**Steering the Gender Ship Through the Waters of Change:**

**Report of the CIGN Annual Meeting, 2015**

**Sarajevo, Bosnia-Herzegovina, 2-5 February 2015**

# Meeting Summary

CARE International (CI) is changing. Vision 2020 sets out priorities for a CARE that is responsive to today’s and tomorrow’s aid delivery environment, is more inclusive of its membership, and that acknowledges gender inequalities as the key cause of the poverty and injustice. A new CI program strategy includes a women’s empowerment goal, and a gender equality approaches, and it prioritises a number of areas for change and intervention to meet gender equality and women’s rights goals. The purpose of CARE International Gender Network (CIGN) annual meeting 2015 was to plan the ways in which CIGN will provide the federation with gender equality leadership during this time of transition. The objectives of the annual meeting were to

* identify the ways in which CIGN can best to fulfil its mandate in the context of CARE International’s transition process;
* identify opportunities and mechanisms to better collaborate and coordinate on CARE’s gender equality programming and practice;
* decide on the priority actions that CIGN will take to support the CARE International (CI) Program Strategy Implementation Plan;
* produce a communiqué summarising the key messages and outputs from the CIGN meeting; and
* update the CIGN annual work plan for 2015.

To do this, CIGN reviewed its gender work to date, identified current strengths and weaknesses in the federation’s operational and programming gender work, explored the potential of a social norms framework to close programming gaps, and created an annual work plan for 2015. The meeting took place in Sarajevo from February 2-5, 2015.

This report provides a summary of the key sessions, conclusions and action items produced at the CIGN 2015 meeting. It begins with recommendations for strengthening the 2016 meeting, proceeds with highlights of daily meeting outputs, and concludes with annexes describing the urgent and important work that both CIGN and the CARE federation needs to do in order to make the gender equality commitments in Vision 2020 a reality. The report also contains basic information on CIGN co-chairs, work plans and related management issues.

All of the [presentations](http://minerva.care.ca/livelink1/livelink.exe?func=ll&objId=4375412&objAction=browse), background reading and other documentation related to CIGN annual meeting 2015 can be found in the [CIGN Annual Meetings and Workshops](http://minerva.care.ca/livelink1/livelink.exe?func=ll&objId=2020425&objAction=browse) folder in the Minerva CIGN Community Library.

# Recommendations for CIGN Annual Meeting 2016

Based on the feedback provided in Meeting evaluations, the facilitator recommends courses of action for a strong CIGN Annual Meeting 2016.

**Clarify the expectations and purpose of the CIGN meeting with participants from the first stages of organization. Ensure that CIGN balances participants’ interests in CI governance and CIGN organizational issues on one hand and program issues on the other.** There were two juxtaposed groups of feedback that show a need for more conversations and communications to take place regarding the purpose of CIGN meetings. One set of participants felt that the discussions about the CIGN role, structure and organizational positioning were overdone and that there needed to be more energy spent on programmatic discussions. Another set of participants felt that the programmatic content was interesting but not a priority for the CIGN meeting. This suggests that CIGN members have very different expectations of and ideas about what the CIGN should be focused on, and that these two types of expectations need to be managed both in terms of communications and also in terms of meeting design.

**Repeat the practice of outlining the roles and expectations about CIGN co-chairs and positions at the beginning of the week.** Many participants identified this as a good practice that they would like to see repeated in the future.

**Consider extending the meeting to 5 days, or hold CIGN action planning before the day(s) on programming.** A number of participants noted that sessions felt rushed given the number of issues that needed to be addressed. The action planning felt rushed and was left unfinished. To mitigate this, extend the meeting length or place the action planning session in a different place in the agenda.

# Day 1: Setting the Stage

## Day 1, Session 1: Town Hall on CARE’s Gender Work to Date

The first day of the meeting focused on providing CIGN members with updates and background information on CARE International gender work to date as a method of building a common knowledge base and understanding amongst attendees. This included presentations from:

Margaret Capelazo, CARE Canada: *A review of the recommendations from the CIGN November 2014 report to the CI Board.*

Abby Maxman, CARE International: *Update on CI changes and priorities linked to the transition.*

Diana Wu, CARE USA: *A review of outcomes and recommendations from the papers produced in FY14.*

Sofia Sprechman, CARE International: *Update on CI staffing plans and suggested priorities for the CI gender function in FY15 and FY16.*

CIGN discussed gender equality in the program strategy with Sofia Sprechmann in a question and answer style. The program strategy provides a unified framework to advance program quality, outcomes and accountability across the CI membership. All CARE programs are expected to link to the program strategy, including to its gender equality approaches and goals. The outcomes expressed in the strategy are not directly equated with programs. It is expected that many programs will achieve one of the strategic outcomes.

**CIGN, Gender Equality and the Program Strategy**

No matter which entry point you use to implement the program strategy, gender equality is the central consideration.

In the program strategy, gender equality is not negotiable.

CIGN has a unique role to play in fleshing out the gender approach in the CI program strategy. CI expects that CIGN will take the lead in articulating the gender approach and providing guidance on gender based violence and women’s voice programming.

## Day 1, Session 2: Good Practice in Interdependence and Collaboration

Select CIGN members presented flagship examples of interdependent program work completed in 2014. These presentations were extemporal (no formal documentation is available) and included:

**What does it Take to Create Effective Interdependence?**

* Identify and capitalise on existing initiatives and momentum.
* Bring diverse groups and people together, considering the CARE office, skill set, geographic location, position and sector.
* Clarify expectations, work flows, budgets, financial contributions and accountability up front.
* Combine a broadly participatory process with grounding in CO realities and practitioner experience.
* Ensure that participants have dedicated time and resources to engage in both the work and the relationship management.
* Involve director level leadership and ensure they have a sense of buy in and ownership over the process.

Nikki de Zwaan, CARE Nederland: *Report on progress against the CI based violence (GBV) strategy.*

Jasveen Ahluwalia, CARE International: *progress in gender in emergencies (GiE).*

Elizabeth Brezovitch, CARE Austria: *Engaging men and boys (global project) and collaboration between CARE Austria, Norway and Uganda.*

## Day 1, Session 3: A Proposition for Internal Gender Equality Consulting

Doris Bartel, CARE USA, proposed a new type of inter-dependent consulting model to provide CARE with gender equality technical assistance starting with clear menu of services that they can offer internally or externally as part of a gender equality self-financing model. CIGN members were excited about the opportunities this presented and noted that the model is a potential opportunity for south-south collaboration and/or staff retention; that it provides an opportunity for inter-dependence; and that the gender in emergencies (GiE) model in the humanitarian sector can provide an example of good practice on how to run this kind of

## Day 1, Session 4: Gaps and Opportunities Analysis

CIGN participants identified potential mechanisms and strategies to maximize CARE’s gender equality governance impact and program quality interdependent model and in the CI program strategy. In small groups, participants identified gaps and opportunities related to: changes in CARE **governance**, efforts to build **interdependence** among members, the CI program **strategy** and the **transition** process to CARE Global. Participants used the information from previous sessions and report back was deferred to Day 2.

**Day One Top Line Messages**

* Outcomes are not programs.
* Gender equality is a non-negotiable in the Program Strategy.
* Interdependence increases results and efficiency.
* The CIGN – and CARE – has an abundance of motivation, excitement, resources and expertise to implement the Program Strategy and move the gender agenda forward in the organization.
* The CIGN has tremendous capacity but can use it more strategically.
* The Policy on the Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) still needs a champion within the CARE world and in CIGN.
* The CIGN is a positive model of the Vision 2020 idea of inter dependence and distributive leadership

# Day 2: Identifying CIGN Priorities

On day 2, the CIGN continued to explore opportunities to work collaboratively and interdependently, to engage with the CI Program Strategy, to coordinate with the CI Gender function and to continue strengthening implementation and accountability for CARE’s gender policy and the CI PSEA. As part of this work, participants

* continued with the Opportunities and Gaps Analysis,
* reviewed the role and function of the CIGN in light of the current transition process, and
* identified concrete actions that need to be included in programmatic and organizational action plans to help move gender equality forward.

## Day 2, Session 1: Gaps and Opportunities Analysis con’t

In a report back, CIGN identified the following as the key gaps, challenges and opportunities for moving gender equality forward in CARE given the transition to CARE Global and the introduction of the program strategy.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Opportunities** | **Gaps** |
| Gender equality is non-negotiable in the CI program strategy |  |
| Targeted advocacy and communications with the people sitting in the strategy development groups to provide support on integrating/developing the gender approach | Lack of CIGN linkages with existing strategy development processes |
| Some people are gender equality champions (but not many) | Who owns GED and how will this move forward? |
| GBV strategy and the fact GBV is part of all the areas of the program strategy | Need to define what is meant by a global program approach |
| Existing inter dependent work, cross sectoral collaboration and gender equality successes | Humanitarian-development continuum and conflict prevention not developed in the strategy |
| Gender consulting model | Funding streams and funding model is based on sectors and can therefore silo programs and/or outcomes |
| Challenge and opportunity – CARE members coming together to develop common methodologies | Challenge – Issues of trust and attribution (ie who ‘owns’ what approach) |
| During the transitional moment, identify resources (funding) for GED staff capacity, management skills and allocate that in the planning | Lack of support and funding for PSEA at Excom level |
| Program and GBV briefs | Lack of a communication strategy and updates throughout the year that communicate the achievements, passion and solidarity of those working on GE with others |
| A chance to redefine the advocacy that will be done post 2015 (for CIGN) | Lack of defined accountability lines and/or will for accountability for certain elements of GE |
| Passion and solidarity | Lack of diversity (gender, nationality, etc) on the board |
| Defining the outcome measures for the program strategy | Defining governance membership based on “financial independence” rather than including program strengths or commitment to gender equality |
| Change membership of governance structures to reflect populations and members we are working with (ie engendering and diversifying board leadership) | Need to align the HR policies across CAREs |
| Country presence reviews | Lack of funding for GE (outside of programs) since there are HR and organizational issues that need to be addressed as well |
| Identify ways to make board members more accountable for impacts and GE | Undefined baselines or indicators related to GE |
| Reporting structures that require COs and CMPs to report against gender indicators |  |

This analysis was produced to feed into the upcoming CIGN work plan.

## Day 2, Session 2: The CIGN Mandate, Roles and Way Forward

CIGN members asked to have a session to surface and discuss the different visions of what the CIGN should be moving forward. During this session, the CIGN members discussed how best to fulfil the group’s mandate in the context of CI’s current transition process, its placement in the formal structure of CI and its relationship to support the implementation of the CI Program Strategy and the CI gender function. The discussion largely centred on the pros and cons of maintaining an informal structure or trying to formalize the CIGN given the changing context. Key conclusions from the discussion were:

* There is now a formal gender function in CI making the informal nature of the CIGN more important, but also demanding that the CIGN have a clear strategy for interacting with the formal gender function.
* The informal aspect of the CIGN allows the group to act as an advocacy and activist initiative within CARE but also means that several members are expected to engage with the CIGN and gender equality off the sides of their desks.
* Formalizing the CIGN into a sub-committee in the governance structure would allow members to have sanctioned time and space from their managers for CIGN work and would provide a direct line to management at the CI level and more possibility for influence. However, formalizing also means the CIGN runs the risk of being co-opted into existing management models and being a functional, rather than strategic, body.

Ultimately, the discussion highlighted the importance of distinguishing between formalization on working vs governance levels. It was also noted that the CIGN never was totally informal as it has TORs, (had) restrictions on membership and mailing lists and some reporting responsibility to the CI Board. Participants agreed that they do not want to lose the various advantages of the current more informal setting but that it was important to create a formal entity that is fit for CARE Global purpose as well. CIGN may be able to call on the support of Mike Furher and CIGN national director ambassadors as it shifts to a new model under CARE Global.

On Day 4, the CIGN members voted to move the CIGN into a hybrid informal-formal model that reaffirms the groups’ important advocacy function and positions it within CI’s new architecture. It is hoped that this ensures an optimal balance of internal advocacy, activism and influence. The Governance working group was tasked with defining the model in the first few months of their 2015 action plan.

## Day 2, Session 3: Identifying CIGN’s and CARE’s Gender Equality Priorities

This session used the Gaps and Opportunity Analysis to make concrete recommendations for the CI program strategy and to identify activities that the CIGN needs to pursue in 2015. Participants identified key activities under five categories:

* Programs and Impacts,
* CARE’s Presence and Legitimacy,
* Leadership, Alignment and Accountability,
* Fundraising and Communications, and
* Other.

Participants prioritised activities that were “urgent” and “important but not urgent” for both CIGN to do and for others in the CARE federation to do under each of these five categories. The complete output of these exercise can be found in the annexes. The key priority activities for CIGN and for others

**Top 5 Urgent Tasks for CIGN**

* Identify methods to hold CDs accountable for gender equality program (and organizational) standards.
* Articulate standards for the gender approach in the program strategy.
* Explore the definition of voice in the program strategy.
* Develop communications materials to explain the gender equality approach in the program strategy.

**Top 5 Urgent Tasks for CARE International**

* Find a method of continuing the GED work, especially as training for senior managers.
* Revise CI and national board membership TORs to include gender balance and interests and skills in gender equality.
* Include CI GE policy benchmarks in country presence reviews.
* Link PIIRS data with the CI gender policy.
* Address the PSEA.

**Day Two and Three Top Line Messages**

* CIGN is modeling distributive leadership.
* The CARE Balkans program is an excellent example of a best practice.
* Importance of promoting creativity and edginess (such as a co-authored play where the public and CARE staff are invited together).
* Social norms is a lens that can be used to understand how change happens
* CIGN and CARE members are aligning around gender equality through the program strategy. CIGN has a responsibility to provide leadership here.
* There is a need to connect the women’s empowerment framework with other important frameworks within CARE.
* Is there a way to use evidence from gold standard projects to influence current and new programming?
* Be context specific
* Be consistent – use the women’s empowerment framework

## Day 2, Session 4: Guest Speaker on Social Norms and Masculinities

Mrs. Sabiha Husic, the director of Medica Zenica spoke on the evolution of her organization and on the strengths and opportunities involved in partnership with an organization such as CARE. She outlined the way in which Medica Zenica works with boys and men to support its work on gender based violence (GBV) and women’s rights.

# Day 3 – Social Norms

This day shifted gears from discussing gender issues in CARE governance and management to focusing on programming, with a specific look at using social norms frameworks and approaches to create deep structural gender change in programs. The goal of the day was to identify ways in which social norms approaches can apply to CIGN’s recommendations on the CI program strategy and the upcoming CIGN action plan. Doris Bartel and Theresa Hwang (both from CARE USA) led the day.

**Social Norms Key Conclusions**

* The important role of social norms in gender work implies a need to better align advocacy work, theories of change and programming strategies with the approach.
* Social norms work takes considerable time, while quick results are typically required under current funding cycles.
* There is an opportunity to document where CARE work is of similarly high quality in order to articulate the gold standard.
* There are a multitude of technical tools, and it may be helpful to map and endorse a smaller set.
* A rights based perspective needs to be incorporated into the approach.

In addition to providing an introduction to social norms theory, CARE Ethiopia and Balkans shared their good practices and experiences from working with the theory. CARE Ethiopia used social analysis and action to uncover and explore the social norms influencing early forced child marriage and nutrition programming. In the Balkans, the Young Men’s Initiative started in 2006 based on a situation analysis and now works with schools known for having populations of particularly vulnerable or challenged boys. The program centers on challenging and transforming masculinities. CIGN explored the issues that CARE Ethiopia and the Balkans raised through a market place discussion. It also analyzed and discussed ways to make social norms approaches practical and to identify the implications of social norms for monitoring and evaluation.

# Day 4 – Action Planning

On the final day of the workshop, CIGN planned for 2015. To do so, the group

* looked at the results of the Gaps and Opportunities Analysis prioritization,
* revisited the conversation on CIGN’s role and structure,
* created working groups for the year,
* identified the new co-chairs and 3 working groups leads, and then
* broke into work groups to complete action plans.

**CIGN Working Groups Priority Activities for 2015**

**Organizational Accountability Working Group**

* Make CI reporting against the gender policy more accurate, standardised and robust.
* Improve the gender equality benchmarks to which COs are held accountable for programming and organizational GE results.
* Advocate for the implementation of, and accountability to the CI PSEA.

**The Program Working Group:**

* Develop guidance to define the gender equality approach in the program strategy. Create related minimum standards.
* Elaborate guidance and/or ”white papers” on “women’s voice” and on the outcome area “life free from violence.”

**Governance Working Group:**

* Influence CI structure and operations.
* Develop guidance to fit the new gender function into the evolving CI structure.
* Update CIGN’s mandate, structure and function to fit Vision 2020.

The three working groups are:

* Governance, led by Doris Bartel (dbartel@care.org)
* Accountability, led by Sonia Martins (martins@careinternational.org), and
* Programming, led by Feven Tassew ([ftassew@care.org](mailto:ftassew@care.org)) and Nikki de Zwaan (dezwaan@carenederland.org).

The three co-chairs for 2015 are:

* Alexandra Wilde (CARE Norway): alexandra.wilde@care.no
* Theresa Hwang (CARE USA): thwang@care.org
* Margaret Capelazo (CARE Canada): margaret.capelazo@care.ca

# Evaluation and Annexes

At the end of the CIGN meeting, the facilitator asked participants to provide feedback regarding:

1. The organization and content of the meeting
2. The logistics and organization of activities in country
3. The facilitation and methodologies used

|  |
| --- |
| Annex 1:Analysis of Urgent and Important Gender Work for CIGN and the CARE Federation to do to Make Vision 2020 a Reality |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The following is a synthesis of the potential recommendations, actions and priorities identified during the first 2 days of brainstorming and conversation at the 2015 CIGN meeting and form the basis of the CIGN work plan to be developed for 2015. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **CIGN** | | **TOTAL CIGN** |  | **Others** | | **TOTAL Others** |  | **Not Prioritized** |  | **TOTAL** |
|  | **Urgent** | **Important** |  | **Urgent** | **Important** |  |  |
| **PROGRAMS AND IMPACTS** | **32** | **17** | **49** | **0** | **8** | **12** | **20** | **0** | **13** | **0** | **69** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Definition and/or Guidance: General/Standards | 15 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 22 |
| Guidance: Briefs | 5 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 15 |
| Understanding Program Context/Outcomes (ie mapping) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Program Leadership/Governance | 3 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
| Capacity (to implement program approach) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Accountability for GE in the Program Strategy/Policy | 6 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| Increase impact through HR | 3 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| TA support and networking | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CARE's PRESENCE AND LEGITIMACY** | **1** | **1** | **2** |  | **0** | **2** | **2** |  | **3** |  | **4** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **LEADERSHIP, ALIGNMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY** | **24** | **29** | **53** | **0** | **45** | **14** | **59** | **0** | **35** | **0** | **112** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sharing, Learning | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Accountability and measurement frameworks | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Analysis | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Data, Benchmarks, Systems (for GE/CI Gender Policy) | 6 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 19 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 26 |
| Obligations: Program Standards and Reporting | 7 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 23 |
| Organizational Leadership and Accountability | 2 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 18 |
| Influencing CARE leadership | 2 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 8 |
| HR and alignment | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 |
| Internal Communications | 2 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 15 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **FUNDRAISING AND COMMUNICATIONS** | **7** | **4** | **11** | **0** | **16** | **11** | **27** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **38** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Branding and communications | 6 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Internal movement building | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Funding and Resources | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **"OTHER" (AS IMPORTANT FOR ACHIEVING THE PS AND IP FROM A GE PERSPECTIVE** | **7** | **8** | **15** | **0** | **7** | **8** | **15** | **0** | **4** | **0** | **30** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Governance | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| CIGN Structure, role, etc | 7 | 7 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 17 |
| **Priorities not on the wall, but that need to be included (based on discussions in the room over the last few days)** |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provide specific recommendations to flesh out the "gender approach" in the CI Program Strategy (and id roles re who develops it, when, how, etc) |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | **0** |
| Provide specific recommendations to "engender" the CI Program Strategy Implementation Plan |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | **0** |

**NOTE – 3 things raised and discussed a lot during the meeting, but not prioritized from the brainstorming/prioritization exercise include:**

* PSEA – Follow up (though there are recommendations included in the brainstorming. See the HR section of the Excel table).
* Role of the Gender Director/Head and their links/relationship w CIGN. See the Excel table for specific references.
* “Engendering” the Program Strategy, “gender approach,” and implementation plan
* **TOP 14 SUGGESTED PRIORITIES FOR CIGN**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **CIGN** | | |
|  | **Urgent** | **Important** | **TOTAL** |
| Explore definition of “voice” – at what levels and including organizational issues of voice (ie COs and women’s leadership) | **5** |  | 5 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Articulate standards for gender approach – Program Directors need line to Sofia to ensure accountability | **6** |  | 6 |
| Help define "life free from violence" in a way that helps know which projects and program go into the mapping | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Develop briefs to explain the approaches | **5** |  | 5 |
| Develop a brief to clarify "GBV" vs/and "violence and conflict" |  | 4 | 4 |
| Strategic leadership for continued GED roll out (need to find it? Identify it) | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Ensure gender transformative strategy in Program Strategy developments - identify gender people in each piece of strategy development (and, if there is a gap, ensure someone is there) | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Gender transformative strategy in Program Strategy developments - accountability to update regularly (GBV, WEE, FNS, SRMH) | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| GED roll out to continue | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Set specific gendered benchmarks/targets for the outcomes in the Program Strategy | **4** |  | 4 |
| Hold CDs accountable to gender org program standards | **7** |  | 7 |
| Provide advocacy messages from CIGN to key opinion leaders |  | 4 | 4 |
| Regularly communicate successes of CIGN |  | 5 | 5 |
| Review recommendations re CIGN membership, roles, responsibilities and update TORs, change CIGN member roles and officially include others | 3 | 3 | 6 |

**TOP 14 SUGGESTED PRIORITIES FOR OTHERS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Others** | | |
|  | **Urgent** | **Important** | **TOTAL** |
| Promote common understanding of global program | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Develop briefs to explain the approaches | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Continue with gender audit in CMPs and COs |  | 4 | 4 |
| Include CI GE policy benchmarks or just GE benchmarks in country presence reviews | **4** | 1 | 5 |
| Link PIIRS data with CI Gender policy (indicators and guidance) | **4** |  | 4 |
| Gender Marker in all new proposals | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Develop explicit/common program standards (and clarity) for Cos and clear mechanisms to measure them (ie re CI gender policy and PIIRS) | **4** |  | 4 |
| Revise board member TORs to include GE (incl national boards?) | **5** |  | 5 |
| Address PSEA//Resubmit PSEA proposal to Mike and Transformation Group | **4** |  | 4 |
| Sofia to record video explaining importance of GE in/for the program strategy | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Branding and a really clear message to donors, staff, partners and potential staff | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Articulate gender priorities for CI fundraising cmte (in line w program strategy and w common language) | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Fundraise for GED capacity building (especially for senior management) | **6** | 2 | 8 |
| Improve diversity of board membership | 2 | 4 | 6 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Annex 2: CIGN Annual Meeting 2015 Evaluation Feedback** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1 (lowest)** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5 (highest)** | **Did not answer** | **TOTAL** |
| **Day 1 - Setting the Stage** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Setting the Stage – Town Hall Presentations* |  |  | 3 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 15 |
| *Setting the Stage – Lessons Learned from Previous cross-CARE collaborative work (presentations)* | | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 15 |
| *Setting the Stage – Gaps and Opportunities Analysis (small group work)* |  | 1 |  | 6 | 4 | 4 | 15 |
| *Additional sessions not originally on the agenda* |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | 11 | 15 |
| **Day 2 – Identifying Gender and CIGN Priorities** |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| *Gaps and Opportunities Analysis (con’t): Report Backs and additional conversations* | | 2 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 15 |
| *Identification of recommendations and activities for the CIGN (2015) and the CI Program Strategy (and implementation Plan): Small Group Work* | | 2 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 15 |
| *Prioritizing recommendations and activities for the CIGN and the CI Program Strategy: Individual Exercise* | | 3 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 15 |
| *Additional sessions not originally on the agenda (CIGN role/purpose/space in the future)* | |  | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 15 |
| *Guest Speakers – Medica Zenza* |  |  | 1 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 15 |
| *Theatre attendance: Macho Men, the play* |  |  |  | 2 | 12 | 1 | 15 |
| **Day 3 – Social Norms** |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| *Theoretical framework and CARE Ethiopia experiences (presentations)* |  |  | 2 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 15 |
| *Learning from other experiences (external presentations by CARE partners from the Balkans)* | | |  | 4 | 9 | 2 | 15 |
| *Marketplace discussions* |  |  |  | 6 | 8 | 1 | 15 |
| *Making it practical (group work and plenary)* |  | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 15 |
| *Implications for M and E (group work and plenary)* |  | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 15 |
| **Day 4 – Action Planning** |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| *Prioritizing recommendations and actions (synthesis)* |  |  | 2 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 15 |
| *The CIGN: Decision Making and Propositions (discussion)* |  |  | 2 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 15 |
| *CIGN 2015 Action/Work Planning* |  | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 15 |

**Additional Comments:**

***Day 1 - Setting the Stage***

More time for presentations next year

Good, some of the back story may have been useful

Nice start, good energy

***Day 2 - Identifying Gender and CIGN Priorities***

Great to connect to programming

We paid in the end for not grouping properly the activities (still multiple and similar activities) when we tried to identify priorities

High quality theatre

**Day 3 - Social Norms and Program Experiences**

Probably in hindsight, best doing this on last day so we have enough time to do work planning. More on the M and E would have been useful

Best day! Extrapolation from concrete experience to general guidelines

M and E - Would have been good to have a little more time on this. This was really excellent.

***Day 4 - Action Planning for CIGN 2015***

Would have been good to link across groups and clarify wor (but no time!)

Not enough time (we should have taken more time ie 4 day meeting). This part always gets squeezed. Let's learn for next time.

Sightseeing tour (add a…)

Balance internal and external/programmatic topics. Felt it was more about internal organizational issues (which is also needed)

Thought this was really well organized. Lots of space for discussion.

Have at least half a day of open/unstructured space for people to have more one on one conversations (rare and valuable!)