

Gender Scorecard

Narrative Report

UNCT Zimbabwe
Performance Indicators for
Gender Equality and
Women's Empowerment

November 2011



Andrea Lee Esser, PhD
and
Sunungurai Dominica
Chingarande, PhD

Table of Contents

I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	3
II. METHODOLOGY	3
III. FINDINGS	4
STRENGTHS	5
WEAKNESSES	6
IV. STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP	7
#1 APPOINT GFPs IN ALL TGs	7
#2 STRENGTHEN GTG	7
#3 IMPLEMENT AND MONITOR GRBS	8
#4 PILOT GM IN PLANNING STAGE OF ALL JOINT PROGRAMS	9
#5 IMPROVE GM PERFORMANCE ON KEY UNCT M AND E PROCESSES	9
#6 ENGAGE GENDER CSOs AND DONORS	10
#7 IMPROVE QUALITY CONTROL	11
#8 DEVELOP UNCT CAPACITIES TO FOSTER GE/WE	11
#9 OPERATIONALIZE GENDER MAINSTREAMING	12
RECOMMENDATIONS BY SCORECARD DIMENSION AREA	13
ANNEX A - UNCT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT	14
ANNEX B - ZUNDAF 2007-2011 AND 2012-2015 OUTPUTS, INDICATORS AND BASELINES	32
GENDER EQUALITY IN ZUNDAF OUTPUTS	32
INDICATORS TO TRACK ZUNDAF RESULTS ARE GENDER-SENSITIVE	33
BASELINES ARE GENDER-SENSITIVE	34
ANNEX C - ZUNDAF BUDGET DELIVERY – 2010	35
ANNEX D - PERSONS CONSULTED FOR GENDER SCORECARD ASSESSMENT	36
INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS - UNCT PERSONNEL	36
EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS – GOVERNMENT, DONOR AND CSO	36
PARTICIPANTS - GENDER SCORECARD DEBRIEFING - 11 NOVEMBER 2011	37

I. Background and Context

The Gender Scorecard is a standardized rapid assessment of the effectiveness of UNCT gender mainstreaming processes. The Scorecard is focused on the performance of the UNCT as a whole, rather than the achievements of any one agency. By focusing on gender mainstreaming processes at the highest level, the tool highlights the growing importance of UNCT collaboration and coordination to achieve common goals.

The key objectives of the exercise, as outlined in the “UNCT Performance Indicators for Gender Equality Users’ Guide” (2008) and as conducted in Zimbabwe, were to:

- Assist the UNCT to assess the status of gender mainstreaming performance against minimum standards;
- Identify successes and best practices toward fostering gender equality;
- Highlight shortcomings and challenges with achieving gender equality;
- Encourage stakeholder dialogue and deepen understanding of the value of gender equality results; and
- Outline steps to facilitate a more comprehensive mainstreaming approach among UN and partner agencies.

The Scorecard was conducted in Zimbabwe in late 2011 at the close of the 2007-2011 ZUNDAF cycle. Although the 2012-2015 ZUNDAF was freshly finalized at the time of the consultancy, it was agreed that the assessment would be for the 2007-2011 cycle, following the logic that it was not possible to assess the new ZUNDAF on the basis of planning alone. At the time of this exercise, the UNCT was in the process of transitioning its humanitarian operation into a recovery program that interlinked with on-going development operations under the ZUNDAF. This added a level of contextual complexity, but it also provided new opportunities for mainstreaming gender into processes as highlighted in the recommendations.

II. Methodology

The Scorecard methodology measures gender mainstreaming in UNCT operational processes across eight overarching dimensions. The method explicitly evaluates processes, rather than results, based on the logic that the UNCT may be held accountable for its processes, while achievement of gender equality results is a collective effort that depends on numerous actors and external variables that are beyond the scope of the tool.

The Gender Scorecard works within eight overarching areas of inquiry that encompass 22 indicators to present a holistic measure of gender mainstreaming. The eight dimensions center on planning, programming, partnerships, UNCT capacities, decision-making, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation, and accountability.

A senior level national and international consultant worked together over a 10-day period in November 2011 to complete the Scorecard exercise with support from the RCO and Gender Theme Group (GTG). The consultants relied on both primary and secondary data to inform their assessment. Following a review of key background documents, the consultants facilitated a combination of interviews and participatory group meetings to engage key players from

the UN, government and other partner agencies to critically assess the status of UNCT gender mainstreaming processes. Methods employed included interviews, focus groups and participatory workshops. Stakeholders offering input included key representatives from the UNCT, Government Agencies, CSO and Donors¹.

Using this methodology, consultants were able to view UNCT gender mainstreaming processes through the eyes of various players, thereby combining both insider and outsider perspectives in their assessment. Consultants assigned a numerical ranking to each indicator in accordance with the criteria prescribed by the Scorecard. Details on ranking, evidence and explanations by indicator are included in Annex A. Average scores in each dimension were calculated by combining indicator scores and dividing by the total number of indicators.

Difficulties encountered with implementing the methodology centered on coordination. There were challenges in securing access to key stakeholders within a tight timing window. Access issues were solved creatively by using representative sampling of key groups and adjusting and readjusting schedules daily. The availability of two consultants allowed for some interviews and meetings to be scheduled concurrently. There were some communication and coordination issues between the three groups that had a special role to play in facilitating the consultancy: RCO, UNFPA and UN Women. This occurred despite the fact that roles were quite clearly defined on paper. Ultimately, issues were managed and the consultants were able to meet their terms of reference, but smoother operations would have helped to facilitate the process more effectively.

Findings and preliminary recommendations were presented for feedback and discussion to representatives from the Gender Theme Group. This was followed by a formal debriefing that was attended by representatives from UNCT (see Annex D). Presentations and discussions around scorecard results were designed to move beyond the scores to facilitate a deeper understanding of strengths and weaknesses, and how to move forward.

III. Findings

The findings presented below reflect the average score in each dimension. Dimensions had between 1-5 indicators, so in some cases, average scores can conceal variability within dimensions. For full explanation and rating on each indicator, refer to Annex A.

Dimension	Average score
1 Planning	3.4
2 Programming	4.4
3 Partnerships	3.3
4 UNCT capacities	3
5 Decision-making	4.5
6 Budgeting	1.5
7 Monitoring and evaluation	2
8 Quality control and accountability	2

¹ See Annex D for full list of stakeholders consulted.

Strengths

Decision-making. The high average score of 4.5 is a result of the fact that the Coordinator of the Gender Theme Group is the UNFPA Representative who can bring key gender issues to the attention of the UNCT for support. Furthermore, there is good evidence that gender issues are regularly discussed at HOA meetings due to the efforts of multiple Representatives (notably, UNFPA, UNDP, UNICEF and UN Women) to bring forth issues. The addition of UN Women as a full-fledged UN Agency has helped to make issues more visible at the highest levels of leadership within the UNCT.

Programming. The UNCT scored a 4.4, above the minimum standards level on programming, due to sound performance in joint initiatives to support gender equality and strong support for national gender equality priorities². While a joint program to address key gender issues is not yet developed, there are clear plans in place for the development of a flagship GBV joint program. Despite good results against indicators as laid out in the Scorecard methodology, gender equality programming has been limited by weaknesses in other key areas including budgeting, monitoring and evaluation and quality control, as outlined below.

Planning. The average score of 3.4 indicates that there is room for improvement in the planning process for deeper gender integration. The score reflects a good analysis of the country context related to gender equality and women's empowerment, and good results in addressing gender issues at the levels of outcomes and outputs. However, the score is lowered by inadequate gender sensitivity at the level of outcome indicators. Baseline data is also poorly disaggregated, despite significant improvements in the availability of disaggregated national level data.

One of the six 2007-2011 ZUNDAF outcomes centers on gender equality, and efforts have been made to mainstream gender in other outcome areas, although there remains a need for more systematic inclusion of gender as a cross-cutting theme during the planning process. Annex B provides detailed data on findings by outcome area, but key points are outlined below:

- **Outputs – 41 percent.** 23 out of 56 outputs are gender-sensitive. This meets minimum standards of 33 – 50 percent. Levels of gender sensitivity vary significantly across outcomes, however, from a high of 100 percent GM in outputs in Outcome 4 to a low of 8 percent GM in Output 6.
- **Indicators – 16 percent.** Only 16 percent of indicators to track ZUNDAF results are gender sensitive (59 out of 305). This does not meet minimum standards of 33 – 50 percent. Three outcome areas (Outcomes 2, 3 and 6) have mainstreamed gender in less than 10 percent of their indicators.
- **Baselines – 30 percent.** 30 percent of baseline data included in the ZUNDAF is sex disaggregated or gender sensitive (16 out of a total of 54 baselines that are conducive to disaggregation). This is well below the minimum standard of 100 percent of baseline data disaggregated by sex.

Partnerships. The 3.3 score in the partnerships dimension reflects uneven performance across three indicator areas. The UNCT received high scores for having a strong relationship with the MWAGCD, and involving the women's machinery in all aspects of ZUNDAF elaboration. The UNCT also met minimum standards for involving women from

² While the Scorecard assessment centers on programming under the 2007-2011 ZUNDAF, it is noteworthy that the GTG has developed its Joint Implementation Matrix for the gender outcome of the 2012-2015 ZUNDAF that may help ensure that all agencies with gender-focused activities plan together to achieve targeted outcomes.

excluded groups as partners and beneficiaries, though such groups have not been actively engaged in ZUNDAF planning and decision-making processes.

Low scores were achieved in the UNCT's involvement of the women's and gender NGOs and networks. This shortcoming was recognized from both within and outside of the UNCT. Engagement with women/gender CSOs is largely limited to individual agency interactions with specific implementing partners. There has not been a concerted effort to involve CSO in key UNCT activities around ZUNDAF elaboration. Women/Gender CSOs generally have a relationship with UNW and one or two other agencies. They do not perceive themselves as having a relationship with the UNCT as a whole. Historical tensions between the Government and CSO were cited as a key factor influencing the low levels of engagement with CSO.

UNCT Capacities. The average score of 3 for UNCT capacities encompassed variability across indicators. The score reflects the strong functioning of the GTG, although there remains room for improvement in formalizing terms of reference and bolstering resources. The UNCT does not have a central gender expert's roster, but many individual agencies have good national and regional rosters and there is very good communication between agencies in sharing these resources. Agencies can also avail of a search for national gender specialists via the Gender Forum. Challenges remain to assess and improve the capacity of the UNCT as a whole for mainstreaming gender. Lacking focus and coordination, efforts on this front have been inadequate.

Weaknesses

Budgeting. The budgeting dimension has garnered the lowest score of the exercise (1.5), revealing the need for urgent attention in this area. A number of individual agencies have instituted the gender marker system, but the UNCT has yet to fully consider the possible means for tracking gender equality expenditures at the highest level. New directives from headquarters have institutionalized budget disaggregation by outcome area beginning in 2010. Since gender is included as a ZUNDAF outcome, this offers a rough means of assessing expenditures, but it does not capture information on those programs that have successfully mainstreamed gender. Data that does exist suggests that budgetary commitments toward gender equality for the UNCT as a whole have been exceptionally low, accounting for less than one percent of the larger budget (see Annex C for details).

Monitoring and Evaluation. Monitoring and evaluation received a low average score of 2. While the ZUNDAF M&E framework does incorporate gender related outcomes and outputs, the baselines and indicators are insufficiently gender sensitive and sex disaggregated to allow for meaningful measurement of results. More importantly, the ZUNDAF M&E framework was not actively operationalized, pointing to M&E issues that are far broader than the gender mainstreaming elements of M&E alone. The UNCT has not carried out a separate gender evaluation or audit during the five-year ZUNDAF period, although gender was addressed to an extent in the MTR and Annual Reviews.

Quality Control and Accountability. Quality control and accountability requires attention, as it earned a low score of 2. The UNCT relied on internal and regional gender expertise during ZUNDAF preparation, and this has proven to be insufficient for optimal gender mainstreaming in the planning phase. Reader's Group comments and quality review templates on gender issues were not utilized as such. The UNCT did receive support and guidance from the undg during ZUNDAF and CA development, but those inputs tended to be piecemeal, focusing on particular sectors.

While the UNDG commented on gender as an outcome area, there is no evidence to suggest that the UNDG was able to provide meaningful inputs on gender as a crosscutting theme.

IV. Strategic Recommendations for Follow-up

Below outlines nine main follow-up areas, including an indication of timing, responsibilities and resources³. There was general agreement at the time of the debriefing in Harare that the recommendations were sound, though differences of opinion emerged on prioritization and resource availability for operationalization. It was agreed that the GTG would use the findings and analysis to undertake a process of assessing and prioritizing the recommendations to develop their own action plan and timeline.

#1 Appoint GFPs in all TGs

Weaknesses in several dimensions, including planning, programming and monitoring and evaluation, are influenced by a failure to fully mainstream gender across all ZUNDAF outcome areas. Gender focal points should be appointed within all TGs for mainstreaming to occur more effectively and evenly across outcome areas. The MTR (2009) made a similar recommendation, and steps were taken to comply, but it remains a problem area that requires immediate attention. The following steps should be taken to facilitate the process beyond the actual appointment, and to enable GFPs in all TGs to realize their full potential.

- The directive for GFPs appointment in all TGs should be carried out by the PMT with full support of the RC and HOAs.
- TGs that fail to appoint a GFP within a specified time period should automatically delegate the TG Chair as the new GFP.
- GFPs should participate in both their subject theme group and the gender theme group.
- GFPs should be provided clear TORs, and be offered specialized gender training to help them to perform in their roles.

Timing: Immediate

Responsibility: PMT with cooperation from TGs and GTG

Cost: None apart from capacity development as covered in item #8

#2 Strengthen GTG

The GTG currently operates under a terms of reference that was drafted in 2008. The TOR should be updated and formally endorsed. Re-development of the TOR offers a vehicle for the GTG to collectively agree to membership and leadership, incorporating newly appointed GFPs from TGs. Leadership within the GTG has been shouldered by a

³ Resources are framed in terms of financial inputs only, though it must be noted that all initiatives will require time and commitment inputs from key personnel. Such inputs are critical, but notoriously difficult to predict and quantify.

single agency (UNFPA) for the past five years, with another agency serving as deputy-chair, and another as secretariat. The structure of a three-person leadership team is top-heavy for a small group. In order to simplify leadership and build broader capacity for gender advocacy across the UNCT, the GTG should be led by a two-person team on a 2-3 year rotational basis with one agency chairing and a second agency serving as co-chair and secretariat. At the time of leadership rotation, one of the two lead agencies should remain in one of the two leadership positions for the sake of continuity. All UNCT gender mainstreaming initiatives should be conducted through the GTG, though individual agencies should take the lead on different activities in line with capacities and areas of expertise.

Timing: TORs should be adjusted in early 2012. Rotation of leadership roles should begin in 2013 to allow the new team to see through the end of the 2012-2015 ZUNDAF.

Responsibility: GTG with support of RCO

Cost: None

As a crosscutting TG with broad responsibilities, the GTG should have access to core discretionary funds comprised of small voluntary contributions from key agencies to allow it to conduct its work efficiently⁴. This will not take the place of intermittent requests from agencies for large initiatives, but will give the GTG flexibility to act quickly on small seed activities and timely inputs without expending time and resources to engage in extended negotiation processes.

Timing: 2012 on

Responsibility: RCO, HOA and GTG

Cost: Approximately USD 50,000/year

#3 Implement and Monitor GRBs

UNCT Zimbabwe began delineating yearly budgets by ZUNDAF outcome area in 2010 in response to a global directive. Analysis of 2010 budget data shows that “Outcome 4” on gender equality received less than one percent of the total UNCT budget in 2010, raising serious questions about the commitment of the UNCT to affect measurable change in this area. While current budget processes do not allow an analysis at the UNCT level of the extent to which gender has been mainstreamed in other outcome areas, it remains notable that the gender outcome area received far less budget allocation than the other five outcome areas (several of which are also cross-cutting in nature), as detailed in Annex C. The PMT should utilize this data to monitor yearly budget allocations under all outcome areas, and advocate for deeper resources to under-resourced areas. Results should be shared widely with HOAs and TGs. Gender advocates within the UNCT should track this data yearly, and utilize findings for advocacy efforts to increase funds allocated to fostering GE/WE.

Timing: Immediate

Responsibility: PMT, GTG

Cost: None

⁴ In fact, this approach was piloted in 2011. Experiences should serve as a reference and test of the efficacy of the recommendation for subsequent years.

The UNCT should take steps over a longer period of time to institutionalize a UNCT-wide gender marker system that allows for analysis of budget allocations toward gender equality across outcome areas, as this will give a more accurate picture of disbursement on gender activities. There are currently discussions at higher UN levels to introduce such a system globally, but this has yet to transpire. The UNCT Zimbabwe has a chance to pioneer such a system at the UNCT level by building on the institutionalization of the gender marker in key agencies (UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA), and drawing on the successes that the humanitarian arm has had with the gender marker in Zimbabwe as a guide.

Timing:	2013 on
Responsibility:	RC to advocate with UNCT, PMT to implement with GTG
Cost:	Technical expertise will be required to develop and train on use of the system; consulting fees will be incurred for external specialists as required

#4 Pilot GM in Planning Stage of all Joint Programs

The planning stage of any program is arguably the most important juncture for mainstreaming gender due to the strong potential for positive flow-on effects of effective mainstreaming. Joint UN programs offer flexibility and allow agencies to contribute to a larger goal by working in their particular niche area in consultation with partner agencies. There is evidence to suggest that joint programming is particularly able to address women's equality/gender equality issues by involving a broad base of stakeholders, and increasing the likelihood of including stakeholders who are well attuned to gender issues in a particular program area.

UNCT Zimbabwe had few joint programs at the time of the Scorecard assessment, though there were more examples of 'joint programming.' The UNCT was in the process of planning for a number of new joint 'flagship' programs in each outcome area, including a planned GBV program. The Joint Implementation Matrix, and the 'flagship' programs, as a core element of the matrix, offer a valuable opportunity for mainstreaming gender across outcomes, but this will require targeted, coordinated efforts to ensure gender mainstreaming from the planning stage forward. The UNCT should trial the gender marker system during planning of all new joint programs as a pilot exercise toward more comprehensive GM and GRB. Newly appointed TG-GFPs should help to facilitate the process in each outcome area with support from the GTG. Technical experts may be hired as needed for short-term inputs.

Timing:	2012 on
Responsibility:	PMT to implement with support from GTG and TG-GFPs
Cost:	Variable - none if in-house technical expertise is utilized including regional support; otherwise, fees for short-term inputs of technical experts (preference for national experts whenever possible)

#5 Improve GM Performance on Key UNCT M and E Processes

The Scorecard assessment revealed a failure to systematically operationalize the 2007-2011 ZUNDAF results framework due in large part to historical circumstances that required immediate humanitarian efforts during most of

the ZUNDAF period. This weakness in UNCT processes was identified in the ZUNDAF MTR (2009) and final evaluation (that was conducted concurrently with the Scorecard exercise). While outcomes were generally monitored at a yearly level, the indicators as outlined in the ZUNDAF results matrix were either absent or not regularly updated, so that weaknesses in gender-specific monitoring must be understood within broader M and E issues.

The analysis of ZUNDAF outputs, indicators and baselines for the 2007-2011 and the 2012 – 2015 ZUNDAF showed that little improvement has been made in the planning stage for the new ZUNDAF, and in fact, baseline data were actually less gender sensitive in the new ZUNDAF⁵. The following actions are recommended for immediate redress of the new ZUNDAF (2012-2015):

- Conduct a quick review and adjustment of indicators to track ZUNDAF results to build in gender sensitivity. 12 out of a total of 59 indicators (20 percent) are gender sensitive. Target should be to sensitize 33-50 percent of indicators to meet minimum standards.
- Review and adjust baseline data to improve gender sensitivity and sex disaggregation. 7 out of 25 (28 percent) baselines that are conducive to GM have mainstreamed gender. Minimum standard as set by UNDG is 100 percent. Realistic target should be 50-75 percent.

The reviews and adjustments recommended amount to a ‘quick and easy fix’ to the new ZUNDAF, which was signed in April 2011. The adjustments may be made by key members of the GTG together with the ‘Data for Development’ TG under the direction of the PMT – with final approval from the signatories of the ZUNDAF. Adjustments to make data more gender sensitive and/or sex disaggregated should also impact on the Joint Implementation Matrix (JIM) that was being finalized at the time of the Scorecard exercise.

Timing:	Immediate
Responsibility:	PMT with support from GTG and ‘Data for Development’ TG
Cost:	None, assuming internal expertise is utilized

#6 Engage Gender CSOs and Donors

Engagement with the women’s/gender CSO is recognized by stakeholders from within and outside the UNCT as an area that requires attention. Historical reasons for lack of full engagement are well noted, but it is incumbent upon the UN to play a proactive role to fully engage all sectors in development processes. The UNCT should explore opportunities to open up a better dialogue with CSO on gender issues, including greater involvement in ZUNDAF/CA processes and improved transparency of gender-focused UNCT initiatives. To this end, UNW should play a conduit role for linking gender/women’s CSO to the UNCT more broadly via the Gender Forum, starting with quarterly or bi-annual presentations of UNCT gender-focused activities at Gender Forum meetings as a means of improving transparency with timely information and consultation on current and upcoming initiatives.

⁵ Effective gender mainstreaming in output indicators had increased from 16 to 20 percent while gender sensitivity in baseline data fell from 30 to 28 percent when comparing the two ZUNDAFs (2007-2011 and 2012-2015). See Annex B for details.

Limited formal mechanisms for donor coordination on gender-focused activities mirrors broader issues around donor coordination in Zimbabwe. There is some interest within the donor community to improve communication on gender programming, and the UNCT is well positioned to spearhead discussions on the possibility of reviving a 'gender donors group' or other formal/informal means of collectively exploring opportunities for stronger gender programming. Within the broader parameters of improving aid effectiveness, the UNCT should seek out a niche role to establish mechanisms that will help avoid duplication and find synergies in alignment with national objectives.

Timing: 2012 on
Responsibility: UNW, GTG
Cost: None

#7 Improve Quality Control

Internal quality control mechanisms failed to fully support the UNCT in Zimbabwe to mainstream gender in the ZUNDAF due to two factors: 1) reviews did not follow standardized templates and/or 2) reviews did not address gender as a cross-cutting issue⁶. This resulted in a loss of critical opportunities for adjustments in early phases of the ZUNDAF cycle to maximize GE programming. The UNCT Zimbabwe must take charge of the quality control processes that have been instituted at higher levels to ensure that such processes fully assess and address GM beyond a single outcome area. This requires the UNCT to take a much more proactive role to specify requests to UNDG to provide technical reviews of gender as a crosscutting theme within quality review processes. The UNCT should draw on other means of support as needed including: in-house UNCT Zimbabwe gender experts, regional agency gender specialists, and external specialists.

Timing: Immediate
Responsibility: RC and RCO with support from PMT and GTG
Cost: None if in-house or regional technical expertise is utilized; otherwise, fees for short-term inputs of technical experts (preference for national experts whenever possible)

#8 Develop UNCT Capacities to Foster GE/WE

A concerted effort is required to gather baseline and set targets for the UNCT as a whole in order to broaden the skills and knowledge base within the team for GM. This requires a capacity needs assessment that leads to a participatory process of setting and monitoring targets for gender training and other forms of skills development (e.g. access to tools and other resources). Ideally, this process should be a part of a broader Gender Mainstreaming Strategy (GMS) for the UNCT, but it may also be conducted as a separate exercise in the absence of a GMS (see item #9). Targets should be established based on the findings of the needs assessment as well as a realistic assessment of available human and financial resources. Possible targets may include:

⁶ This is true for the 2007-2011 ZUNDAF (the focus on this assessment), but it also presented as a persistent problem affecting the 2012-2015 ZUNDAF.

- institutionalize gender training for all new staff in first year, utilizing existing on-line courses where available;
- conduct targeted training for key staff (e.g. GFPs, budget personnel) on a regular basis (once every one to two years);
- ensure that at least 50 percent of each TG have had gender training within the ZUNDAF period.

The UNCT should hire a short-term consultant to conduct the needs assessment and design the capacity development plan. Monitoring of capacity development plans may be handled by individual agencies, but there should be a centralized consolidation and accountability mechanism at the UNCT level. The OMT should be the coordinating and monitoring body, locating this exercise within broader standardized human resource development systems.

Timing:	Conduct needs assessment and design plan in second half of 2012; monitor on yearly basis thereafter
Responsibility:	PMT to advocate; OMT to implement
Cost:	Consulting fees plus variable costs for some training activities (part of training budget may be accessed from GTG core budget)

#9 Operationalize Gender Mainstreaming

The best way to fully develop and operationalize gender mainstreaming at the UNCT level is to develop a UNCT Gender Mainstreaming Strategy⁷ (GMS). The GMS should incorporate the Scorecard recommendations and the commensurate action plan, but it should go several steps further to establish:

- Common vision for standardizing processes to improve GM across UNCT
- Priority action areas
- Individual and collective areas of responsibility
- Monitoring framework

There are a number of different options available to the UNCT in Zimbabwe to develop a GMS and operationalize the above recommendations, but the bottom line is that additional human and financial resources will be required to improve performance and move the UNCT to the next level of GM. While the UNCT does include some excellent in-house technical gender specialists, many of whom are active in the GTG, such people are usually stretched thin, and do not realistically have time to manage GM processes across the UNCT. This limits the extent to which the GTG can effectively address gender issues across the sixteen agencies that comprise the UNCT. Possible means of operationalizing UNCT GM strategies include hiring a full-time gender advisor or increased use of short-term consultants. The two approaches are not mutually exclusive, and will depend upon internal UNCT consultations involving the to decide the most viable route. Factors that should be considered:

- Hire a full-time senior level gender advisor at RCO to guide institutionalization (cost est/year \$80,000). This will require a minimum two-year commitment. Work plans should include a phase-out stage for the gender advisor to institutionalize activities within on-going operations and structures.

⁷ Country teams that have developed a GMS include Vietnam and Kyrgyzstan.

- Pros: should produce measurable results in shortest period of time; continuity and follow-up on processes; high-profile advocacy for GM.
- Cons: can lead to lack of ownership due to a tendency to 'hand-off' responsibility to advisor, rather than internalizing; risks lack of sustainability if not carefully managed, high cost.
- Utilize resources from proposed GTG core budget to hire short-term external experts as needed in key stages (cost est/year \$50,000).
 - Pros: lower cost; allows for managing strategic inputs in a flexible manner to align with variable needs; fosters stronger ownership over management of broader GM processes.
 - Cons: risk of 'shelving' and 'stalling' initiatives until workloads lighten (i.e. never); lack of follow-through mechanisms at close of consultancy; delays likely in time-consuming hiring processes; lack of continuity between consultancies.

Recommendations by Scorecard Dimension Area

The recommendations detailed above are designed to impact across dimensions covered by the Scorecard. The inter-connected nature of the eight dimensions means that improvements to gender mainstreaming in one process area are likely to impact on other areas in a synergistic fashion, as highlighted in the below table. Dimension numbers correspond to those laid out in the Scorecard: 1-Planning; 2-Programming; 3-Partnerships; 4-UNCT Capacities; 5-Decision-Making; 6-Budgeting; 7-M and E; 8-Quality Control and Accountability

Recommendation	Scorecard Dimension							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
#1 Appoint GFPs in all TGs								
#2 Strengthen GTG								
#3 Implement GRBs								
#4 Pilot GM in Joint Programs								
#5 Improve GM in M and E Processes								
#6 Engage CSOs and Donors								
#7 Improve Quality Control								
#8 Build Capacities								
#9 Operationalize GM								

Annex A - UNCT Performance Indicators for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Zimbabwe UNCT – November 2011

Rating

5 = exceeds minimum standards

4 = meets minimum standards

3 = Needs improvement

2 = Inadequate

1 = Missing

0 = not applicable

Dimensions	Definition	Rating
1. PLANNING (CCA/UNDAFs) ⁸		
1.a - Adequate UNCT review of country context related to gender equality and women's empowerment Source: UNDG	Exceeds minimum standards - Includes an in-depth evidence-based analysis of the ways in which gender inequality is reproduced, including the influence of gender relations, roles, status, inequalities and discrimination in legislation and policies, access to and control of resources. - The analysis notes links to national legal frameworks, relevant to the promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment, and specific measures for follow up to CEDAW reports and CEDAW	Rating: 3 – needs improvement Evidence: Secondary data review (2007-2011 ZUNDAF and 2010 Country Analysis) Comments: The UNCT has met two of the three

⁸ To be completed once during the CCA/UNDAF period. Countries that don't have a CCA/UNDAF, including conflict/post conflict/crisis countries, should apply these indicators and standards to any other common country planning and programming that the UNCT agrees on. This process will be reviewed on an ongoing basis by the Development Operations Coordination Office.

Guidance	Committee concluding comments. • All data is sex-disaggregated, or there is a specific reason noted for not disaggregating by sex. • Critical capacity gaps are identified in the area of the promotion of gender equality. Meets minimum standards • Includes an analysis of the ways in which gender inequality is reproduced, including the influence of gender relations, roles, status, inequalities and discrimination in access to and control of resources. • The analysis notes links to national legal framework relevant to the promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment, and includes reference to CEDAW reports and concluding comments. • All data is sex-disaggregated, or there is a specific reason noted for not disaggregating by sex. Needs improvement Any two of the above three areas (under <i>Meets minimum standards</i>) are met. Inadequate Any one of the above three areas (under <i>Meets minimum standards</i>) is met. Missing Not applicable	criteria under “meets minimum standards.” They have failed to fully meet minimum standards due to a failure to fully disaggregate data by sex in key planning documents.
1.b - Gender equality and women's empowerment in UNDAF outcomes Source: UNDG Guidance	Exceeds minimum standard More than one outcome clearly articulates how gender equality and women's empowerment will be promoted. Meets minimum standard One outcome clearly articulates how gender equality will be promoted. Needs improvement	Rating: 4 – meets minimum standards Evidence: 2007-2001 ZUNDAF Comments: Outcome 4 is focused on gender equality: “reduction in the negative social,

	One outcome includes reference to gender, but does not clearly articulate how gender equality will be promoted. Inadequate Gender equality or women's empowerment are given 'token' or minimal attention. Missing Not applicable	economic, political, cultural and religious practices that sustain gender disparity." The other five outcomes have mainstreamed gender to a greater or lesser degree.
1.c - Gender equality and women's empowerment in UNDAF outputs Source: UNDG Guidance	Exceeds minimum standard At least one half of outputs clearly articulate tangible changes for rights holders and duty bearers which will lead to improvements in progress toward gender equality and women's empowerment. Meets minimum standard Between one third and one half of outputs clearly articulate tangible changes for rights holders and duty bearers which will lead to improved gender equality. Needs improvement Less than one third of outputs clearly articulate tangible changes for rights holders and duty bearers which will lead to improved gender equality. Inadequate Outputs refer to gender equality or women in passing, but with no logical connection to changes in gender equality. Missing Not applicable	Rating: 4 – meets minimum standards Evidence: 2007-2011 ZUNDAF Comments: 23 out of 56 outputs (41 percent) articulate gender equality strategies. Outcome 4 is especially strong, with 100 percent of outputs mainstreaming gender equality. Outcome 6 is particularly weak, with only 8 percent of outputs articulating gender mainstreaming.
1.d - Indicators to track UNDAF results	Exceeds minimum standard At least one indicator at outcome level, and one half of indicators at	Rating: 3 – needs improvement

are gender-sensitive	output level, are gender sensitive, and will adequately track progress towards gender equality results.	Evidence: 2007-2011 ZUNDAF
Source: UNDG Guidance	Meets minimum standard At least one indicator at outcome level, and between one third and one half of indicators at output level, are gender sensitive, and will adequately track progress towards gender equality results. Needs improvement No gender-sensitive indicators at outcome level, and less than one third of indicators at output level are gender sensitive. Inadequate Token reference to gender equality or women in indicators. Missing Not applicable	Comments: Sixteen percent of output indicators are gender sensitive.
1.e - Baselines are gender-sensitive	Meets minimum standard⁹ All data is sex-disaggregated, or there is a specific reason noted for not disaggregating by sex. Needs improvement Some data is sex-disaggregated but sex-disaggregation is not systematic. Inadequate There is token sex-disaggregation of data. Missing Not applicable	Rating: 3 – needs improvement Evidence: 2007-2011 ZUNDAF Comments: Only 30 percent of baseline data that was suitable for disaggregation was disaggregated. Outcomes 2, 5 and 6 were especially weak, disaggregating 0, 13 and 0 percent respectively of those baselines suitable for disaggregation.
Source: UNDG Guidance		

⁹ It is not possible to exceed the minimum standard in this case, because the indicator refers to an absolute value (all data).

2. PROGRAMMING		
2.a - Gender perspectives are adequately reflected in joint programming Source: ECOSOC 1997, 2004, 2005, 2006, TCPR 2007, World Summit Outcome 2005	Exceeds minimum standard - Promoting gender equality and women's empowerment is reflected in long-term programming consistent with the opportunities and challenges identified in the UNCT's background analysis of gender inequality and women's rights situation (e.g., in CCA/UNDAFs, MDG report, etc.). - UNCT joint initiative(s) (e.g., advocacy and other initiatives) in support of gender equality and women's empowerment exist. Meets minimum standard - There are detailed, practical and adequately funded programmes addressing the problems and challenges identified in the background analysis of gender inequality and women's rights situation. - UNCT joint initiative(s) in support of gender equality exist. Needs improvement Meets either one of the two areas above (under <i>Meets minimum standard</i>). Inadequate Token reference to gender equality in programming. Missing Not applicable	Rating: 5 – exceeds minimum standards Evidence: Secondary data review; GTG workshop; HOA interviews; RC interview; Women's Machinery interview Comments: Programming addresses critical issues with different agencies taking a lead role according to areas of expertise. UNCT joint initiatives include support for international women's day, 16 days of activism against GBV, advocacy to understand and address GBV, coordinated inputs into CEDAW reporting, joint support for international conference on women, peace and security (April 2011).
2.b – Joint programmes Source: UNDG Guidance	Exceeds minimum standard Key national gender equality and women's empowerment priorities are being addressed through a Joint Programme on gender equality, and through mainstreaming gender equality into other Joint Programmes. Meets minimum standard A Joint Programme on promoting gender equality and women's	Rating: 3 – needs improvement Evidence: GTG workshop, HOA interviews, Women's Machinery interview; secondary data (HOA meeting minutes)

empowerment is in place, and work is in progress to mainstream gender into other Joint Programmes.

Needs improvement

Joint Programme on promoting gender equality and women's empowerment being formulated, and limited mainstreaming in other Joint Programmes.

Inadequate

No Joint Programme on promoting gender equality and women's empowerment being formulated, and limited attention to gender in Joint Programmes

Missing

Not applicable

Comments: The UNCT is developing a joint flagship program on GBV. The program is in early draft stages.

2.c - UNCT support for national priorities related to gender equality and women's empowerment	Exceeds minimum standard UNDAF budgetary allocations support implementation of national gender equality legal frameworks, including: - National Plan of Action on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. - implementation of CEDAW, and follow-up to CEDAW Committee concluding comments. - collection and analysis of sex-disaggregated data at the national level. - gender mainstreaming in ministries other than the women's machinery. Meets minimum standard Meets any three of the above. Needs improvement Meets any two of the above. Inadequate Meets one of the above. Missing Not applicable	Rating: 5 – exceeds minimum standard Evidence: GTG workshop, Women's Machinery interview; HOA interviews; Government focus group Comments: The UNCT is providing substantive support in all four indicator areas.
2.d - UNCT support to gender mainstreaming in programme based approaches	Exceeds minimum standard • Capacity development provided to relevant government ministries for mainstreaming gender in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers or equivalent. • Capacity development provided to relevant government ministries for mainstreaming gender in General Budget Support programming. • Capacity development provided to relevant government ministries for mainstreaming gender in Sector Wide Approaches and/or National Development Plans. Meets minimum standard	Rating: 5 – exceeds minimum standard Evidence: GTG workshop, Women's Machinery interview; HOA interviews; Government focus group Comments: The UNCT is providing substantive support in all three indicator areas.

	Meets any two of the above. Needs improvement Meets any one of the above. Inadequate Token attention to gender mainstreaming in programme based approaches. Missing Not applicable	
2.e - UNCT support to gender mainstreaming in aid effectiveness processes Source: TCPR 2007	Exceeds minimum standard • Gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) is promoted in the Ministry of Finance and other key ministries. • UNCT takes lead role in strengthening the Government's ability to coordinate donor support to promote gender equality. • UNCT supports monitoring and evaluation of gender mainstreaming in National Development Plans, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers or equivalent, General Budget Support programming, and Sector Wide Approaches. Meets minimum standard Meets any two of the above. Needs improvement Meets one of the above. Inadequate Token attention to gender mainstreaming in aid effectiveness processes. Missing Not applicable	Rating: 4 – meets minimum standard Evidence: GTG workshop, Women's Machinery interview; HOA interviews; donor interview Comments: UNCT promotes GRB in the Government, and gender mainstreaming in key guiding strategies. It does not take a lead role in coordinating donor support to promote GE.

3. PARTNERSHIPS

3.a - Involvement of National Machineries for Women / Gender Equality and women's departments at the sub-national level¹⁰

Source: UNDG Guidance

Exceeds minimum standard

Women's machinery/department participates fully in:

- Consultations about CCA/UNDAF planning (e.g. the prioritization retreat).
- Development of UNDAF outcomes, outputs and indicators.
- As key informants/stakeholders in the monitoring and evaluation of UNDAF results.

Full participation means that the women's machinery/department is present at meetings, is involved in decision-making, and that recommendations made are followed-up and there is involvement at the implementation level.

- Role of women's machinery in supporting achievement of UNDAF outcomes clearly defined.

Meets minimum standard

Women's machinery/department participates fully in CCA/UNDAF consultations.

Role of women's machinery/department in supporting achievement of UNDAF outcomes clearly defined.

Needs improvement

- Women's machinery/department participates fully in one of the above (under Meets minimum standard).

Inadequate

Token participation by women's machinery/department.

Missing

Rating: **5 – exceeds minimum standards**

Evidence: **GTG workshop; Women's Machinery interview**

Comments: **The women's machinery is fully engaged in all ZUNDAF activities from planning to development of outcomes, outputs and indicators, and monitoring and evaluation. The UNCT and the women's machinery have a common understanding in the strategic role that the agency plays in achieving ZUNDAF outcomes.**

¹⁰ To be completed once during the CCA/UNDAF process.

3.b - Involvement of women's NGOs and networks¹¹ Source: UNDG Guidance	Not applicable Exceeds minimum standard Women's NGOs and networks participate fully in: • Consultations around CCA/UNDAF planning (e.g. the prioritization retreat). • Development of UNDAF outcomes, outputs and indicators. • Monitoring and evaluation of UNDAF results. Full participation means that women NGOs and network representatives are present at meetings, involved in decision-making, that recommendations made are followed-up, and that they are also involved at the implementation level. • Role of women's NGOs and networks in supporting achievement of UNDAF outcomes clearly defined. Meets minimum standard • Women's NGOs and networks participate fully in CCA/UNDAF consultations. • Role of women's NGOs and networks in supporting achievement of UNDAF outcomes clearly defined. Needs improvement • Women's NGOs and networks participate fully in one of the above (under Meets minimum standard) Inadequate Token participation by women's NGOs and networks. Missing Not applicable	Rating: 1 - inadequate Evidence: GTG workgroup; CSO focus group Comments: The historical tensions between the government and civil society during the development of the 2007-2011 ZUNDAF led to difficulties in fully engaging the CSO. The CSO participation was more indirect via the Gender Forum. The GSP offers a new (since 2009) and important mechanism for support and engagement with the women's and gender CSOs, but this interaction has been limited to CSO-UNW, and has not involved the wider UNCT.
3.c - Women from	Exceeds minimum standard	

¹¹ To be completed once during the CCA/UNDAF process.

excluded groups included as programme partners and beneficiaries in key UNCT initiatives Source: UNDG Guidance	• Women from excluded groups and their capacities and livelihoods strategies, clearly identified in UNCT country level analysis. • UNCT proactively involves women from excluded groups in planning, implementation, decision-making, and monitoring and evaluation. • Women from excluded groups are participants and beneficiaries in key UNCT initiatives, e.g. in UNDAF outcomes and outputs. Meets minimum standard • Women from excluded groups clearly identified in UNCT country level analysis. • Women from excluded groups are participants and beneficiaries in key UNCT activities, e.g. in UNDAF outcomes and outputs. Needs improvement Meets one of the above (under <i>Meets minimum standard</i>). Inadequate Token involvement of women from excluded groups. Missing Not applicable	Rating: 4 – meets minimum standards Evidence: GTG workshop, HOA interviews, Women’s Machinery interview; CSO focus group; secondary data review (2007-2011 ZUNDAF; 2010 Country Assessment) Comments: Women from excluded groups are clearly identified in the CA and ZUNDAF in analysis and targeting. While women from excluded groups have not had direct input into ZUNDAF design, they are participants and beneficiaries in some programs. The GSP funding mechanism also targets excluded women.
4. UNCT CAPACITIES		
4.a - Multi-stakeholder Gender Theme Group is effective Source: TCPR 2007	Exceeds minimum standard • Gender Theme Group adequately resourced, and resourced equally to other Theme Groups. • All key stakeholders participate (e.g. national partners, Bretton Woods institutions, regional banks, civil society, trades unions, employer organizations, the private sector, donors, and international NGOs). • Gender Theme Group recommendations taken into account in preparation of CCA/UNDAF. • Gender Theme Group has a clear terms of reference with membership of staff at decision making levels and clear accountability as a group.	Rating: 4 – meets minimum standards Evidence: GTG workshop, Women’s Machinery interview; HOA interviews, RC interview, secondary data (MTR 2009) Comments: While the GTG is resourced adequately in relation to other TG, it does not have a separate

	Meets minimum standard • Gender Theme Group adequately resourced. • Gender Theme Group recommendations taken into account in preparation of CCA/UNDAF. • Gender Theme Group has a clear terms of reference. Needs improvement Meets any two of the above (under <i>Meets minimum standard</i>). Inadequate Meets any one of the above (under <i>Meets minimum standard</i>). Missing Not applicable	budget to allow it to move quickly on initiatives. It is, however, able to mobilize funds from individual agencies for key initiatives. The GTG is chaired by the HOA for UNFPA together with the Women's Machinery. UN Women serves as the secretariat. Individual agency participation varies, with some agencies taking lead, active roles, and others not engaging fully. This is influenced by the mandate of individual agencies, but there is room for more active involvement of some agencies as well as consideration of broader participation to include donors, CSO, etc. The GTG was fully involved in preparation of the ZUNDAF and CA. The GTG has a clear terms of reference and is accountable via its work plan and obligation to deliver on ZUNDAF Outcome 4.
4.b - Capacity assessment and development of UNCTs in gender equality and women's empowerment programming Source: ECOSOC 2006	Exceeds minimum standard • Resident Coordinator systematically promotes, monitors and reports on capacity assessment and development activities related to gender equality and women's empowerment. • Regular review of capacity of UNCT to undertake gender mainstreaming (e.g. once every one or two years). • The impact of the gender component of existing training programmes regularly reviewed, and revised based on the review. • Training on gender mainstreaming takes place for all UNCT staff (one day every six months for new staff for first year, minimum of one day of training once every year after this). • Gender specialists and gender focal points receive specific training (minimum four days of training a year on gender equality and women's empowerment programming). Meets minimum standard • Resident Coordinator systematically promotes, monitors and reports	Rating: 1 – inadequate Evidence: GTG workshop, HOA interviews, RC interview Comments: It is not possible to clearly tick any of the criteria set forth under the 'meets minimum standard' category. However, there are some grey areas. While there is no regular review of UNCT staff capacity to undertake GM, the gender scorecard is a form of a capacity assessment. Monitoring of staff capacity is embedded within the ZUNDAF M and E framework and JIM M and E.

	on capacity development activities related to gender equality and women's empowerment • Regular review of capacity of UNCT to undertake gender mainstreaming (e.g. once every two or three years). • Training on gender mainstreaming takes place for all UNCT staff (one day every six months for new staff for first year, minimum of one day of training once every two years after this). • Gender specialists and gender focal points receive specific training (minimum two days of training a year on gender equality and women's empowerment programming). Needs improvement Any two of the above (under <i>Meets minimum standard</i>) are met. Inadequate Token attention to capacity development of UNCTs in gender mainstreaming. Missing Not applicable	Failure to deliver on gender-specific outcomes should highlight staff capacity limitations. While there is currently no universal gender training for UNCT staff, some agencies have mandatory gender training and there are opportunities for some staff to take part in in-country technical training. This is not monitored at the UNCT level.
4.c - Gender expert roster with national, regional and international expertise used by UNCT members¹² Source: ECOSOC 2006	Exceeds minimum standard • Gender expert roster exists, is regularly updated and includes national, regional and international experts. • Experts participate in key UNCT activities (e.g. UNDAF planning, development of Joint Programmes on gender equality and women's empowerment). • Roster used on a regular basis by UN agencies (dependent on size of UN country programme). Meets minimum standard • Gender expert roster exists. • Roster used on a regular basis by some UN agencies (dependent on size of UN country programme).	Rating: 4 – meets minimum standard Evidence: HOA meetings; GTG interviews Comments: There is no single gender roster, but many agencies have their own national and regional rosters that code by categories including gender. Those agencies that lack rosters may request support from other agencies, and do so regularly. Requests may also be made for national

¹²The roster can be maintained at national or regional levels.

	Needs improvement Roster in place but not updated or utilised. Inadequate No roster exists. Missing Not applicable	gender experts via the Gender Forum, GTG and informal networks.
5. DECISION-MAKING		
5.a - Gender Theme Group coordinator is part of UNCT Heads of Agency group Source: TCPR 2007	Yes/No	Rating: 4 – meets minimum standard Comments: The GTG is headed by the Representative for UNFPA.
5.b - UNCT Heads of Agency meetings regularly take up gender equality programming and support issues Source: TCPR 2007	Exceeds minimum standard - Gender equality programming and support issues included in 75% of Heads of Agency meetings. - Decisions related to gender equality programming and support issues are followed through. Meets minimum standard - Gender equality programming and support issues are included in 50% of Heads of Agency meetings. - Decisions related to gender equality programming and support issues are followed through. Needs improvement Heads of Agency meetings occasionally include gender equality programming on their agenda.	Rating: 5 – exceeds minimum standard Evidence: HOA interviews; secondary data review (2011 HOA meeting minutes) Comments: Gender equality issues were included in 100 percent of the 2011 HOA meetings according to the minutes. Decisions were followed through.

	Inadequate Token attention to gender equality programming and support issues. Missing Not applicable	
6. BUDGETING		
6.a - UNCT Gender responsive budgeting system instituted Source: ECOSOC 2005	Exceeds minimum standard The UNCT has implemented a budgeting system which tracks UNCT expenditures for gender equality programming, as a means of ensuring adequate resource allocation for promoting gender equality. Meets minimum standard The UNCT has clear plans for implementing a budgeting system to track UNCT expenditures for gender equality programming, with timelines for completion of the plan noted. Needs improvement Discussions ongoing concerning the need to implement a budgeting system to track UNCT expenditures for gender equality programming. Inadequate The issue of implementing a budgeting system to track UNCT expenditures for gender equality programming has been raised, but a decision was taken not to proceed with this. Missing Not applicable	Rating: 1 – Missing Evidence: RC interview, RCO interview, HOA interviews; secondary data (annual budget) Comments: The UNCT is able to track budget expenses by outcome area, therefore it is able to see monies spent on outcome 4 (for gender equality) but it is not able to ascertain the extent to which other outcome areas have mainstreamed gender. The issue of implementing a budgeting system to track UNCT expenditures for GE programming had not been raised in Zimbabwe, but there is openness to adapting approaches so that this may be realized.
6.b - Specific budgets allocated to stimulate stronger programming on gender equality and	Exceeds minimum standard Specific budgets to strengthen UNCT support for gender equality and women's empowerment located for: • Capacity development and training of UNCT members. • Gender equality pilot projects.	Rating: 2 – needs improvement Evidence: RCO interview; GTG interview; Women's

women's empowerment	• Support to national women's machinery. • Support to women's NGOs and networks. • Maintenance of experts' roster. • Gender mainstreaming in CCA/ UNDAF exercises (e.g. for the preparation of background documentation, gender analysis capacity building, technical resource persons, etc.).	Machinery interview; CSO interview Comments: Only one of the five criteria may be soundly ticked (support to national women's machinery) at the UNCT level. There is some minimal budgeting for capacity development of UNCT members (including this exercise) and support to CSO, but such funding tends to be agency-specific and ad-hoc. No budgets for gender equality pilot projects, maintenance of experts' roster. GM in CA/ZUNDAF was handled by internal expertise; no monies spent on external experts.
Source: ECOSOC 2005	Meets minimum standard Specific budgets allocated for any four of the above. Needs improvement Specific budgets allocated for any three of the above. Inadequate Specific budget allocated for one or two of the above. Missing Not applicable	
7. MONITORING AND EVALUATION		
7.a - Monitoring and evaluation includes adequate attention to gender mainstreaming and the promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment	Exceeds minimum standard • A dedicated gender equality evaluation is carried out once during the UNDAF period. • Gender audit undertaken once during UNDAF period. • The UNDAF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework measures gender-related outcome and output expected results. • Data for gender-sensitive indicators in the UNDAF Results Matrix is gathered as planned. • All monitoring and evaluation data is sex-disaggregated, or there is a specific reason noted for not disaggregating by sex. • The UNDAF Annual Review reports on the main gender-related expected results. • Resident Coordinator reporting covers the main gender-related expected results.	Rating: 2 - inadequate Evidence: RC interview; M and E Officer interview; secondary data review (2010 AR; 2010 ROAR; 2007-2011 ZUNDAF) Comments: The UNCT met 3/5 criteria under meets minimum standards.' Data is monitored and reported generally at the outcome level. The ZUNDAF M and E Framework measures gender-related results but indicators have not been
Source: UND Guidance		

	- Gaps against planned results are rectified at an early stage. Meets minimum standard - The UNDAF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework measures gender-related outcome and output expected results. - Data for gender-sensitive indicators in the UNDAF Results Matrix is gathered as planned. - All monitoring and evaluation data is sex-disaggregated, or there is a specific reason noted for not disaggregating by sex. - The UNDAF/CAP Annual Review reports on the main gender-related expected results. - Resident Coordinator reporting covers the main gender-related expected results. Needs improvement Any four of the above (under <i>Meets minimum standard</i>) are achieved. Inadequate Less than four of the above (under <i>Meets minimum standard</i>) are achieved. Missing Not applicable	carefully collected or monitored throughout the process. There are opportunities for more comprehensive gender sensitive M and E with new program processes (JIM and new RCO M and E position). The 2010 AR and the 2010 ROAR report on gender-specific results. M and E data is not systematically sex disaggregated.
8. QUALITY CONTROL AND ACCOUNTABILITY		
8.a - CCA/UNDAF quality control ¹³ Source: UNDG Guidance	Exceeds minimum standards - Gender experts involved in all aspects of CCA/UNDAF preparation. - Readers' Group comments refer specifically to gender equality and empowerment of women. - Evidence of changes based on Readers' Group comments concerning gender equality and empowerment of women. - Relevant assessment on gender equality and empowerment of women from the CCA quality review template taken into account in	Rating: 2 – needs improvement Evidence: RCO interview; GTG workshop; secondary data (UNDG – ESA Support Mission to Zimbabwe 2011)

¹³ To be completed once during the CCA/UNDAF process.

revising the CCA/.

- Relevant assessment on gender equality and empowerment of women from the UNDAF quality review template taken into account in revising the UNDAF.

Meets minimum standard

- Gender experts involved in all aspects of CCA/UNDAF preparation.
- Relevant assessment on gender equality and empowerment of women from the CCA quality review template taken into account in revising the CCA.
- Relevant assessment on gender equality and empowerment of women from the UNDAF quality review template taken into account in revising the UNDAF.

Needs improvement

Meets only one or two of the above (under *Meets minimum standard*).

Inadequate

Token attention to gender equality during review and quality control exercises.

Missing

Not applicable

Comments: Gender experts are involved in the CA/ZUNDAF preparation, but this is primarily in-house expertise with back-up support from regional offices. UNDG quality review comments have focused on the gender-specific outcome, but have failed to appreciably assess gender as a cross-cutting theme, suggesting a lack of skills and expertise to address gender as a cross-cutting issue within UNDG. CA and ZUNDAF quality review templates could not be located nor could staff recall use of such templates as feedback mechanisms.

Annex B - ZUNDAF 2007-2011 and 2012-2015 Outputs, Indicators and Baselines

GENDER EQUALITY IN ZUNDAF OUTPUTS

ZUNDAF 2007-2011

Outcome Area	Total Number Outputs		Total Percent Outputs	
	GM	No GM	GM	No GM
Outcome 1	5	9	36	64
Outcome 2	3	5	38	63
Outcome 3	4	5	44	56
Outcome 4	5	0	100	0
Outcome 5	5	2	71	29
Outcome 6	1	12	8	92
TOTAL	23	33	41	59

ZUNDAF 2012-2015

Priority Area	Total Number Targets		Total Percent Targets	
	GM	No GM	GM	No GM
Priority 1	1	10	9	91
Priority 2	0	9	0	100
Priority 3	0	3	0	100
Priority 4	0	4	0	100
Priority 5	1	17	6	94
Priority 6	4	6	40	60
Priority 7	4	0	100	0
TOTAL	10	49	17	83

INDICATORS TO TRACK ZUNDAF RESULTS ARE GENDER-SENSITIVE

ZUNDAF 2007-2011

Outcome area	Total Number Indicators		Total Percent Indicators	
	GM	No GM	GM	No GM
Outcome 1	15	77	16	84
Outcome 2	7	69	9	91
Outcome 3	2	29	6	94
Outcome 4	21	2	91	9
Outcome 5	12	52	19	81
Outcome 6	2	76	3	97
TOTAL	59	305	16	84

ZUNDAF 2012-2015

Priority Area	Total Number Indicators		Total Percent Indicators	
	GM	No GM	GM	No GM
Priority 1	1	10	9	91
Priority 2	0	9	0	100
Priority 3	0	3	0	100
Priority 4	0	4	0	100
Priority 5	1	17	6	94
Priority 6	6	4	60	40
Priority 7	4	0	100	0
TOTAL	12	47	20	80

BASELINES ARE GENDER-SENSITIVE

This chart represents only those baselines that are conducive to gender mainstreaming, having omitted all others from this analysis.

ZUNDAF 2007-2011

Outcome area	Total Number Baselines		Total Percent Baselines	
	GM	No GM	GM	No GM
Outcome 1	13	10	57	43
Outcome 2	3	18	14	86
Outcome 3	0	0	0	0
Outcome 4	1	0	100	0
Outcome 5	8	9	47	53
Outcome 6	0	43	0	100
TOTAL	25	80	24	76

ZUNDAF 2012-2015

Outcome area	Total Number Baselines		Total Percent Baselines	
	GM	No GM	GM	No GM
National Development Priority 1	0	4	0	100
National Development Priority 2	0	3	0	100
National Development Priority 3	0	0	0	0
National Development Priority 4	0	0	0	0
National Development Priority 5	0	9	0	100
National Development Priority 6	4	2	67	33
National Development Priority 7	3	0	100	0
TOTAL	7	18	28	72

Annex C - ZUNDAF Budget Delivery – 2010

Outcome Number	2007-2011 ZUNDAF Outcomes	Indicative budget delivery amount per outcome (USD)
Outcome 1	Reduction of the spread of infection, improvement in the quality of life of those infected and mitigation of the impact of HIV and AIDS.	32,457,908
Outcome 2	Enhanced national capacity and ownership of development processes towards the attainment of the MDGs by 2015.	9,237,219
Outcome 3	Strengthened mechanisms for promoting the rule of law, dialogue, participation in the decision-making process and protection of human rights strengthened.	14,281,286
Outcome 4	Reduction in the negative social, economic, political, cultural and religious practices that sustain gender disparity.	2,389,930
Outcome 5	Improved access to good quality and equitable basic social services.	136,609,632
Outcome 6	Improved food security and sustainable management of natural resources and the environment.	82,521,241
TOTAL		277,497,216

Annex D - Persons Consulted for Gender Scorecard Assessment

Internal Stakeholders - UNCT Personnel

Alain Noudehou, Resident Coordinator, UNCT Zimbabwe
Paul Farran, Coordination Advisor, RCO
Vimbainashe Mukota, Coordination Specialist, RCO
Alexina Rusere, GenCAP Advisor, RCO
Basile Tamashe, Representative, UNFPA
Caroline Nyamayemombe, Gender Specialist, UNFPA
Piason Mlambo, Chair of Data for Development Working Group, UNFPA
Zil-e-huma, GBV Coordinator, UNFPA
Mildred Mushunje, HIV/Livelihoods Officer, FAO
Trevor Kanyowa, Maternal and Child Health Officer, WHO
Stanley Midzi, Health Systems Officer, WHO
Christine Umutoni, Country Director, UNDP
Doreen Nyamukapa, Program Analyst, UNDP
Marc Rubin, Deputy Representative, UNICEF
Jelda Nhliziyo, Programme Specialist, UNICEF
Sydney Nhamo, Planning and Monitoring Specialist, UNICEF
Hodan Addou, Country Program Director, UN Women
Marshall Karidozo, Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting Officer, UN Women
Memory Zonde-Kachambwa, Program Specialist, UN Women
Gloria Bille, Partnerships Advisor, UNAIDS
Martha Chinyemba, Programme Analyst, UNAIDS
Nomagugu Ncube, Health and HIV Officer, IOM
Vincent Oduor Omuga, Humanitarian Affairs Officer, OCHA

External Stakeholders – Government, Donor and CSO

K. Mudawarima, Deputy Director, Ministry of Women and Gender Affairs
N. Mushanga, National Coordinator, Women's Coalition of Zimbabwe
R. Nyampinga, Boardmember, Women's Coalition of Zimbabwe
Fanny Chirisa, Director, Women in Politics Support Unit
Chipiwi Chifamba, Programme Coordinator, ZWRCN
J. Chikuni, Intern, K/LSA
Sandra Aslud, Gender Focal Point, SIDA

Participants - Gender Scorecard Debriefing - 11 November 2011

Name	Position	Agency
Basile Tambashe	UNFPA Representative	UNFPA
Caroline Nyamayemombe	Programme Specialist - Gender	UNFPA
Alexina Rusere	Gen Cap Advisor	UNFPA
Zil-e-huma	GBV Coordinator	UNFPA
Paul Farran	Head of RCO	UNRCO
Vimbai Mukota	Coordination Specialist	UNRCO
Manasi Bhahachayya	Consultant	Independent
Godfrey Bvute	Coordination Analyst	UNRCO
Daniel Yoo	JPC	UNRCO
Marc Rubin	Deputy Representative	UNICEF
Jelda Nhiziyo	Programme Specialist, HR and Gender	UNICEF
Hodan Addou	Country Director	UNWOMEN
Adelaine Sibanda	Consultant	UNWOMEN
Doreen Nyamukapa	Programme Analyst	UNDP
David Mfote	AFAOR-P	FAO
Tafadzwa Mwale	National Information Officer	UNIC
Monica Czapla	Health Coordinator	IOM
Guy Broucke	Programme Specialist	UNESCO
Stanley Midzi	Programme Specialist, OIC a.i	WHO
Iris Mabuwa	Programme Specialist	ILO

Annex E - References

Government of Zimbabwe and United Nations Country Team. 2010. "2010 ZUNDAF Annual Review Report."

Government of Zimbabwe and United Nations Country Team. 2010. "Country Analysis Report for Zimbabwe."

Government of Zimbabwe. 2010. "2010 Millenium Development Goals Status Report – Zimbabwe."

Government of Zimbabwe. 2009. "Combined Report of the Government of Zimbabwe in terms of the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)."

Nhongo, Simon R. 2009. "Review of the UN Development Assistance Framework (ZUNDAF) 2007-2011." Consultancy report.

Noudehou, Alain. 2010. "Results Oriented Annual Report – 2010" Unpublished internal document.

UNCT HOA meeting minutes Jan – Oct 2011. Unpublished internal documents.

Office of the Zimbabwe Resident Coordinator. 2006. "Zimbabwe United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2007-2011."

Ombisi, David. 2011. "UNDG – ESA Support Mission to Zimbabwe 24-28 October 2011." Unpublished internal document.

United Nations Zimbabwe. 2011. "Zimbabwe United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2012-2015."

UNDG Task Force on Gender Equality. 2008. "UNCT Performance Indicators for Gender Equality Users' Guide."