message tends to be muted and presented as ‘one of many’ issues, rather than a lens that should frame all of UN-Habitat work, be it in climate, city planning, tenure, mobility or basic services.

---
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Focused local coherence across a country programme was evident in Afghanistan, where there is a full time gender advisor who is working to a local gender strategy and action plan. This demonstrates what is possible and the cost benefit should be calculated.

9.3 The missing ‘how to’

Despite the existence of many guidance documents, the most significant gap in gender mainstreaming is practical guidance and support to local level implementation. A significant proportion of staff interviewed felt that gender mainstreaming was hindered by lack of implementation guidance and handholding, and in particular a lack of dedicated support dialogue that would ‘localise’ gender focused activities to take account of local conditions and contexts. This person-to-person process cannot be filled by documents. A good practice databank, however, would not go amiss.

The Gender Equality unit was not able to drive gender mainstreaming based on an overarching view of how gender was being embedded in the structures, functions and practices of UN-Habitat. This meant that very often the extent of gender focus was a result of partner requirements and the level of understanding and prioritisation of the project or programme designers. It also meant that normative tools were not consistently and comprehensively made gender friendly. Also, it meant that the notion of gender mainstreaming remained at the planning level in terms of compliance. Importantly, this meant that there was no process to look horizontally across programmes and projects to identify good practices that might be usefully utilised elsewhere, or identify potential cross project/programme engagement – to enhance and deepen the quality, to optimise use of resources, to share learnings, to build internal understanding of the intersectionality of gender.

In 2012 seven thematic Gender Issue Guides were published – these are consultant-speak heavy, but do contain some practical ‘how to’ and ‘what to cover/look for/include’ guidance for project design that would drive more explicit gender focus in implementation. These were not mentioned in any of the interviews as sources of assistance to planning or implementation. However, by 2018, there had been 14,145 downloads of the various guides. Were they useful after downloading? This question remains unanswered.

An important consequence of the lack of sufficient staff was that the Gender Equality was not proactive in providing implementation support to regional and country offices – the complaint about a lack of ‘how to’ support was loud, despite many written guidelines. The opportunity was lost to build confidence across the agency about the usefulness of the gender unit as a good source of normative and practical guidance. The dilution of the gender function as a result of resource constraints over the 2014-2019 period is at risk of being further diluted with its placement as part of Social Inclusion in the 2020-2023 strategic period, as gender competes for attention and resources with other cross-cutting issues: ‘Politically it is about making gender the primary lens – we should look at a gender responsive city – and then disaggregating into the other ‘inclusion elements’ such as particularly vulnerable groups, older people, disabled people’.

9.4 Poor monitoring means successes stories cannot be told nor lessons learned

UN-Habitat’s global data gathering efforts are pushing for disaggregated data for gender, location, age, and disability. Programme monitoring has also seen improvements in gathering sex-disaggregated data but these attempts are ad-hoc. Although there is evidence of good practice in a wide range of projects and programmes, UN-Habitat’s fragmented monitoring systems mean there is no consolidation of project data to show agency performance, so the full picture of breadth, depth and sustained impact of gender-focused interventions is not known, making it difficult to provide a fair evaluation of achievements. Importantly key learning opportunities are lost if the full picture is not evident.

A lot of work was done over the strategic period to improve urban indicators – at global and country levels. With this came increased emphasis of the need for data to be disaggregated at least by sex, but increasingly by other factors such as age, vulnerability, and location. Improvements in project monitoring have however, taken place in a range of different systems. This means that individual project or programme progress can be tracked, and increasingly tracked for gender outcomes if these indicators have been added. However, there was no process to consolidate programme data to provide a picture of whole agency performance.

Other important monitoring gaps seem to be a standard process to ensure evidence-based baselines, and set monitoring points within project life cycles to prompt review and revision. Efforts to address monitoring gaps include dashboards of performance in the Office of the Executive Director and using the Environment and Social Safeguarding System model as a framework to assess gender focus at the planning and design stage as it includes more rigorous requirements for risk management and mitigation.

The initiatives to establish monitoring dashboards at the highest level could contribute significantly to help build an agency-wide picture of gender mainstreaming – as long as the appropriate indicators and monitoring activities are put in place for the 2020-2023 period.
9.5 Men and women’s perceptions of influence and capacity building

The interviews did not reveal vastly different perceptions between males and females about UN-Habitat’s internal commitment and actions aimed at gender equality and empowerment of women. The survey, however, revealed significant differences in opinion regarding the level of influence that women have internally and whether this has changed over the period. Opinions also differed about whether capacity building had improved people’s ability to implement internal guidelines on gender with males being much more positive and the majority of female respondents feeling that there had been no or very little improvement.

9.6 Lessons learned

Having a Gender Strategy was an important signal regarding UN-Habitat’s intentions for gender mainstreaming. However, while the policy’s existence was an important indicator of commitment, the document itself was not inherently strategic, and the GEAP results framework that almost mirrored the corporate results framework meant that delivery of the strategy was largely out of control of gender-focused staff. The next Gender Strategy should be focused, simple and direct, aiming to challenge and support the agency to improve its gender focus, with a results framework that measures improvements to the gender focus of UN-Habitat work.

Improving gender parity in Country Offices impacts counterparts’ thinking and attitudes to women’s inclusion and empowerment over time. There was evidence of this in Egypt and Iraq.

While it is very important to work towards achieving parity among training course participants, it is also important that the gender content and messaging of the courses themselves is robust and challenging and relevant to participants’ context. This would contribute to sustainability.

Similarly, participatory consultative processes that include women are critical. However, the project or programme must ensure that the views of women and other excluded groups are heard and then reflected in the implementation planning, and continue to inform implementation reviews. This is particularly important where counterparts such as local governments take over implementation. This indicates the importance of obtaining initial agreements about the nature and extent of gender content and desired results, and ensuring that these are included in monitoring and reporting frameworks.

Informants indicated that baselines are very seldom identified for gender-focused work. Outcome quality would be improved by ensuring that a clear baseline is established at project inception, and building in review points and feedback loops enabling improvements to be made during implementation. This process would contribute to improved monitoring data and to building a consolidated corporate picture of gender mainstreaming.

The more information and evidence there is about the benefits of taking a gender-focused approach, the more likely it is that counterparts and partners can understand how this is beneficial to them – practically and politically. Pragmatically, this might be finding the ‘what’s in it for everyone if women are more empowered’. This in turn could potentially generate additional resources for gender-focused programming.

Guidelines and toolkits are useful to the extent that implementers are directly supported to adapt and use the content appropriately for their context.
10 Recommendations

**What strategic, programmatic, structural and management adjustments should be undertaken to improve performance in the implementation of gender mainstreaming in view of the Strategic Plan 2020-2023?**

These recommendations arise from the findings and conclusions of this evaluation. Many are inter-related.

### 10.1 Make the Drivers of Change and flagship programmes gender focused

To give substance to UN-Habitat’s commitment to gender equality and the empowerment of women, gender must be positioned more strategically. The 2020-2023 Strategic Plan identifies drivers of change as: ‘specific elements that work together and are required to deliver services and products that will lead to change or drive results and will ultimately result in the achievement of the objectives of the Strategic Plan’[129].

This evaluation recommends that

i. **Each of the Drivers of Change is enhanced to include a gender focus**

ii. **Each of the flagship programmes is enhanced to include a specific gender focused outcome for which targeted funds are sought.** These outcomes should be drawn from or directly complement the Gender Strategy.

iii. **The new Gender Strategy goals and indicators are included as a dashboard that is monitored by the Office of the Executive Director.**

These two actions would place a gender lens over each of the 2020-2023 Domains of Change, with the desired impact that UN-Habitat’s way of working and thinking is gender transformative.

UN-Habitat’s budget is more than 80% project based, and its core resources will not stretch to supporting a meaningful gender function. It is more likely that a flagship programmes could attract earmarked but flexible funding to support the programme’s gender outcome.

### 10.2 One big and many small Gender Strategies

If the Strategic Plan 2020-2023 demonstrates visible commitment to a gendered approach, a Gender Strategy becomes the mechanism to support this. The Gender Strategy would seek to implement gender mainstreaming through language, indicators, monitoring, methodologies, knowledge production collation and dissemination, and very practical day-to-day assistance to project and country implementation staff and partners to ensure local context and issues are effectively addressed, and providing methodologies and support approaches that enable and capacitate UN-Habitat staff, partners and counterparts. Its vision would describe a gender friendly result for sustainable urbanisation – sharing that goal with the corporate Strategic Plan.

This evaluation recommends:

iv. **Development of UN-Habitat Gender Equality and Empowerment Strategy that is based on a Theory of Change, and has a Results Framework that measures the depth and extent of gender mainstreaming, with clear baseline information.** The Gender Strategy would support the gender content of the Strategic Plan’s Drivers of Change and the gendered content of the Flagship Programmes.

- The Expected Accomplishments and indicators would be very different from those in the corporate strategy. They would measure the extent to which people, projects and processes are gender transformative – holding UN-Habitat to account for its stated commitment – and provide the framework for technical and advocacy support to facilitate this growth.
  - Gender Strategy indicators should measure the extent of gender data/sensitivity/Scope within projects to get a better indication of whether gender is becoming a primary lens for programming work. ie interrogate what the programme sections are doing, not seek own data sets, test whether programme work is tracking gender data, track lives changed as shown by programme data –
  - In thematic areas and regional and country programmes, the key measurable accomplishment for gender would be to ensure that all of the EAs and indicators included gender measures. Capacity building for gendered approaches could also usefully be measured.

- Focus areas for the Gender Strategy would include:
  - Advocacy: in international, national and local forums, in UN-Habitat’s focus areas
  - Capacity building: Support external capacity building design to ensure meaningful gender content; contribute to internal gender-focused capacity building

---
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o ‘How to’ support: Support to project planning and design, and to practical implementation to build gender-focused capabilities across operations
o Partnerships: Optimise linkages with representative groups, networks
o Monitoring: Contribute to building the gender content of corporate and country monitoring
o Knowledge management: Support data analysis processes to build global picture of UN-Habitat results for gender. Facilitate /build a repository of good practice to support implementation improvement and consistency.
o Resource mobilisation: Identify opportunities to mobilise resources for gender focused normative work and projects, Gender Focal Points functions, and other interventions that will consolidate rights-based gender focused work within UN-Habitat

• The key questions for a gender strategy to answer:
  o Does UN-Habitat consistently and coherently include a gender lens in all advocacy and thematic messaging on global, regional, national and local forums?
  o Do UN-Habitat documents, normative tools, guidelines and knowledge products include meaningful gender focus and gender transformative language?
  o Are our projects and programmes gender transformative – at every stage, with targets measured from a clear qualitative and quantitative baseline?
  o Are our staff and partners able to implement and monitor gender transformative programmes?
  o Is the agency taking gender parity beyond numbers?
  o Does the agency contribute to building an evidence based case for gender mainstreaming at global level, together with other agencies such as UN Women?

v. The development of context driven Country Gender Strategies that support and contribute to the main strategy. The Afghanistan example of a local country-focused gender strategy is a good practice that should be replicated in all country offices. These country strategies would be based on the overarching strategy, but would have action plans to address the specific country conditions and constraints.

vi. Implementation of the Gender Strategy should be the responsibility of an executive staff member.

10.3 Make the Gender Focal Point role meaningful

Part of the reason for many gaps in effective gender mainstreaming is that some roles are implicit or dependent on the level of commitment of individuals to pursue gender-focused activities, or the roles are given – in the case of Gender Focal Points – to junior staff.

This evaluation recommends that the Gender Focal Point role is located at a senior level and afforded sufficient time. Specific actions would include:

i. Gender Focal Points are appointed from staff at P3 level and above

i. Gender Focal Point responsibilities, targets and deliverables formally account for 20% of their time against the Gender Strategy outcomes.

ii. Focused internal Capacity Building opportunities aimed at enhancing gender transformative capabilities are provided for Gender Focal Points. Joint training opportunities should be explored with other agencies to make this cost effective.

iii. The Bolivia Country Office Gender Focal Point is a partial secondment from UN Women. UN-Habitat should explore whether similar arrangements are possible in other countries.

iv. Where possible, country level Gender Focal Points or advisors posts are funded by the member state or main project donor.

10.4 Revitalise the Advisory Group on Gender Issues (AGGI)

UN-Habitat is committed to working with a wide range of partners and to ensuring that its contribution to the 2030 Agenda leaves no one behind. This means voices from the grassroots must be reflected in how the agency responds ‘to persistent and new development problems’. The Advisory Group on Gender Issues (AGGI) is a key structure that brings these voices into the sustainable urbanisation dialogue. This evaluation recommends that:

i. The advisory pool of potential AGGI members is expanded, drawing on both existing long-term partners, but also seeking advisors from a wider range of organisations, networks or groups that have potential to introduce new ideas and innovation, taking account of current international trends and debates around gender.
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ii. That the Secretariat facilitates timeous replacement of members of AGGI every two years in line with the Terms of Reference for this structure, ensuring that there is some overlap for continuity. XXX

iii. Revise the AGGI Terms of Reference to clearly outline minimum expectations of members in terms of:
- Frequency and schedule of meetings and engagements to facilitate advisory roles and functions with UN-Habitat senior management and internal departments and structures,
- Process for document reviews
- Roles and responsibilities in international forums such as WUF and Expert Group meetings
- Any other requirements that would promote and enhance UN-Habitat’s gender mainstreaming agenda.

10.5 Gender focused resource mobilisation
Gender mainstreaming was constrained by many things in the 2014-2019 period, but one of the most critical gaps was a lack of resources. This evaluation recommends that a Gender Function Resource Mobilisation Strategy is implemented as part of the Gender Strategy. This would include:

i. Where possible, replication of the Afghanistan model in countries with larger programmes: a full-time senior gender advisor who covers project design, implementation support and monitoring, donor engagement, internal gender mainstreaming and parity implementation.

ii. Mobilising resources for gender-focused programmes in focus areas and countries – this could be linked to specific gaps identified in countries based on evidence collected through programme monitoring.

iii. Engagement of member states through the Executive Board, the Committee of Permanent Representatives and the UN-Habitat Assembly: the advocacy message would be for support to give substance to the 2019 Assembly Resolution on gender, confirming their commitment to making the resolution’s provisions a reality, globally and in their home countries.

10.6 Advocacy in all forums to elevate gender-transformative messages
i. Enable constant, coherent gender messaging in all forums to build UN-Habitat’s reputation as a gender transformed agency. This can be achieved by harnessing the evidence of gender results from projects and programmes for use in advocacy and general corporate messaging, as well as into forums at all levels where dialogue takes place on how best to achieve the SDGs and the NUA.

ii. UN-Habitat is supporting data to UNSDCFs in some countries and evaluations are starting of UNSDCFs at country level. Look for opportunities to raise UN-Habitat’s profile though urban/gender data.

10.7 Ensure capacity building includes meaningful gender content and monitoring
Existing training often includes reference to gender but this tends to be ‘light touch’. This evaluation recommends:

i. Provide input into UN-Habitat training materials to ensure meaningful gender content as well as desired gender-focused learning/behaviour/implementation outcomes.

ii. Ensure that both internal and external capacity building and training interventions provide evidence of the benefits of gender-focused implementation for sustainability.

iii. Provide input into corporate, country, project monitoring processes around monitoring of training outcomes that reflect gender. Support data analysis.

10.8 Provide gender focused ‘how to’ design and implementation guidance
This evaluation found that there is a need for more direct support to project and programme implementation to support building in a meaningful gender focus. Most frequently the need is to have direct engagement and dialogue with another person with gender-specific expertise. This is labour intensive, but it is possible to harness existing expertise within and linked to UN-Habitat. The following suggestions are some ideas, but there are no-doubt many other possible methods.

i. Identify which guidelines/tools need to be updated and plan for this. This would involve:
- Needs analysis consultation with implementation partners, country office staff, and local and national government counterparts.
- Getting guidance from global programmes such as GLTN which has well used gender focused guidelines.
- A process to familiarise implementation staff with the practical content advice in these guides – this does not end with sending copies out to people, it involves focused discussion sessions, dialogue on how to use, engagement on which aspects of a project may best benefit from the specific advice. This process should be linked to project design and project start points to gain most traction.
• Determine the need for translation of guidelines documents as well as identified most useful knowledge products.

ii. To avoid ‘in-house fees or charges for gender support
• Establish an internal gender support community of practice with members from across UN-Habitat focus areas and key skills who could provide implementation advice as part of ensuring that UN-Habitat’s gender mainstreaming capabilities are improved and deepened.
• Identify key external partner organisations and individuals at country level who could provide implementation advice as part of building gender focused sustainable urbanisation in their contexts
• Ensure tight coordination and management to link requested support to relevant expertise via on-line platforms. Advertise the service and monitor use.
• Offer learning and dialogue spaces/platforms for people from both groups as well as those receiving support.

10.9 Gender focused monitoring and knowledge management

This evaluation found that UN-Habitat’s monitoring systems are not yet able to provide a global picture of the agency’s successes and challenges in implementing gender mainstreaming. It would be in UN-Habitat’s interests to build a body of evidence showing the benefits of gendered approaches for the NUA and the 2030 Agenda.

This evaluation recommends that UN-Habitat implements a Gender Knowledge Management and Monitoring Plan to support wider corporate initiatives such as the expansion of the ESS v3 that will guide design processes, the Integrated Planning, Management and Reporting (IPMR) module of UMOJA, and the monitoring dashboards being set up by the Executive Director’s Chief of Staff. Some specific actions would be: XXX

i. Prioritise the process of harmonizing indicators across the agency: ONE central bank of gender indicators that is relevant across UN-Habitat normative functions and focus areas. The existing Gender Catalogue is a good starting point. Ensure that indicators are drafted and verified through a process of consultation with staff in normative, global programme and country operations work.

ii. Continue with the work to expand the scope of the ESS v3 to enhance the Gender Equality Marker.

iii. Ensure that all projects provide for baseline data collection, realistic but meaningful gender-focused indicators, and monitoring and review points to support continuous improvement and learning.

iv. Establish a knowledge bank of good practices, up to date guidelines, knowledge products. Include links to global data sets to show gender related trends in urbanisation.

v. Ensure that Urban Thinkers Campus events always include a gender focus/gender expert input into the design or facilitation, and follow up with local authority participants to further enhance understanding to ensure that the ideas take root.
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EVALUATION OF UN-HABITAT’S POLICY AND PLAN (2014-2019) FOR GENDER EQUALITY
AND EMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND HUMAN SETTLEMENTS

1. Background and Context

Equal rights of men and women is a fundamental principle of the Charter of the United Nations. Several international conventions and declarations of world conferences on women have promoted the cause of gender and the advancement of women in the global agenda as well as global goals. The Millennium Development Goals adopted in 2000 were linked to advancing women’s rights. Goal 3 specifically called for promotion of gender equality and women empowerment. While Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 5 focuses on gender equality and the empowerment of women, the 2030 Agenda is aimed at integrating the gender notions into all SDGs.

UN-Habitat is the lead United Nations agency responsible for promoting sustainable urbanization. Its approach to mainstreaming gender draws on the Convention on the elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) of 1979. Also, as part of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action adopted in 1995, the international community established a strategy of gender mainstreaming. Furthermore, in 2001, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) further defined gender concept, elaborating on the principles of a gender perspective in the UN system and requested the creation of a system-wide accountability mechanism. In the response to the ECOSOC request, the Chief Executive Board (CEB) endorsed the UN system-wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of women in April 2012.\(^{131}\) In addition, various resolutions of the ECOSOC highlight the multifaceted dimensions of gender mainstreaming including the goal of 50/50 gender balance at all levels in the UN system.\(^{132}\) Although United Nations entities are mandated to mainstream gender, there are varying levels of commitment, concrete actions, and understanding of how specific agency’s work is linked with gender development results.\(^{133}\)

1.1 UN-Habitat’s Gender Policies and Governing Council Resolutions

The first edition of UN-Habitat’s gender policy titled “Gendered Habitat: Working with Women and Men in Human Settlements Development” was adopted in 1996. The policy was adopted after the Second United Nations Conference of Human Settlements, Habitat II, held in 1996. The Habitat Agenda as an outcome document of Habitat II reinforced UN-Habitat mandate to consider women roles and needs in human settlements development. A revised version of UN-Habitat Gender Policy was adopted in 2002, emphasizing empowerment of women as a primary indicator of the success of UN-Habitat’s interventions, and emphasizing the mainstreaming equal gender and women’s rights into UN-Habitat activities and policy decisions.

Also, a number of UN-Habitat Governing Council Resolutions have addressed gender mainstreaming. UN-Habitat Governing Council Resolution 20/7 of April 2005, on gender equality in human settlements development, requested that all normative and operation activities developed and implemented by UN-Habitat address gender equality and women’s empowerment by incorporating gender disaggregated data om the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation activities. Resolution 21/9 of April 2007 on women’s land and property rights and access to finance requested UN-Habitat to develop a gender action plan with specific performance indicators to ensure concrete, measurable gains for the realization of gender equality and women’s empowerment. Resolution 23/11 on gender equality and empowerment of women in sustainable urban development, requested establishment of a consultative mechanism as well as setting up an advisory group on gender issues consisting of representatives of women’s organizations, academic institutions, the private sector, local authorities and policy makers to advise on all issues relating to gender mainstreaming in the work of UN-Habitat, and to provide oversight regarding the implementation of the gender equality action plan. Resolution 24/4 on gender equality and women’s empowerment to contribute to sustainable urban development, requested mainstreaming gender equality in the normative and operational work of UN-Habitat and to align the gender policy and plan of action of UN-Habitat with the United Nations System-wide action plan on gender equality and women’s empowerment.

1.2 UN-Habitat gender mainstreaming before the implementation of the Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan (MTSIP) 2008-2013

Since the early 1990s gender mainstreaming and women’s empowerment has been an important component of UN-Habitat programmes. UN-Habitat has implemented programmes addressing women’s participation in UN-Habitat’s work through the Women and Habitat Programme (WHP). In 1996, UN-Habitat adopted a Gender Policy that resulted in separating the outreach and gender mainstreaming functions between the WHP and the Gender Unit respectively. Restructuring of UN-Habitat in 2000, resulted in the merging of the two gender functions into Gender Mainstreaming.

---
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Unit, with the mandate to coordinate and provide policy and technical support for gender mainstreaming and the women's empowerment activities of UN-Habitat. In 2002, a revised UN-Habitat Gender Policy was adopted, retaining the goals and commitments in the original policy document of 1996, but emphasizing responsible stakeholders, to enhance accountability for gender mainstreaming.

In 2003, an evaluation of gender mainstreaming at UN-Habitat was conducted by independent external consultant. Its purpose was to assess UN-Habitat’s previous work on women’s empowerment and gender mainstreaming. As a response to the recommendations arising from the evaluation, a handbook on gender mainstreaming was developed and in-house gender mainstreaming initiated in 2005. To underline the importance of gender mainstreaming, the UN-Habitat Governing Council, in its resolution 20/7 of April 2005, requested UN-Habitat to ensure that all normative and operational activities developed and implemented by its divisions, branches and units address gender equality and women's empowerment in human settlements development by incorporating gender impacts assessment and gender disaggregated data criteria in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the its activities.

1.3 The UN-Habitat Gender Equality Action Plan 2008-2013

An in-depth evaluation in 2005 of UN-Habitat by the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) called for a reform of UN-Habitat with the specific goal of sharpening its programmatic focus in critical areas within its mandate in order to have a greater impact. This led to the formulation of the six year Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan (MTSIP) 2008-2013 that was approved by the GC through resolution 21/2 of April 2007. The first UN-Habitat Gender Action Plan (GEAP) for the period 2008-2013 was approved along the MTSIP as reflected in the HSP/GC/21/Add.1 of April 2007. The GEAP covered each focus area of MTSIP 2008-2008 ensuring that gender concerns and actions were cross-cutting across all UN-Habitat work. Through the GC resolution 22/7 of April 2009, UN-Habitat was requested to report progress made in the implementation of the GEAP 2008-2013 to the twenty third session of the GC. Through Resolution 23/1, the GC took note of the challenges to and the progress made in the implementation of the GEAP 2008-2013. It also encouraged UN-Habitat to continue strengthening staff capacity and incorporating fully a gender perspective into all its work. The Executive Director was also requested to establish a consultative mechanism and to set-up an Advisory group on gender issues.

In 2011, an independent gender mainstreaming evaluation was undertaken. Its purpose was to assess UN-Habitat efforts in mainstreaming gender across its programmes and policies, and the appropriate of its institutional arrangements and strategic partnerships for the promotion of gender equality in human settlements. The evaluation found that UN-Habitat had achieved a significant results in number of areas, including production of advocacy materials, and evidence-based information on gender and urbanization, support to women’s networks and partners, capacity-building in gender mainstreaming in local governments and gender mainstreaming in all UN-Habitat activities. UN-Habitat sought to integrate and mainstream gender into core areas of its work. However, efforts were not uniform in strength across the agency. The institutional arrangements for the integration and mainstreaming gender included many actors: the Gender Mainstreaming Unit, a network of gender focal points, gender task force and Gender Advisory Group.

To improve the coherence of Agency’s work on gender mainstreaming, in 2009, UN-Habitat endorsed the Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) that was aligned with the MTSIP 2008-2013 focus areas. Gender mainstreaming was not adequately explicit in the MTSIP. Elaboration of action plans for gender mainstreaming in MTSIP focus areas was a further step towards implementation of GEAP. The first Gender Equality Action Assembly was held at the Fifth Session of the World Urban Forum in 2010.

The evaluation of the implementation of the MTSIP 2008-2013 in 2012, found that UN-Habitat had taken considerable steps to promote women’s access to security of tenure. The report, Gender Equality for Smart Cities: Challenges and progress published in 2010, was ranked as most read UN-Habitat publication on Scrib.com, a popular social network for publishers. The GLTN had produced innovative tools that were used at the grassroots level to assess land policy in relation to gender equality. The UN-Habitat’s work in access to water and sanitation provisions sought to engage stakeholders in local governments and utility companies to raise awareness on gender equality issues. To ensure climate change and adaption and mitigation methods are gender sensitive, a checklist was tested in vulnerability assessments.

In terms of agency-wide partnerships, UN-Habitat institutionalized relationships with the Huairou Commission and with UNIFEM, now known as UN Women; and UN-Habitat supported the Huairou Commission to develop a women’s online information portal (www.womenhumansettlements.org) to facilitate global exchange of information and learning on issues pertaining to women and human settlements. The portal was launched in 2010.

1.4 UN-Habitat Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements (GPP) 2014-2019

The GPP for 2014-2019 responds to the GC resolution 24/4 of 2013 that requested UN-Habitat to execute two-fold gender strategy comprising of the mainstreaming of gender equality and women’s empowerment in normative and operational programmes, and second, to set up policies and programmes needed to achieve equity and women’s empowerment. The resolution also urged UN-Habitat to align its gender policy and action plan with the UN system-wide Action Plan.

The GPP builds upon the experiences of the former Gender Policies of 1996 and 2002, the Gender Equality Action Plan (2008-2013), the Evaluation of Gender Mainstreaming in UN-Habitat (2011), the Gender Audit Report of UN-Habitat

1.5 UN-Habitat Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) 2014-2019

The GEAP operationalizes the Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements (GPP) 2014-2019 with a comprehensive results framework for each of the seven sub-programmes of UN-Habitat including the Office of the Executive Director. It serves as an accountability framework designed to measure, monitor and drive progress in UN-Habitat towards specific expected accomplishments, indicators of achievement and illustrative actions to achieve gender equality and empowerment of women. The GEAP details institutional arrangements, with specified roles and responsibilities.

The GEAP’s three main goals are:

1) **Programme:** Technical and normative assistance provided to national, regional and local authorities and other stakeholders, so that their policies, plans and programmes achieve clearly articulated, timebound and measurable gender equality and women’s empowerment results in the areas of UN-Habitat’s strategic priorities, identified on the basis of gender analysis, assessed against clear defined baseline data disaggregated by sex and age.

2) **Progress towards internal gender parity at all levels,** and particularly at the P5 levels and above clearly demonstrated, according to the defined United Nations formula, as an objective indicator of organizational commitment to gender equality and women’s rights, and of an organizational culture with the capacity to advance them.

3) Internal institutional arrangements that are fully conducive to the above two objectives increasingly in place, in progressive compliance with the performance standards set out in the System-Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (SWAP).

1.6 Advisory Group on Gender Issues

The UN-Habitat Advisory Group on Gender Issues (AGGI) is an independent advisory body composed of 13 members to the UN-Habitat Executive Director on all issues related to gender equality and women’s empowerment, including gender mainstreaming efforts, in the work of UN-Habitat. Members of AGGI serve in their own capacity for a term of 2 years with a possible extension of 2 more years. It was established in 2012 and has its own mode of operation with an AGGI Secretariat and Chairperson of AGGI and annual work plan to be approved by the UN-Habitat Executive Director. The mission of AGGI, functions, mode of operation, membership, funding and terms and conditions of operation are specified in the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the UN-Habitat Advisory Group on Gender Issues.

2. Mandate and Rationale for the evaluation

In the context of the ongoing reform and restructuring of UN-Habitat, gender equality and gender parity are priorities of the organization. Further, UN-Habitat has recently embarked on its new strategic plan 2020-2023 aimed at effectively advancing transformational changes in sustainable urbanization. This evaluation is therefore mandated by UN-Habitat Management as a corporate evaluation of strategic importance. It will assess how UN-Habitat has mainstreamed gender consideration in its organizational context and programme of work and may contribute to highlighting further actions to be undertaken to promote gender equality and empowerment of women in UN-Habitat. The evaluation also responds to UN-SWAP recommendation to conduct an evaluation of corporate performance on gender mainstreaming every 5-8 years. The last gender mainstreaming evaluation in UN-Habitat was conducted in 2011. The evaluation also implements the recommendation from the UN Women (2015 a) “Review of Corporate Gender Equality Evaluations in the United Nations System.”

3. Purpose and objectives of the Evaluation

The purposes of this corporate evaluation are: (a) to provide UN-Habitat and its key stakeholders with and independent assessment of the implementation of UN-Habitat Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements (GPP) 2014-2019. The evaluation findings will be used for strategic decisions, organizational learning and accountability as well as for (a) the generation of knowledge on what works and what does not work to advance gender mainstreaming in UN-Habitat; (b) feed into UN-Habitat efforts to promote the gender equality in the SDGs and implementation of the New Urban Agenda as well as the Decade of Action announced by the UN Secretary-General; and, (c) inform the revision of the Gender Policy and Plan in line with the new Strategic Plan 2020-2023. The targeted users for the evaluation are the UN-Habitat Executive Board, the UN-Habitat Management and staff, the donors, partners and other key stakeholders. The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

(vii) **Assess progress and achievement on the goal and expected accomplishments of the gender policy and plan for 2014-2019**

(viii) **Assess the relevance of the UN-Habitat gender policy and plan in view of 2014-2019 and looking forward for 2020-2023**
(ix) Assess extent to which UN-Habitat approach towards gender mainstreaming has been effective, efficient, sustainable and impactful on delivery of programmatic results
(x) Assess the institutional arrangements and processes, including the added value of the Advisory Group on Gender Issues as it is presently structured and recommend any amendments to its structure and mandate, for greater impact
(xi) Identify lessons learned, good practices and examples of innovations of the gender mainstreaming work supported by UN-Habitat at global, regional and country levels
(xii) Recommend strategic, programmatic and management considerations for future gender mainstreaming.

4. Scope and focus
The scope of the evaluation is the assessment of UN-Habitat Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements (GPP) 2014-2019 and the GEAP that operationalized the policy and plan, as well as the role and results of the UN-Habitat Advisory Group on Gender issues. The evaluation will cover programmatic issues at global, regional and national based on the GEAP results framework; address institutional arrangements and procedures for gender mainstreaming; and cover organizational architecture, parity, organizational capacity, performance management and coherence with UN SWAP on mainstreaming gender. The evaluation will make use of the annual reports progress on the implementation of the strategic plan, the evaluation report of the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan 2014-2019, and other assessments/evaluation products. It will also consider the new Strategic Plan 2020-2023.

5. Evaluation Questions based on Evaluation Criteria
Overarching evaluation questions, each of which will be operationalized by a series of sub-questions have been identified and are organized around evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and coherence. The following questions will further be expanded upon by the evaluation team:

- **Performance in terms of results achieved:** To what extent has UN-Habitat achieved its goals and expected accomplishments, through illustrative actions and indicators of achievement for gender mainstreaming for the period of 2014-2019?
- **Relevance:** To what extent was the UN-Habitat Gender Policy and Plan 2014-2019 known, understood, accepted and acted upon internally and externally for maximum contribution to gender mainstreaming? To what extent was the GPP aligned with the UN System-wide Action Plan on gender equality and the empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP), thus being relevant to UN system-wide expectations?
- **Efficiency:** How efficiently has UN-Habitat harnessed its resources (financial, human and partnerships) to achieve gender mainstreaming? How clearly aligned has UN-Habitat gender mainstreaming been in terms of clarity and coherence of linkages between agency’s operational and normative work streams at global, regional and country levels and institutional arrangements? What is the added value of the Advisory Group on Gender Issues?
- **Effectiveness:** What transformational changes did the implementation of gender mainstreaming bring? What were the key factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of goals?
- **Sustainability:** What strategic, programmatic, structural and management adjustments should be undertaken to improve performance in the implementation gender mainstreaming in view of the Strategic Plan 2020-2023?
- **Impact:** What changes have occurred as a result of implementation of gender mainstreaming during 2014-2019 that may contribute to the achievement of the SDG 5 and the New Urban Agenda?
- **Coherence:** To what extent did UN-Habitat implement its gender mainstreaming approach in coherence and synergy with other development programmes?

6. Evaluation Approach and Methodology
The evaluation will be based on Theory of Change (TOC) and will outline the results chain and pathways as well as assumptions. The TOC to be described in the inception report should demonstrate how UN-Habitat was supposed to achieve its gender mainstreaming results by describing the causal logic of inputs, activities/actions, expected accomplishments; and conditions and assumptions needed for the causal changes to have taken place. Also, context approach should be used to assess the GPP institutional arrangements, procedures, collaboration, coordination, partnerships and targeted beneficiary needs. It will be based on gender principles and adhere to the United Nations norms and standards for evaluation in the United Nations System. The Results framework of the GEAP 2014-2019 will be used to assess UN-Habitat’s gender mainstreaming is on the right track and whether the proposed actions have achieved the expected achievements. Analysis of application of gender equality principles will be an integral part of this evaluation. The evaluation should employ a mix of approaches and methods in seeking to provide a summative and formative forward-looking assessment, including:

---

• Desk review of relevant policies, resolutions, GGP, GEAP, regional strategic plans, progress performance and monitoring reports and evaluation reports;
• Desk review of relevant policies, resolutions, GGP, GEAP, regional strategic plans, progress performance and monitoring reports and evaluation reports;
• Interviews with various stakeholders, including relevant UN-Habitat staff including Gender Focal Points, CPR/Executive Board members, donors, Advisory Group on Gender Issues and other relevant key UN-Habitat partners;
• Focus group meetings for discussion and validation of evaluation findings;
• Use of surveys and questionnaires in order to obtain quantitative information on stakeholders’ views;
• Direct observation to capture first-hand information on UN-Habitat operational work through field visits, if deemed feasible.

7. Stakeholder Involvement
The evaluation will be a transparent and participatory process involving relevant stakeholders and partners at global, regional and country levels. Stakeholders will be kept informed of the evaluation processes including design, information, collection and evaluation reporting and results dissemination to create a positive attitude towards the evaluation and enhance its credibility, quality and utility. Key stakeholders will be given opportunity to comment on evaluation deliverables. Key stakeholders to be involved will include UN-Habitat staff, governing bodies including the Executive Board, Committee of Permanent Representative (CPR), donors, other relevant Habitat partners, and beneficiaries of UN-Habitat programmes and projects.

8. Management and Conduct of the Evaluation
The Independent Evaluation Unit will manage the evaluation process; ensuring that the evaluation is conducted by a suitable evaluator; providing technical support and advice on methodology; explaining evaluation standards and ensuring they are respected; ensuring contractual requirements are met; approving all deliverables (i.e., TOR, inception report; draft and final evaluation reports); sharing the evaluation results; supporting use and follow-up of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations.

An evaluation consultative arrangement will be put in place to maximize the quality, credibility, and utility of the evaluation in the form of an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG). The ERG will comprise of internal and external members, including representatives of Global Solutions Division; Strategy, Planning, Knowledge, Advocacy and Communications Division; and Regional Programmes Division. External members will include representatives of donors and AGGI. The Reference Group will be responsible for reviewing and endorsing main evaluation deliverables including the TOR, inception report, drafts and final evaluation report. In addition to being presented in the ERG, the Social Inclusion Section will provide documentation as required.

The evaluation will be conducted by an independent external consultant. The consultant must have proven and extensive experience in carrying out institutional, programme and project evaluations and have working experience on gender issues. He/she should have solid knowledge of UN-Habitat.

9. Qualifications and Experience of the Evaluator
Education: Advanced academic degree in international development, public administration, development economics, governance, project management or related fields.

Work experience and other requirements
• A minimum of eight years of professional practical experience in results-based management working with projects/programmes, specifically in organizational development and change management processes, including the ability to present credible findings derived from evidence and putting conclusions and recommendations supported by findings is required.
• Experience in project evaluation work for different organizations, including gender and human rights is desirable.
• Familiarity goals of United Nations and UN-Habitat’s mandate, knowledge of gender mainstreaming and capacity building is an asset.

Language: Fluency in oral and written English is required.

10. Work Schedule
The evaluation will be conducted over a period of three months from May to July 2020. A negotiated lumpsum will be paid upon satisfactory delivery of specified deliverables. The evaluator is expected to prepare a detailed work plan within the inception report that will operationalize the evaluation. Below is the provisional time schedule for the evaluation. The proposed time schedule will be discussed with the evaluation team and refined in the inception report.

11. Proposed Time Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development of Evaluation TOR</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Call for expression of interest and recruitment of consultant  X  X  X  X

Review of background documents  X  X  

Preparation and approval of inception report with work plan and methodology of work  X  

Data collection including document reviews, interviews, consultations and group meetings  X  X  

Analysis of evaluation findings, commence draft report writing and briefings to UN-Habitat  X  X  

Presentation of preliminary findings on results  X  X  

Draft Evaluation Report  


Delivery of Final Evaluation Report, including all results and overall Project evaluation  X  

12. **Key Deliverables**

Working under the direction of the Chief, Independent Evaluation Unit, the consultant for this Evaluation will deliver three outputs:

(i) **Inception Report.** Review of relevant documents including TOR and develop a full informed inception report, detailing how the evaluation is to be conducted, what is to be delivered and when. The inception report should include evaluation purpose and objectives, scope and focus, Theory of Change, evaluation issues and tailored questions, methodology, evaluation work plan and deliverables. Once approved, it will become the key management document for the evaluation, guiding the evaluation delivery in accordance with UN-Habitat’s expectations. The inception report should include:

- Context of evaluation
- Purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation
- Theory of Change
- Approach and Methodology for the evaluation
- Evaluation Questions
- Data collection and analysis methods
- Stakeholder mapping
- Consultation arrangements to maximize the relevance, credibility, quality and uptake of the evaluation
- Work plan and timelines of evaluation

(ii) **Draft evaluation report(s).** Draft evaluation report(s) to be reviewed and endorsed the Evaluation Reference Group. It should contain an executive summary that can act as standalone document. The executive summary should include an overview of what is evaluated, purpose and objectives of the evaluation and intended audience, the evaluation methodology, most important findings and main recommendations.

(iii) **Final evaluation report** should not exceed 50 pages (including Executive Summary but excluding the Annexes). In general, the report should be technically easy to comprehend for non-specialists, containing detailed evaluation findings, lessons learned and recommendations.

The Independent Evaluation Unit reserves the right to ensure the quality of the evaluation deliverables submitted by the external consultant and will request revisions until the products meet the quality standards.

The ultimate result of this assignment is an evaluation report providing member states, partners, UN-Habitat and other stakeholders with an independent appraisal of the performance of UN-Habitat’s Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women in Urban Development and Human Settlements (2014-2019).

13. **Resources and Payment**

The evaluation consultant will be paid a professional evaluation fee based on the level of expertise and experience. No travel is foreseen for this evaluation – all interviews are expected to be conducted remotely. However, if any travel is conducted, travel costs will be covered by UN-Habitat and Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) will be paid based on UN terms and conditions for consultants.
Annex 2: List of persons interviewed and consulted

92 requests for interviews were made, most directly, and a small number via country office staff. 60 people were interviewed in 58 interview sessions. Translations were provided by country office staff in Iraq and Bolivia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sri Sofjan</td>
<td>Huairou Commission</td>
<td>AGGI member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jan Peterson</td>
<td>Huairou Commission; National Congress of Neighborhood Women</td>
<td>Chair Huairou Commission; AGGI member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bernadia Irawati Tjandradewi</td>
<td>United Cities and Local Government Asia Pacific Region</td>
<td>Secretary General; AGGI member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Katherine Kline</td>
<td>General Assembly of Partners (GAP)</td>
<td>Co-Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sonia Dias</td>
<td>Women in Informal Organisation: Globalising and Organising (WEIGO)</td>
<td>Solid Waste Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nayoka Martinez-Backstrom</td>
<td>SIDA, Sweden</td>
<td>Program Manager/Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sandeep Chachra</td>
<td>Action Aid; World Urban Campaign</td>
<td>Co-Chair World Urban Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Olenka Ochoa</td>
<td>Federacion de Mujeres Municipalistas de America Latina y element Caribe</td>
<td>Previous municipal official; Sustainable Urban Development Practitioner/Activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Magdalena Garcia</td>
<td>Budete-MIRA Mexico; UN-Habitat Global Multi Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAGE)</td>
<td>SAGE member; Sustainable Urban Development Practitioner/Activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Susana Pantoja</td>
<td>Directora Dirección de Seguridad Ciudadana Gobierno Autónomo Municipal de Tarija (Bolivia)</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bernarda Sarue</td>
<td>Directora Ejecutiva de Asociación de Concejalas de Bolivia</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Patricia Cortes</td>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>Previously Secretary to the UN Women Focal Point for Habitat III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Laura Capobianco</td>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor, Safe Public Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ifrah Barre</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Somalia JPLG programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Abdul Haq Niazi</td>
<td>Today's Afghanistan Conciliation Trust Organization (TACT-O)</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Neil Khor</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Special Advisor to the Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Christine Knudsen</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Director External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Raf Tuts</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Director Global Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Rong Yang (HQ)</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Officer-in-Charge, Regional Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Shipra Narang-Suri</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Officer-in-Charge, Urban Practices Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Trang Nguyen</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Capacity Development and Training Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Pacome Kossy</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Officer-in-Charge, Strategic Planning Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Robert Ndugwa</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Officer-in-Charge, Data and Analytic Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Asnath Omwega</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Programme Monitoring Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Lucia Kiwala</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Officer-in-Charge, Partnerships &amp; Local Government Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Angela Mwai</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Officer-in-Charge, Human Rights and Social Inclusion Section. Gender Equality Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. David Thomas</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ex UNH Gender Equality Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Claudia Scheufler</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ex UNH Gender Equality Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Haris Pajtic</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Officer-in-Charge, Human Resources and Training Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Kerstin Sommer</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Programme Manager, Participatory Slum Upgrading Programme (PSUP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Hezekiah Pireh Otieno</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>WASH Expert, Urban Basic Services Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remy Sietchiping</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Officer-in-Charge, Policy, Legislation and Governance Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia Anderson</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Programme Manager, Public Space Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juma Assiago</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Nairobi</td>
<td>Specialist, Safer Cities Programme. Human Rights and Social Inclusion Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwendoline Mennetrier</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Kosovo Office</td>
<td>Chief Technical Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernhard Barth</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Asia &amp; Pacific Regional Office</td>
<td>Regional Gender Focal Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutinta A. Munyati</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Africa Regional Office</td>
<td>Regional Gender Focal Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salma Mustafa</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Arab States Regional Office</td>
<td>Regional Gender Focal Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkin Valasquez</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Latin America Regional Office</td>
<td>Regional Director; Regional Gender Focal Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noorullah Farajid</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Afghanistan</td>
<td>Team Leader, KMUc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Adam</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Somalia Office</td>
<td>Country Gender Focal Point; Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anosha Ejlasi</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Afghanistan</td>
<td>Senior Gender Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Yuko Otsuki</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Iraq Country Office</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Iraq Country Programme and Head of Kurdistan Region of Iraq Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Suarez</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Iraq Country Office</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Soave</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Iraq Country Office</td>
<td>Country Gender Focal Point; M&amp;E Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mohammed Hammady</td>
<td>Caritas Chez Republic, Iraq</td>
<td>Head of Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. Jihan Dado</td>
<td>Hamdaniya Municipality, Iraq</td>
<td>Head of projects department (Engineer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khluood Al-Hussein</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Iraq Country Office</td>
<td>Legal Advisor on Land, HLP support programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio Blanco Ania</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Boliva Country Office</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escarley Torrico</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Boliva Country Office</td>
<td>Country Gender Focal Point; Gender and inclusion specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisol Soto</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Bolivia Country Office</td>
<td>Habitat and Housing Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild do Rosario</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Mozambique Country Office</td>
<td>Head of Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Guambe</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Mozambique Country Office</td>
<td>Country Gender Focal Point; Urban Resilience Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Ferreiro</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Mozambique Country Office</td>
<td>DRR Specialist &amp; Team Leader for Safer Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Meza</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Mexico Country Office</td>
<td>Country Gender Focal Point; Programme Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joaquin Guillemí</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Mexico Country Office</td>
<td>Programme Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanuja Dharmasena</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Sri Lanka Country Office</td>
<td>Country Gender Focal Point; Gender and Environment Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salma Mousallem</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Egypt Country Office</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farida El Kattan</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Egypt Country Office</td>
<td>Country Gender Focal Point; Assistant Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amira Badran</td>
<td>UN-Habitat Egypt Country Office</td>
<td>Programme associate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex 4: Survey questionnaire

Two surveys were administered: one for partners and stakeholders and another for staff. The two survey instruments comprised the same set of questions, with the staff survey containing an additional section related to issues of internal gender parity and initiatives to address gender bias in work and recruitment. Partners and stakeholders at national/local and international levels were also directed to different question sets in the main questionnaire.

Introduction

UN-Habitat Staff survey on gender equality and empowerment of women

Dear UN-Habitat staff member

We are conducting an evaluation of our Gender Policy and Action Plan. This survey is being used to collect data on how gender equality and empowerment of women have been prioritised over the period 2014-2019.

We are interested in your personal experiences internally (as a staff member). We would like to hear if internal practices, programmes and policies are becoming more relevant to, and inclusive of women at all levels within UN-Habitat.

We are also interested in the extent to which, in your experience, UN-Habitat has managed to increase the focus on gender equality and the empowerment of women in its programmes and projects, and among its partners in all countries. In other words, does UN-Habitat’s work help to improve the lives of women?

The evaluation is being conducted by an independent evaluator. Your responses will be anonymous and will be analysed by the independent team in full confidence. We will use your feedback to grow gender responsiveness across UN-Habitat, and would greatly appreciate your frank and thoughtful inputs.

We would greatly appreciate your time. The survey should take about 20 minutes to complete.

Thank you

1. Your gender:
   - Female
   - Male
   - Transgender
   - Other
   - I would rather not answer

2. Age:
   - Under 25 years
   - 26 to 35 years
   - 36 to 45 years
   - 46 to 55 years
   - Above 55 years

3. At what level are you currently employed in UN-Habitat (drop down)
   - General Service and Related
   - National Professional Officer
   - Field Service
   - P2-P3
   - P4-P5
   - D1-2
   - Other (please specify)

4. Where have you primarily worked in the last five years? (Please select as many as apply)
   - UN-Habitat Head Headquarters (Nairobi)
   - UN-Habitat New York Liaison Office
   - UN-Habitat Brussels Liaison Office
   - UN-Habitat Geneva Liaison Office
   - Regional office - Africa
   - Regional office - Asia and the Pacific
   - Regional office - Arab States
Regional office - Latin America and the Caribbean  
A UN-Habitat Country Office  
Other (please specify)

5. Please select the country in which you are currently based
(drop down menu of all countries where UN-Habitat works)

6. During the period 2014-2019, which were your major work areas? (Please select those where you spent significant time)
   - Functions falling under the Office of the Executive Director
   - Programme coordination and Implementation, Monitoring & Reporting, Gender Coordination and Support
   - Operations, Donor Relations & Income Management, Project Administration, Finance & Budget, Quality Assurance, Legal Office, Knowledge Management Support, ICT Support
   - External Relations, Partners and Inter-Agency relations, Advocacy, Outreach & Communications, Liaison
   - Urban Legislation, Land and Governance
   - Urban Planning and Design
   - Urban Economy
   - Urban Basic Services
   - Housing and Slum Upgrading
   - Risk Reduction and Rehabilitation
   - Research and Capacity Building
   - Other (please specify)

Internal gender equity

The Gender Policy and Action Plan aims to achieve gender parity at all levels within UN-Habitat, particularly 'at the P5 levels and above'.

7. Are you aware of any initiatives to address gender parity in recruitment?
   - Yes  
   - No

8. Are you aware of any initiatives to address 'gender bias' or 'blindness' at work?
   - Yes  
   - No

9. How would you describe the level of internal equity in terms of decision-making in management in your branch/unit/office in 2020?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women have more influence or power than men</th>
<th>Women and men have equal influence</th>
<th>Women have less influence than men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Has internal equity in decision-making increased or decreased within the branch/unit/office during the period 2014-2019?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women’s influence has increased</th>
<th>Women’s influence has stayed the same</th>
<th>Women’s influence has decreased</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What do you see as barriers to achieving greater internal parity in supervisory and management levels? (select all that apply)
   - NONE - There are no barriers to gender parity at senior levels (please do not select other options if you choose this one)
   - There are few women with appropriate skills
   - There is bias in appointments or promotions
   - This is not a priority for managers
   - Women may occupy positions but have little influence over decisions
   - Other (please specify)
12. What could UN-Habitat do to improve its management of and performance around gender parity, equality and women’s empowerment within UN-Habitat?

**Capacity building for gender equity**

13. Capacity building that included gender equality and empowerment of women: Between 2014-2019 I attended/received the following: (select all that apply).
- Mandatory UN-Habitat or UN training on gender.
- Other training that included gender equality and empowerment of women.
- Global Urban Lectures that include a specific focus on gender issues.
- Coursework or lectures via the Habitat UNI Gender Hub.
- Tools, manuals or guidelines with a specific gender focus.
- Technical assistance inputs or placements on gender.
- Support from experts/consultants on gender equality and women’s empowerment.
- None (please do not make any other selection).
- Other (please specify).

14. Did the capacity building support improve your ability to contribute to, implement and/or lead gender equity practices at UN-Habitat?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Building Activity</th>
<th>Yes, a lot</th>
<th>Yes, a little</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>n/a (No gender capacity building received)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT or REVISE guidelines or standard operating procedures to better address gender issues inside UN-Habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPLEMENT OR MONITOR guidelines, standard operating procedures to better address gender issues inside UN-Habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support RECRUITMENT, retention or talent management to improve gender balance in UN-Habitat staffing at all levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide on-the-job SUPPORT and/or address any concerns around gender equity among staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other: How else has capacity building enhanced your role in support of gender equity?

15. Did the capacity building support improve your ability to implement and lead gender-focused UN-Habitat programming?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Building Activity</th>
<th>Yes, a lot</th>
<th>Yes, a little</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I do not work in programme delivery</th>
<th>n/a (No gender capacity building received)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft or revise POLICY of target countries or city to include gender issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake RESEARCH or DATA COLLECTION that highlights gender differences globally, or in target countries or cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPLEMENT programmes or projects on the ground taking account of gender differences Ensure meaningful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN in programmes and projects in target countries or cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. CAPACITY BUILDING THAT INCLUDED GENDER EQUALITY AND EMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN: Between 2014-2019 I delivered or prepared materials for the following capacity building: (select all that apply).
- Mandatory UN-Habitat or UN training on gender.
- Other training that included gender equality and empowerment of women.
- Global Urban Lectures that include a specific focus on gender issues.
- Coursework or lectures via the Habitat UNI Gender Hub.
- Tools, manuals or guidelines with a specific gender focus.
- Technical assistance inputs or placements on gender.
- None - I do not provide training or formal capacity inputs (please do not make any other selection).
- Other (please specify).
17. Which of the following topics were included in the capacity building interventions you were involved in delivering? (please select all that apply)
   - How to improve the gender focus or content of existing capacity building interventions
   - How to improve the gender focus or content of projects and programmes
   - Monitoring of urban conditions and trends that affect women
   - Collection of sex disaggregated data
   - How gender equality and empowerment of women are a necessary part of sustainable urbanisation
   - Country or local level technical assistance that included a focus on gender equality and empowerment of women
   - Other (please specify)

**UN-Habitat gender focus in programming and implementation**

18. To what extent do you think senior management actively champions gender integration into programming and/or internal processes?

   Senior management ....
   - are strong champions for gender in BOTH programming and internal equity
   - champions gender in PROGRAMMING, but not in internal equity
   - champions gender in INTERNAL equity, but not in programming
   - does NOT champion gender
   - UNDERMINES gender focus
   - I don’t know

19. How effective do you think the role of Gender Focal Points has been in supporting integration of gender into programming?

   - Highly effective
   - Somewhat effective
   - Little effect
   - Not effective
   - I have never heard of Gender Focal Points
   - I don’t know

20. Has the Gender Marker been an effective tool in improving the levels of focus on equality and women’s empowerment in UN-Habitat projects and programmes?

   - Yes
   - No
   - I don’t know
   - I have not heard of the Gender Marker
   - n/a

21. REGIONAL VARIATION IN GENDER-FOCUS: How well do different UN-Habitat programmes and project, (e.g. global programmes or the new Flagship programmes) ensure that women benefit across all interventions?

   - All programmes and projects implemented at country level consciously ensure benefit for women
   - Most programmes and projects implemented at country level ensure benefit for women
   - A few programmes and projects implemented at country level ensure benefit for women
   - None of the programmes and projects implemented at country level ensure benefit
   - I don’t know
   - I do not work in programmes and projects implemented at country level

22. Do you also have specific country experience?

   - Yes
   - No

23. Please select the country / countries in which you spend most or all of your time, where 1 represents most time. Countries in which you have not worked significantly should be left blank. This ranking will be used in the next question

   - Afghanistan
   - Andean Countries
   - Angola
   - Argentina
   - Bangladesh
   - Bolivia
   - Botswana
   - Burkina Faso
   - Cabo Verde
   - Cambodia
   - Cameroon
   - Chad
   - Chile
   - China
   - Commonwealth of Independent States
   - Comoros
   - Cuba
24. If you selected 'other' for a country above please state which country this is, and its ranking, where 1 is most time.

25. ARE UN-HABITAT PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS GENDER-FOCUSED: Using the 3 countries above in which you have spent most professional time, how well do your UN-Habitat programmes and projects in this/these country/countries ensure that women benefit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Thoroughly All programming ensures benefit for women</th>
<th>Quite well Most programming ensures benefit for women</th>
<th>Somewhat A few cases of programming ensure benefit for women</th>
<th>It does not None of the programming ensures benefit for women</th>
<th>don't know</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country 1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. In answering the more in-depth questions about programming and programme outcome that follow, which level do you have most experience at? Please note that all the questions below should be answered through this lens.

- Global level
- Regional level - Africa
- Regional level - Asia and the Pacific
- Regional level - Arab States
- Regional level - Latin America and the Caribbean
- National level (your primary country as selected above)
- None - I do not work in implementation or programme delivery
- Other (please specify the level and/or region or country for which you would like to evaluate UN-Habitat programming for gender)

27. MONITORING OF PROGRAMME AND PROJECT RESULTS IN 2014-2019: In your experiences, have good/effective practices for achieving gender equality and empowerment of women in target communities been monitored?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know
- I am not involved in planning, monitoring or evaluation

28. How well does programme and project monitoring separate information about women and men?

- Sufficiently - Most of the important indicators show data for women and men
- More disaggregation is needed - There is some disaggregation, but not enough
- There are no separate data for women and men
- I don’t know

29. USE OF DATA IN PLANNING: What are your most useful data sources for planning or designing programmes and projects that highlight gender differences?
30. Have UN-Habitat documents on programme and project design, planning, guidance and monitoring documents changed in their inclusion of gender equality and empowerment of women in the period 2014 to 2019?
   - Programming documentation has **more emphasis on gender equality** than before
   - Programming documentation has **remained the same in its emphasis on gender equality**
   - Programming documentation has **less emphasis on gender equality**
   - I don’t know

31. Has UN-Habitat advocacy, media and partner communications changed in terms of awareness and promotion of gender issues in sustainable urban development?
   - Advocacy and communication have more emphasis on gender equality than before
   - Advocacy and communication have **remained the same** in their emphasis on gender equality
   - Advocacy and communication have **less emphasis** on gender equality than before
   - I don’t know

32. Has awareness among UN-Habitat partners about gender equality and empowerment of women as a necessary part of sustainable urban development changed during the period 2014 - 2019?
   - Partner awareness about gender has **increased**
   - Partner awareness about gender has **remained the same**
   - Partner awareness about gender has **decreased**
   - I don’t know

33. **BETTER POLICIES FOR WOMEN:** In your experience, have urban policy or legislation covering human settlements improved to better meet the needs of women over the period of 2014 to 2019?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National or subnational policy</th>
<th>Great improvement Policies/legislation now benefit women</th>
<th>Some improvement Policies/legislation now benefit women slightly more than before</th>
<th>No change Policies/legislation have not changed</th>
<th>Become worse Policies/legislation now benefit women less than before</th>
<th>I Don’t Know</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. **OFFICIALS UNDERSTAND AND ACT FOR GENDER:** In your experience, how well do government officials actively implement programmes and projects for women’s empowerment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National or subnational officials</th>
<th>Very well Government authorities actively pursue benefits for women in all implementation</th>
<th>Quite well Authorities often pursue benefits for women</th>
<th>Not very well Most authorities do not consider gender in their implementation</th>
<th>Not at all Government authorities disregard the needs of women</th>
<th>I Don’t Know</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. **MEANINGFUL INVOLVEMENT OF WOMEN:** In your experience, how are women involved in UN-Habitat programmes and projects for sustainable urban development?
   - LEADERSHIP LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT - Women in target areas design, lead and implement interventions or policy revision
   - INFLUENCE AND PARTICIPATION - Women in targets areas participate in and influence interventions or policy revision
   - CONSULTED - Women in targets areas are consulted before decisions on policy or interventions are taken
   - INFORMED - Women in targets areas are informed of policy or interventions in their areas
   - BENEFICIARIES ONLY - Women in targets areas may benefit, but are not informed, involved or participants in any way
   - n/a
   - I don’t know
36. IMPACT ON WOMEN'S LIVES in UN-Habitat programme and project target cities between 2014 and 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Major improvement</th>
<th>Some improvement</th>
<th>It has stayed the same</th>
<th>Worsened</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TENURE: Has security of tenure and/or access to land improved for women?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVELIHOODS: Has women’s access to livelihoods and employment improved?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING AND DESIGN: Has women’s access to integrated, compact and connected cities and neighbourhoods improved?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC SERVICES: Has access to basic services (e.g. water, sanitation, waste management, transport, energy) for poor urban women improved?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADEQUATE HOUSING IN SLUMS: Do women who live in slum areas have more access to adequate housing than before (e.g. affordable, culturally suitable, accessible, structurally sound, with secure tenure)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISASTER RESPONSE: Where disasters have occurred (e.g. fire, flood, disease, natural disasters) have recovery responses improved in terms of addressing the needs of women? (please use n/a if you have not had a disaster in this time)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. What are the obstacles to increasing gender equality and women’s empowerment in national and city programmes and projects?

38. Are you aware of UN-Habitat’s participation in global forums, such as the UN or World Urban Forum?
   - Yes
   - No

39. In global forums how vocal is UN-Habitat with regards to gender equity and women’s empowerment in sustainable urban development?
   - Very vocal - They raise gender concerns at all events
   - Quite vocal - They sometimes raise gender concerns
   - Occasionally vocal
   - Not vocal - They do not raise gender concerns
   - I don’t know
   - n/a

40. INFLUENCING ATTITUDES IN GLOBAL FORUMS: Do you think that UN-Habitat’s contribution has led to changed attitudes around gender equality and women’s empowerment in these global forums?
   - Yes - I have seen substantial change in attitudes through UN-Habitat advocacy
   - Somewhat - I have seen some shift in attitudes as a result of UN-Habitat advocacy
   - No - I have not seen evidence of changed attitudes as a result of UN-Habitat’s advocacy
   - I don’t know
   - n/a

41. Are you familiar with these UN-Habitat reports? (Please select all that apply)
   - City Prosperity Index
   - World Cities Report
   - Global Urban Indicators Database
   - Regional or Urban/Cities Report
   - SDG 11 Progress Reports
   - Urban Data Digests
   - None of the above (please do not select any of the above if you choose this)

42. How well do these reports separate information about women and men?
   - Sufficiently - Most of the important indicators show data for women and men
   - More disaggregation is needed. There is some disaggregation, but not enough
   - There are no separate data for women and men
   - I don’t know

43. What could UN-Habitat do to improve its influence and performance around gender equality and women’s empowerment in its projects and programmes in target communities?

Thank you for your participation in this survey. We greatly appreciate your time, insights and participation.
Annex 4: Detailed Survey Data respondents and sample details

Two surveys were conducted, one targeting partners and another for staff, with similar or identical capacity building, outcomes and impact questions. In addition to these staff were asked internally relevant questions about gender institutionalization, parity and equity within UN-Habitat.

**Data presentation:** The key distinction in the survey data presented is whether results came from the staff or partners’ survey, or combine both sources. For ready reference

- Staff-only data are shown in blue (backgrounds, data points or outlines)
- Partners data are shown in red (backgrounds, data points or outlines)
- Combination graphics are backgrounded in purple.

**Respondent gender and age distribution:** A total of 149 partners responded with almost equal numbers of male and female respondents. No-one selected non-binary or transgender categories. In contrast, UN-Habitat twice the number of female as opposed to male staff responded to the survey. Age distribution was fairly even for partners, although there were fewer younger participants. In contrast, the staff respondent group was younger.

**Language:** The survey was offered in five languages, although the primary design was in English. Other languages were produced through SurveyMonkey translation, and only Arabic thoroughly reviewed for translation. Most responses were received in English, and the next highest number of respondents (32%) used the English version. 29 people only completed the first question, and left most of the survey incomplete. They came from across all language groups in approximately the same proportions as those shown in the pie chart.

**Partners responses by level:** The survey identified whether respondents’ professional landscape was global, national or local. Over half of responses were local level partners, suggesting strong relationships and engagement on the ground.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners’ level of involvement</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local level: Local or city government or municipal official, non-profit NGO, CBO, network or women’s group; city academic institution; local or city business; locally engaged individual</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National level: National government, non-profit NGO; network or women’s group; academic institution; private sector; individual.</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International level: Partner UN agency; international bilateral agency; international NGO, network or women’s group; private sector; philanthropist; individual</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff employment levels and functional work areas:** The figure alongside shows the level of employment of staff respondents. In line with UN-Habitat’s system for substantial delivery through contracts, the highest proportion (29%) of responses were received from this group. Work areas were divided into 12 categories. An exceptional response was received from Urban Planning and Design, and good responses also from Programming, Gender Coordination and M&E.
Country experience and representation: Staff with experience in Africa responded most, followed by staff working in Arab States and Asia and the Pacific. The Arab States region produced by far the most partner responses, largely due to an exceptional number of people contributing from Syria, while partner responses from Africa were among the lowest. Both staff and partners in Latin America and Eastern Europe\textsuperscript{135} were among the lowest response rates, although partners from Bolivia responded in reasonable numbers.

Country representation: Staff listed their country experience, giving a total of 45 countries. Partners each gave their primary country of operation, and apart from the six who worked globally, 26 countries were represented by partner survey respondents.

Table 11. Country experience of survey respondents
Fifty three staff (several countries) and 121 partners (primary country only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Staff (n=51)</th>
<th>Partners (n=121)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>29 (52%)</td>
<td>19 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>26 (49%)</td>
<td>27 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>5 (9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth of Independent States</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab States</td>
<td>26 (49%)</td>
<td>27 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Palestine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{135} No regional language was provided for Eastern European partners
**Partner Affiliation:** Respondents were asked to show their affiliations. 16% of respondents had more than one affiliation. Most respondents came from local government, and approximately equal numbers from national government and local NGOs.

**Financial contributors:** Sixty one respondents (41%) stated that their organisation/s contributed financially to UN-Habitat programmes. International partners and UN partners were major contributors. 37% of government and 39% of non-profits provided financial contributions. Within these, it is interesting to note that a substantial proportion are local partners, with 32% of all local level respondents stating that they contributed financially, drawn from government, non-profit and private sectors at this level. Contributions by government and NPOs at national level suggest sustainability and engagement. Internationally, all except private sector responses had high rates of financial contribution, although very small sample sizes for some of these sectors make this inconclusive.

Respondents’ organisations that contribute financially to UN-Habitat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Financial Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International (n=25)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National (n=42)</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (n=65)</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level not stated (n=16)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>41%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: Gender parity figures

The graphs below show the actual numbers of male and female staff as well as the percentage increase or decrease in the number of female staff at the different levels.