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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3SPN</td>
<td>Three Sesan River Protection Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoD</td>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVC</td>
<td>Building Community Voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community Based Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Commune Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Cooperation Committee for Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSP</td>
<td>Cambodian Civil Society Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSS</td>
<td>Cambodia Civil Society Strengthening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGA</td>
<td>Cambodia Gender Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Commune Investment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Community Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMDG</td>
<td>Cambodia Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Community Reporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIW</td>
<td>District Integration Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Development Partner (Donor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRG</td>
<td>Democracy, Rights and Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Ethnic Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWMI</td>
<td>East-West Management Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GESI</td>
<td>Gender and Social Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>Highlander Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Indigenous People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP3.3</td>
<td>Implementation Plan 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAF</td>
<td>Implementation of the Social Accountability Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transsexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mol</td>
<td>Ministry of Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOP</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVI</td>
<td>My Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPVAW</td>
<td>National Action Plan to Prevent Violence Against Women and Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>Nak Akphivath Sahakum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCDD</td>
<td>National Committee on Decentralization and Deconcentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>Natural Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTFP</td>
<td>Non-Timber Forest Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODC</td>
<td>Open Development Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDoWA</td>
<td>Provincial Dept of Women’s Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDP</td>
<td>People Center for Development and Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKH</td>
<td>Ponlok Khmer Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>People with Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNA</td>
<td>Sub-national authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNL</td>
<td>sub-national levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCC</td>
<td>Youth Council of Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRDP</td>
<td>Youth Resource Development Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

East-West Management Institute (EWMI) commissioned a Gender and Social Inclusion (GESI) assessment of its first round of 12 grantee partners under the Cambodian Civil Society Strengthening (CCSS) program. The purpose of this exercise was to assess the grantees’ GESI-related strengths, weaknesses, and results achieved, and to extract lessons learned and develop a framework for EWMI to apply to the CCSS program moving forward. The assessment covers both the partners’ internal institutional structure and external program interventions, with a view to understanding how these will affect GESI in their outcomes. The framework has been designed to help EWMI and their partners learn to improve; capture change for accountability; and project future impact. The assessment also analyzes the extent to which CCSS grantees are delivering on GESI at the outcome level, using the three overarching goals of the USAID Gender Policy as a framework.

The report includes a background summary situation analysis on gender, ethnicity and disability issues in Cambodia. Cambodia has achieved the CMDG targets for gender equality in education and literacy, however this impressive progress has yet to be reflected in women’s equal (or at least significantly increased) participation in higher levels of public sector management, decision-making and leadership. In particular at the sub-national level, women in leadership positions are rare. That said, a number of women working in civil society positions and projects gain valuable relevant experience that leads them to formal leadership positions in their communities. The CCSP project has provided this platform for 24 women so far and promises to deliver more by the end of the project. Gender-based violence is a commonly raised issue, one in five ever-partnered Cambodian women aged 15-64 reported experiencing physical or sexual violence, or both, by an intimate partner in their lifetime, and these cases are rarely addressed through the proper legal channels, the current legal system is making it difficult for cases to be effectively prosecuted. There are 24 indigenous groups spread across 15 provinces, with the highest populations by far in Ratanakiri, Mondulkiri and Kratie. They are estimated to number around 200,000 or around 1.2% of the population. Approximately 9.5% of the population over five years of age reported some form of physical difficulty; 2.1% of the population reported a ‘strong difficulty’. They tend to have lower levels of education, employment, and participation in public life.

The GESI assessment covered both internal institutional structures as well as external program level outcomes. To the extent possible the data has been quantified and tabulated to facilitate on going monitoring. Key findings of the GESI assessment of the 12 CSO partners are as follows:

- Partners’ main GESI metric is quantifying participation in staffing and project activities in community structures and events. While representation matters and is a necessary starting point and a possible transmission mechanism, there is a need to broaden the focus to also include the substance and issues being discussed and addressed which will lead to GESI responsive results (noting that GESI is not just about having GESI issues raised by women/IP/PWD but also women/IP/PWD raising “mainstream issues” and men/non-IP raising GESI issues. To date the GESI emphasis has been mainly on the process rather than outcomes: partners have focused on GESI in participation in project activities, however they also need to ensure GESI is reflected in the identification of advocacy issues and follow up on results.

- The existence of a gender policy, and its implementation, is an element of the GESI infrastructure necessary for building a robust internal GESI system, by demonstrating corporate willingness and commitment to acknowledge the importance of GESI to the organization. Eleven of the 12 partners have a gender policy that covers gender and sometimes other forms of inclusion such as IP, in either staffing or programs as beneficiaries. Five partners have quantitative targets for women in organizational leadership and/or in participation in programs.

- A third of the partners is led by a woman Executive Director (ED), which is fairly significant in a male-dominated field such as governance and natural resource management. This trend is
mirrored in the average representation of women in the partners’ Board of Directors and Senior Management Teams. In terms of staffing, the average is 40% women, and partners that work with interns and volunteers report a higher representation of women in these roles.

- One partner, HA, is led and staffed 100% by IP, 4 (33%) of the partners have IP on staff, and only 2 have IP on their Board of Directors and Management Teams. Only 3 partners claimed to have GESI expertise, a third have gender focal points, approximately half have had some sort of gender training for selected staff through other Donor or NGO funded initiatives, and most requested further GESI training from CCSS.

- Key gender issues raised include: female staff and beneficiary attrition due to marriage, gender based violence in communities and personal security issues for female staff in the field, the high level of women’s participation in project activities and the low level of women’s voice and participation in leadership and decision making. There is an emphasis on women’s role in natural resource management (NRM), and the impact of NR issues on women’s time, income and labour.

- Key issues related to indigenous people include: IP are most affected by land grabbing and displacement and rely on natural resources for their survival. It is more challenging to have IP demands met (related to land concessions, etc) due to the entrenched business interests at stake. It is difficult to recruit IP on staff due to language and capacity constraints. Indigenous women experience more burdens because in IP culture men cannot help with housework.

- The majority of the partners state that they use a mainstreaming approach to gender, although this is implicit rather than explicitly documented in the reporting. Due to the regional and issue specific nature of working with IPs, partners working on IP issues take a targeted approach, as it is difficult to mainstream IPs into ‘non-IP specific’ interventions. While partners state that they welcome the participation of PWD in their events, there is no deliberate needs assessment or planned activities addressing their specific needs under CCSS.

- One important observation relates to the absence of systematic GESI data collection to inform evidence-based planning. For the general community-government dialogues around Commune Investment Plans (CIP), partners take a more ‘organic’ approach to identifying the ‘key issues’ to take forward to higher levels. This is through community stakeholder consultations and public forums, which are facilitated in an open-ended manner by community-selected leaders, resulting in a consensus-driven issue selection process which risks leaving out the voices and concerns of marginalized groups. While partners are following a community driven approach, in light of the risk of exclusion of marginalized groups, an ‘inclusive facilitation’ process should be considered whereby the diversity in voices and issues in the community are heard and recorded.

- A typology of direct and indirect beneficiaries was developed to track to what degree women and IP were benefiting from the projects, and how. Direct beneficiaries include those who play an active role in the project activities and receive logistical support and training from the project: for at least seven partners the majority of the community leaders are women, some reporting up to 80% women in leadership roles. At least half of the partners report that the majority of their volunteers are women. At least 7 partners reportedly support issue-based community groups or networks, of these five partners report having 50% or more women as their community group or network members. Indirect beneficiaries are more ‘passive’ participants in the project activities, such as the community-level stakeholders who are ‘consulted’ or invited to attend public forums or CIP meetings with local authorities to discuss issues. The majority of the partners engage with this type of beneficiary, and most report 50% or more women in this group. It would appear that for CIP meetings, which are smaller and more selective, this might be lower.

- For the most part engagement with government counterparts consisted of preparing for and facilitating community advocacy dialogue with local authorities such as commune and district councils regarding CIP, with the Departments of Fishery and Forestry regarding natural resource management. Partners noted that there are very few women in sub-national councils, thus the main government interlocutors are male. GESI issues are sometimes raised in the context of the CIP, however they tend not to be the primary issues on the agenda.
In addition to counting the number of women and IP among the beneficiaries, GESI results can also be measured through the project outcomes in the context of USAID’s three key gender policy priorities, related to 1) access to resources and opportunities, 2) elimination of gender-based violence, and 3) increasing women’s capacity and voice to realize their rights. Increased capability of women and IP to realize their rights and influence decision making in all spheres is the most immediate outcome to CCSS partners’ activities which are focusing on strengthening citizens’ strategic communications. All partners contribute significantly to this goal. The instances where women participating in the project have taken on official leadership roles also fall under capacity to influence decision making. The partners are also well aligned to the first goal related to access to resources and opportunities, in so far as they provide opportunities for training, as well as access to natural resources and enhanced incomes as a result of advocacy. Approximately half of the partners mentioned that gender-based violence is raised by stakeholders, and in some cases discussed with local authorities.

Most partners reported GESI-related achievements, usually referring to outliers or exceptions, in order words accomplishments of individual women who stood out as ‘brave and confident.’ While these individual cases are interesting and important as role models leading the way to demonstrate what can be achieved, partners’ GESI outcomes should ideally not consist of a small set of aggregated outliers / individual exceptional cases such as these, rather in order to demonstrate sustainable systemic change it will be necessary to document the specific transmission mechanisms which create the enabling environment for a critical mass of such cases to become normalized.

The CCSS GESI work can be assessed through this framework lens: 1) Demand side: most partners focus on community-led demand side processes, see above point on selection of issues, and there is a need for a systematic mechanism to ensure that GESI issues are raised. 2) Supply side: more robust follow up with government response is needed. It would be strategic to embed demands in the context of specific government policy commitments and systems. This requires partners to have a comprehensive understanding of the policy framework related to their sector of interest, as well as local to national mechanisms for holding government accountable for the implementation of these policies.

The partners are actually achieving a lot in terms of GESI, however this is not highlighted or leveraged for deeper impact. There are ‘low hanging fruit’ type opportunities, and the recommendations at the end of the report are designed to support each partner move forward with their GESI intentions, and to provide EWMI/CCSS guidance on how integrate GESI into their own systems, to codify and operationalize these principles across all EWMI/CCSS partners’ programmes, in order to follow up with the 12 partners covered under this assessment and how to address GESI with new partners moving forward.

Suggested recommendations for EWMI CCSS to embed GESI into its own systems as well as its support to partners directly and through service providers such as VBNK, include developing a EWMI/CCSS GESI policy; integrating GESI into CCSS systems including: theory of change, results framework, outcome indicators, M&E and reporting templates (quarterly and annual reports), USAID CSO Strategic Communications Index Interview Guide, USAID Organizational Development Interview Guide, quarterly partner meetings, CCSS mid-term review and final evaluation (if applicable).

Key cross cutting recommendations for partners include: review and discuss GESI assessment and recommendations with team, and with CCSS and VBNK as appropriate; integrate recommendations into strategic plan and workplan; monitor and document implementation of their own Gender/GESI Policy by assessing the current situation in relation to policy targets together with management team and key staff; include a brief report on the policy implementation in the CCSS annual report; pro-
actively integrate GESI into VBNK work on strategic plans, M&E, other capacity development, etc.; monitor and report against the GESI targets included in initial EWMI proposal, include this in the annual report; maintain updated GESI tables on internal and external data, and include this in the annual report.

1. Objective and Approach

East West Management Institute (EWMI) commissioned a Gender and Social Inclusion (GESI) assessment of its first round of 12 grantee partners under the Cambodian Civil Society Strengthening (CCSS) program. The purpose of this exercise was to assess the grantees’ GESI-related strengths, weaknesses, and results achieved, and to extract lessons learned and develop a framework for EWMI to apply to the CCSS program moving forward. The assessment covers both the partners’ internal institutional structure and external program interventions, with a view to understanding how these will affect GESI in their outcomes.

CCSS aims to improve the capability of civil society to participate in governance activities by representing citizens. A key aspect of this is to monitor and measure change and more importantly to identify and isolate the transmission mechanisms for change in GESI. This GESI assessment framework is designed to achieve this objective but also to be used as an adaptive management tool. This is particularly relevant in light of the timing of this assessment, mid-way through the CCSS program. As such, the framework has been designed to help EWMI and their partners learn to improve; capture change for accountability; and project future impact.

The assessment also analyzes the extent to which CCSS grantees are delivering on GESI at the outcome level, using the three overarching goals of the USAID Gender Policy as a framework. This is further explained in Section 2 below. This report serves to both demonstrate achievements as well as to provide guidance on how to improve on GESI outcomes. It provides a framework for evaluating GESI impact at the end of the project, using an ‘eco-system’ approach, where not every partner has to necessarily cover every GESI issue in-depth, but all should be aware and open to accessibility, and more importantly, the portfolio of partners as a group should make a significant contribution to improving GESI in the thematic systems that they operate within.

While the assessment strives to move beyond the basic ‘head count’ approach to measuring GESI, and to examine GESI issues in the technical and substantive outcomes of the CCSS partners’ activities, representation still matters, both internal and external to partners. Thus the assessment adopts the ‘Nothing about us without us’ approach to GESI, using representation (gender, ethnicity) within the partner organizations as well as their target beneficiaries as proxies for some of the quantitative GESI indicators. This is also in recognition of the fact that increasing and deepening the level of engagement with women, minorities and other traditionally marginalized groups, is one form of transmission mechanism for systemic change and movement towards creating more inclusive and equitable power relations and structures. Capturing systemic change and indications of sustainability requires moving beyond the ‘outliers’ of successful women leaders that are usually highlighted, and demonstrating a permanent change in the governance systems, government and civil society transactions in favor of gender equality and social inclusion, beyond a one-off or temporary ‘shift of the dial.’

The recommendations are also aimed to provide EWMI/CCSS guidance on how integrate GESI into their own systems, to codify and operationalize these principles across all EWMI/CCSS partners’ programmes, in order to follow up with the 12 partners covered under this assessment and how to address GESI with new partners moving forward. These can also serve as a basis for informing USAID and EWMI on how to build in GESI as part of future Democracy, Rights and Governance (DRG) programs involving multiple local partners. With this higher level application objective in mind, this
report positions the assessment in the broader USAID Gender and Social Inclusion related Policy and Program Guidelines, including the Gender Policy, the GESI mandate, and the Guidelines on Gender Integration in Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance. These USAID policy directives have been summarised in Section 2 below.

2. Methodology

The overall GESI assessment was conducted over a period from September 2018 to February 2019. The key activities are outlined below (see table of meetings in Annex 1):

- Drafted GESI Self-Assessment Tool, discussed with EWMI, USAID. (September 2018)
- Consultations, first round: Interviewed all 12 partners, total 51 people, 15 women (29%), 7 IP (14%), 1 PWD. Each consultation was between 2-3 hours. Held consultations with 12 relevant external stakeholders. (September 2018)
- Summarized each partner consultation ‘in their own words’ and action points to return to partners for their team validation and completion. (September 2018)
- Drafted framework for analysis and recommendations, discussed with EWMI. (September 2018)
- Drafted interim report and submitted to EWMI, provided recommendations on follow up with partners, talking points for USAID Gender and Development Presentation in October, agenda for Grantee Meeting on GESI in December 2018. (October 2018)
- Consultations, second round: conducted follow up interviews with all 12 partners. Meetings with EWMI, USAID, VBNK (January 2019)
- Reviewed all partners Gender Policies and Annual Reports. Drafted proposed annotated outline and analytical framework for final report and discussed with EWMI. (January 2019)
- Drafted Final Report and submitted to EWMI for comments. (February 2019)
- Revised individual partner assessments and action plans. (February 2019)

The GESI Assessment is based on a participatory self-assessment tool (see Annex 2) which is designed to capture both explicit (quantitative and visible) data as well as tacit (qualitative, internalised, observation and process-based) evidence of each partner’s achievements, gaps, strengths and weaknesses with respect to addressing GESI as part of the CCSS program. The assessment process included two rounds (September 2018 and January 2019) of 3 hour consultations with all 12 partners, as well as a desk review of partners’ project proposals (objectives, activities and M&E indicators) as well as their annual reports (covering the period from 1 October 2017 to 30 September 2018), and their Gender Policies. The consultations covered both the overall institutional capacity assessments including mission and vision, staffing, internal policies, as well as program planning and execution, monitoring and reporting of results. While the discussions covered the partners’ overall GESI issues, more emphasis was placed on the actual results achieved under the CCSS program. As most of the CCSS grants have only been operating since 2017 many of the reported results are very preliminary, however the GESI assessments provide a ‘mid-point’ picture of the institutional arrangements and the program set up through a GESI lens, and the recommendations are designed to allow for mid-course correction without requiring additional resources.

**Working definition of GESI in CCSS**

This assessment uses a working definition of GESI that is useful and relevant to the CCSS partners’ objectives and context. While the consultations encouraged the respondents to comment on all aspects of GESI, including gender, ethnicity and indigenous people (EM/IP), disability (PWD), and sexuality (LGBT), the responses suggested that the main focus is on gender and IP, as women and IP (as well as youth) are the key target groups for the majority of the partners’ projects. While the partners were sensitive to the need to include PWD in their activities, and they were able to respond to questions regarding PWD representation in their organizations and beneficiaries, these numbers were very low, and partners felt that they did not have the necessary resources to deliberately target
PWD as beneficiaries as they require very specific and technical interventions which were outside the scope of their remits and budgets. That said, several partners mentioned including PWD issues in dialogue with local authorities, and PWD are monitored in terms of participation in community events. With respect to LGBT, this group only came up in two partners’ responses, and it was noted that like non-IP minorities such as ethnic Muslim/Cham, they would rather not be identified as such for fear of discrimination. Furthermore partners felt that ethnic Cham were well integrated in mainstream Khmer society and did not require specific measures for inclusion. Section 3 below provides a situation analysis related to gender, ethnicity, and disability to provide some background context as to why these issues are significant for GESI.

USAID Policy Context related to GESI

“USAID requires all projects to address gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) as a crosscutting theme and regularly undergo rigorous GESI analysis and compliance evaluation. As part of project design, USAID calls for mandatory use of a GESI Action Plan and reporting on it as one of the key project deliverables. USAID’s GESI Action Plan framework uses the CLA Maturity Matrix which incorporates the key enabling conditions such as the implementing partners own GESI policy, senior management’s readiness to understand the importance of teamwork in undertaking GESI responsibilities, and their commitment to provide a fair, dignified and safe work environment to women and marginalized groups1.”

According to the USAID/Cambodia Gender Assessment conducted in 2010, many USAID implementing partners do not have a good understanding of or the competencies to use and/or apply gender analysis in the implementation of development interventions. Difficulties have been identified in applying analytical methods to explore links between gender and its contribution to development outcomes.

Gender analysis is a foundation of ‘thinking and working politically’ as it reveals how gender-based power, both privilege and domination and marginalization and subordination, is socially constructed and, as such, can be changed or even wholly transformed. This assessment will use the USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy2 and the USAID ADS2053 to guide and frame the assessment and recommendations to ensure alignment with broader USAID gender approach. The box below summarises USAID’s key gender-related policies and principles.

---

The Gender Integration in Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance Toolkit\textsuperscript{4} (June 2016) contains modules on how to integrate gender effectively into the following ten DRG sub-sectors:

1. Human Rights Protection and Promotion
2. Civil Society
3. Rule of Law and the Justice Sector
4. Legislative Strengthening
5. Local Governance and Devolution
6. Political Party Development
7. Electoral Processes
8. Anti-Corruption and Accountability
9. Reconciliation, Peacebuilding, and Transitional Justice
10. Media and Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs)

This assessment draws from the toolkit’s useful guidance on flagging and addressing gender issues, broadening it to address other key aspects of inclusion such as ethnicity, with a focus mainly on the following sub-sectors: civil society, local governance and devolution, anti-corruption and accountability. This has been summarized in Annex 3.

This GESI assessment seeks to localize these principles in the Cambodian DRG context, to analyze the CCSS grantee portfolio, and to codify and operationalize these principles across EWMI/CCSS partners’ programs.

3. GESI Country Context and Situation Analysis

This section provides a brief background on the key GESI issues related to CCSS, namely gender (with a focus on education as a proxy for ‘capacity’, representation in government and leadership, and gender based violence), Ethnicity and Indigenous People, and Disability. It should be noted that the NCDD/IP3.3 GESI Strategy also addresses these gender and disability issues, and can be taken as a policy signal from government on which GESI issues are policy priorities in the sub-national governance context.

Gender

Education and capacity: Cambodia has achieved the CMDG targets for gender equality in education and literacy5. Based on national net enrolment rates Cambodia achieved near gender parity at a primary level in 2007. Since then, gender parity levels (at the national level) have remained relatively constant with a total primary net enrolment of 93.5% (93.9% for girls). Gross enrolment rates at both lower and upper secondary level also show slightly higher enrolments for girls as well as higher dropout rates for boys6. National learning assessment results also suggest that girls perform slightly better than boys on average at the primary and lower secondary levels in all areas. While female students represent a third of technical and TVET students they are mainly concentrated in short courses and traditional ‘female’ sectors. The share of women students in higher education which includes Associate, Bachelor, Masters and PhD degrees, has increased from 36% to 48% in the past decade.

Representation in Government and leadership: The impressive progress that Cambodia has achieved in gender equality in basic and higher education and in the labour market has yet to be reflected in women’s equal (or at least significantly increased) participation in higher levels of public sector management, decision-making and leadership. Women currently make up 41% of the civil service, however they tend to be concentrated at lower levels of government and in those sectors that are traditionally associated with their gender (health, education, women’s and social affairs, culture and fine arts, etc). There are currently 20%, or one in five, women in the National Assembly as of 2018, showing a slight decrease over the past decade, and 19% women in the Senate, an increase over the previous 15% over the past decade.

At the sub-national level, women in leadership positions are rare. There is only 1 woman (4%) out of 25 Provincial/Capital (PC) Governors, and 7 women (3.5%) out of 197 District/ Municipality/Khan (DMK) Governors. They fare slightly better at deputy level: women are 26 out of 150 (17.3%) of PC Deputy Governors, and 185 out of 711 (26%) of DMK Deputy Governors7. Representation in sub-national councils is fairly low: only 1 out of 25 Provincial Councils is headed by a woman, with 16% and 14% female provincial and DMK council members respectively, as of the last election in 2014.

At the commune level, the 2017 Commune Council (CC) election results showed a slight decrease by 1 percentage point of women CC members (from 17.8 to 16.8%), and Second Deputy Chiefs (from 9.2% to 7%); and an increase in women in the position of Commune Chief (an increase from 5.9% to

---

6 UNICEF (2018): Narrative on Gender Cited from Description of Actions (DoA) submitted to EU. Phnom Penh
7.8%) and First Deputy Chief (an increase from 11.6% to 14.2% women), while women as Second Deputy Chiefs reduced from 9.2% to 7%. However, following the dissolution of CNRP in 2018, all CNRP officials were replaced by CPP officials resulting in a further decrease in the representation of women council members down to 14%, lower than a decade ago. The rate of women Commune Chiefs remained the same, 1st First Deputy Chiefs increased by under 2 percentage points to 16.5%, but Second Deputy Chiefs surged to 17.3%.

Civil society organizations and networks have the potential to play an important role in working for improvements. Civil society activities, such as a gender equality scorecard, can keep pressure on the government to fully implement current policies. The factors that help women to succeed in politics include strong internal motivation, support from the party, pressure for affirmative action within the party, and support from family.

Many civil society organizations focusing on youth (e.g., YRDP, KYA, etc) offer civic engagement education training and could be used to raise awareness and capacity of both male and female youth on transformative leadership. A forthcoming GADC study on Public Perception of Women as Leaders at Sub-national Level sampling 458 respondents in 3 provinces, found that 94.5% of the respondents supported women as leaders in politics, yet only 74.9% of the respondents felt that women candidates were supported by political parties. The respondents preferred an average age of 25.5 years old (between 21 and 30) for women leaders. The highest proportion of respondents strongly agreed that women commune councillors are involved in decision making, and strongly agreed that women commune councillors deliver public services to improve the quality of life of the community, and in particular children, the elderly, and marginalized. The respondents also felt that characteristics such as 'hard working, emotional, honest, positive attitude, humility, self-motivated, and trustworthy' were more true of women than men; other characteristics such as ‘popular, dynamic, caring, intelligent and creative’ were equally true of men and women.

The Social Accountability Framework was developed by NCDD, with the support of WB and other DPs, to empower citizens to hold local government officials accountable for local service delivery and budget allocation. NCDD is administering the Implementation of the Social Accountability Framework (ISAF). The aim of ISAF is to strengthen accountability at sub-national levels (SNL) for addressing citizens’ concerns in development planning and service delivery focusing on health and education, in order to enhance the performance, responsiveness and accountability of local government and service providers (specifically commune councils, health centres and primary schools) in selected districts through improved access to local information, open budgets, and citizen-led monitoring, with a specific focus on the engagement and impacts for women, youth and ethnic minorities, while building the capacity of local government officials. There is an inter-agency working group which is co-chaired by MoI and CCC, and includes key CSO, DPs and line agencies. The ISAF process and institutional structure provides an innovative and organic mechanism for promoting women in leadership as well as monitoring gender equality in citizen engagement at the local level.

The World Bank has established a baseline (survey sample included 4175 interviews) to evaluate the ISAF, which provides interesting gender insights into the level of engagement between state and non-state actors. Citizens' level of participation in CC meetings is low: only 1 in 10 interviewed citizens reported attending council meetings at their commune office in the past 12 months, men are more

---

9USAID (2014): Women's Leadership as a Route to Greater Empowerment, Cambodia Case Study. Virginia, USA.
10Gender and Development for Cambodia (GADC) (2018): Public Perception of Women as Leaders at Sub-national Level in Cambodia, Preliminary Findings, Powerpoint presentation and explanatory text. Phnom Penh
likely to attend and to voice their opinions and concerns than women, and more male citizens know their rights to participation in commune planning, budgeting and access to information than women. This could be a reflection of the fact that most CC leaders and members are men. By age cohort, the participation of the youth in CC meetings is much lower than that of the middle aged and the elderly. Among the participants in Village Planning Meetings, there were more men than women; and projects may have prioritized men’s needs more than women’s needs because, among those that found the selected projects were the most needed, less than half were women.

The Asia Foundation recently carried out a process audit of the ISAF to assess the effectiveness of the ISAF methodology in the field\textsuperscript{12}. On the demand side, 60.7% of the ISAF Community Accountability Facilitator (CAF) volunteers were women, which provides an opportunity for young women to develop leadership skills and increase their profile in the community. In turn, this can lead to more formal leadership positions in the CCs. Commune councillors reported positive working relationships with the CAFs who disseminated information under ISAF and facilitated the monitoring of service delivery, and considered them an important link between the commune administrations and their communities. In some instances, it appeared that the CCs relied on the CAFs to conduct outreach for commune initiatives. CAFs report that the youth are more engaged and less afraid of engaging with and holding the local service providers to account. The report said that youth can serve as effective community leaders and role models for wider community.

Gender-based violence: According to recent data, one in five ever-partnered Cambodian women aged 15-64 reported experiencing physical or sexual violence, or both, by an intimate partner in their lifetime; 8% had experienced it in the past 12 months. Rates of both were higher in rural compared to urban areas. Many affected women did not seek help, and if they reported the violence to any agencies, it was most likely to local leaders (14.5%) or police (11.9%). The low level of help seeking was attributed to lack of services available, especially in rural areas; lack of access due to geography and cost; the need for sensitization among agencies such as village authorities, police, magistrates, and health services to encourage women to approach them; and low levels of trust that their interests will be considered, rather than just the ‘harmony’ of the family unit. Furthermore, the current legal system is making it difficult for cases to be effectively prosecuted.

The Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) has prioritized reducing violence against women and girls. RGC implemented laws and policies, developed national action plans including the National Action Plan to Prevent Violence Against Women and Girls (NAPVAW) and the National Plan of Action of the National Committee on Counter Trafficking. Improved policy implementation and increased coordination have resulted in an improved response in some areas\textsuperscript{13}, though it remains scattered and inconsistent, particularly in rural areas. New minimum service standards have been developed to address gaps in quality of services, but their implementation and monitoring is still limited. One of the key challenges is changing social norms, gendered power relations and attitudes that accept violence. These remain barriers to women’s help-seeking, along with barriers to access to justice – all of which serve to perpetuate violence against women and girls.

In 2010, the RGC issued the Village/Commune Safety Policy that includes ‘no prostitution, trafficking of women and children, and domestic violence’ in its safety criteria. It tasks the CC to take action to


\textsuperscript{13}Ministry of Women’s Affairs (2016) Mid-Term Review of the 2nd NAPVAW. Phnom Penh.
eliminate these occurrences ‘for security and safety for citizens especially for women and children’. NAPVAW2’s overarching goal is to reduce violence against all women and girls through increased prevention interventions, improved response, increased access to quality services, and multi-sectoral coordination and cooperation. Ministries, donors, and civil society with programs related to violence against women are expected to align with and contribute to one or more of the plan’s 20 objectives. The plan prioritizes three forms of violence (domestic violence; rape and sexual violence; and violence against women at high risk) and five strategies (primary prevention; legal protection and multi-sectoral services; formulation and implementation of laws and policies; capacity building; and review, monitoring, and evaluation). At the sub-national level, the PDoWA’s role is to coordinate with state and non-state service providers to ensure an effective referral system. This includes facilitating the referral process and intervening to find solutions to any bottlenecks that occur; monitoring the referral system in accordance with the referral guidelines; and convening regular service provider network meetings on GBV. However, the PDoWA and DoWA are generally under-resourced in terms of skilled staff, adequate supervision, and funding to fulfil the referral system roles.

Ethnicity and Indigenous People
Khmer people make up 90% of the Cambodian population, followed by Vietnamese (5%), with the balance being Chinese, Cham (mostly Muslim) and indigenous ethnic groups sometimes called Khmer Lœu. The 1998 Cambodian population census identified 17 different indigenous peoples, but the consensus today is that there are 24 groups spread across 15 provinces, with the highest populations by far in Ratanakiri, Mondulkiri and Kratie. They are estimated to number around 200,000 or around 1.2% of the population.

Laws and policies: The Ministry for Rural Development has a National Policy on the Development of Indigenous Peoples (NPDIP), approved in 2009. The NPDIP aims to promote the livelihoods of indigenous peoples and to improve their quality of life. It concentrates on ten development sectors including culture, education and vocational training, health, environment, land, agriculture and water resources, infrastructure, justice, tourism, and industry, mines and energy.

The 2001 Land Law makes crucial provision for communal land titles in articles 23–28. Article 25 provides for collective ownership of land, while Article 26 recognizes the role of traditional authorities, mechanisms and customs in decision-making and exercising ownership rights. Under Article 28, no authority outside the community may acquire any rights to immovable properties belonging to an indigenous community. A sub-decree on Procedures of Registration of Land of Indigenous Communities was approved in June 2009, but progress has been slow because of the complexity of the process:

- the Ministry of Rural Development must first recognize the identification of an indigenous people and community
- the Ministry of Interior must then register the community as a legal entity
- the Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction then carries out a collective land titling procedure. This involves surveying the property, making the proposal open for public comments, and issuing title.

While the Land Law gives strong protection on paper for indigenous communities, many observers have said that the lack of implementation and enforcement has left indigenous peoples vulnerable to commercial and state interests.14

Disability
Cambodia’s 2014 National Demographic and Health Study indicates that approximately 9.5% of the population over five years of age reported some form of physical difficulty; 2.1% of the population

14 (ODC) https://opendevelopmentcambodia.net/topics/ethnic-minorities-and-indigenous-people
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reported a ‘strong difficulty.’ A 2014 population-based study of children aged between two and nine years estimated the prevalence of impairment at 15.6%, and disability at 10.1%. The study found that the level of treatment required for these children is very high. According to the MOP Cambodia Intercensal Population Survey 2013, 2.06% of the population (301,629 people) has disabilities. Of these, 10.63% (32,056) are children aged between 0 and 14 with disabilities.

The prevalence of disability increases with age, reaching 44% of those aged 60 and over. There is also an association between disability and education. The prevalence of disability is much higher for persons with no education (20%) than those who have achieved: primary education (8%), secondary education (5%) and higher education (2%). This suggests that disability presents a significant barrier to educational attainment.

The economic activity rate for people with disabilities aged 15-64 is 69.29%, lower than that of the general population, which is 82.2%. While the economic activity rate for disabled men is lower by 8.36 points, the economic activity rate for disabled women is lower by 19.37 points. The gap between the economic activity rates of men, at 76.17%, and women, at 60.62%, among the disabled population is much greater than the gap between the two rates among the general population, at 84.5% for men and 80% for women. Household wealth of people with disabilities is about half that of non-disabled people. 38.5% of people with disabilities in Cambodia earn an income, 42.6% cannot earn an income and 18.8% are under 18 years old. The percentage of women with disabilities who earn an income is much lower than that of their male counterparts, at 25.8% and 44.8% respectively. Thus a significant concern for persons with disabilities is employment. The NDSP specifies that the private sector must ensure that at least 1% of its workforce are persons with disabilities, and the public sector, 2%. However, the quotas are not yet actively monitored by any government body.

Physical rehabilitation for persons with disabilities is still partly dependent on four international organizations. Eleven physical rehabilitation centres, a spinal cord injury centre and an orthopaedic component factory are currently active in Cambodia. The PWDF under MoSVY is expected to take over the physical rehabilitation centres and the prosthetics and orthotics factory. However, observers do not expect to see a smooth and effective take over from international organizations. MoSVY has indicated that they intend to transfer disability programs to the SNL in the coming year.

NGOs have started segregated special schools for children with hearing and visual impairment in Phnom Penh, Siem Reap, Battambang and Kampong Cham. These schools have now been integrated under MoEYS. Nonetheless, any children with disabilities still lack access to education services.

In 2009, the RGC approved the Law on the Protection and the Promotion of the Rights of Persons with disabilities. The law seeks to (i) protect the rights of persons with disabilities, (ii) protect the interests of persons with disabilities, (iii) reduce discrimination of persons with disabilities, and (iv) ensure access to rehabilitation services. The RGC has ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) in 2012. The government followed this up with the development of the National Disability Strategic Plan (NDSP) 2014-2018 which outlines 10 key strategic objectives and focuses on reduction of poverty for persons with disabilities; provision of quality and equal health services as well as physical and mental rehabilitation; provision of access to justice and prevention from discrimination, abuse, mistreatment and exploitation of persons with disabilities; access to education and participation in expressing their voices; access to information and participation in political and development work; and facilitation for access to physical environment, public transport and facilities, knowledge, information and communication; assurance of gender equality and promotion of capacity for women and children with disabilities; and enhancement and expansion of cooperation from international to sub-national level. Other affirmative measures include requests for free health services as well as a quota for employment (2% at government institutions and 1% for companies with
more than 100 employees,) and reasonable accommodation for employment of persons with disabilities.

The Social Protection Policy Framework (SPPF) action plan includes cash transfers for people with disabilities, the government will continue to implement the disability allowance scheme at community level, targeting ID poor households. There is a need to set up guidelines and the institutional structure, which lends itself to SNL operation.¹⁵

**NCDD IP3.3 Social Equity and Inclusiveness Strategy**

As part of the NCDD IP3.3, NCDD/S developed a Social Equity and Inclusiveness Strategy, (see Annex 4). This policy provides IP3 implementers at sub-national level with a mandate to act, to realize Cambodia’s commitment to social equity and inclusiveness, and to mainstream these goals, principles, and actions into all policies, structures, systems, and operations. One of the key results expected is increased civil society partnerships. This provides the policy framework for the GESI related advocacy for CCSS partners. The vision is that SNAs promote and uphold social equity and inclusiveness, dignity, respect, and fairness for all. Some of the outcomes related to decentralization, include:

- Women and other historically disadvantaged groups are empowered to demand their rights, participate fully in all areas of public life, and reach their potential
- Disparities between groups (gaps) are reduced
- All decentralization related policies, plans, strategies and activities adequately address social equity and inclusiveness
- Sub-national authority (SNA) decision makers and IP3 implementers consider the impact all the decisions they make will have on social equity and inclusiveness
- SNA and IP3 resources are increasingly devoted to promoting social equity and inclusiveness
- SNA service delivery addresses and promotes social equity and inclusiveness
- SNAs take firm action to eliminate violence against women and children in their communities
- The workplaces of SNA and IP3-implementers are conducive and safe for all and they respect and promote diversity

This will be done by:

- Strengthening women’s leadership at sub-national level;
- Mainstreaming social equity and inclusiveness into all policies, regulatory instruments, systems, and capacity development;
- Improving the delivery of services which most benefit women, children and other disadvantaged groups, in particular providing social services, social protection and eliminating violence against women;
- Developing SNA capacity to address social equity and inclusiveness.¹⁶

---

¹⁵ Hyun, M. (2017) GESI Inputs to NCDD IP3.3.
¹⁶ NCDD (2017) IP3.3 Annex 4, Social Equity and Inclusiveness Strategy
4. GESI Assessment Findings

This section is structured around the GESI self assessment form (see Annex 2). To the extent possible the data has been formatted in tables for ease of overview and comparison.

A. Institutional self-assessment: How inclusive is our organization?

A.1. Policy: Does our organization have a GESI policy or strategy regarding HR, our programs? Which aspects of GESI are covered in this policy? How it is implemented and monitored?

The table below shows which partners have a gender policy, what it includes in terms of coverage and quantitative targets or quotas, and whether it is monitored and reported on. Eleven of the 12 partners have a gender policy that covers gender and sometimes other forms of inclusion such as IP, in either staffing or programs as beneficiaries. Five partners have quantitative targets for women in organizational leadership and/or in participation in programs (although it is not clear what level of participation is being targeted. This is explored further in the below section on beneficiaries.) The rest have a set of qualitative principles related to gender equality and inclusion. Most said that they have an equal opportunities approach to staffing and welcome applications from all under-represented groups. Some partners reported having quantitative targets in their strategic plan but these documents were not reviewed under this assessment as most were still being developed or revised. For the most part partners did not systematically review, document and report on the implementation of the gender policy, at best it was discussed at staff meetings. The lack of specific quotas or targets, and the lack of systematic reporting, weaken the impact of these policies.

The table below can be used by CCSS to monitor the GESI policy implementation of each partner. The existence of a gender policy, and its implementation, is an element of the GESI infrastructure necessary for building a robust internal GESI system, by demonstrating corporate willingness and commitment to acknowledge the importance of GESI to the organization. This indicator can be included in the USAID CSO Organizational and Sustainability Interview Guide. A common recommendation is for all partners to have an agency-wide discussion and review of the implementation of their Gender/GESI policy and share the findings in the annual report to CCSS.

Table 1: GESI Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Gender Policy and coverage</th>
<th>Quantitative targets</th>
<th>Monitoring and reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ODC</td>
<td>No gender policy. HR policy has no gender quota</td>
<td>No quantitative targets</td>
<td>Revising Staff policy to include gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. YRDP</td>
<td>Gender policy: gender analysis, training, Gender Focal Point</td>
<td>50% women (W) on Board of Directors (BoD)</td>
<td>Monthly staff meeting, in annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PDP</td>
<td>Gender Policy</td>
<td>40% W staff and beneficiaries</td>
<td>No reports, staff reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. YCC</td>
<td>Staff policy</td>
<td>40% W staff, 1 W in Management Team (MT) &amp; BoD, 40% W beneficiaries</td>
<td>Monitor staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CCSP</td>
<td>HR Policy. Now developing GESI policy</td>
<td>50% W staff &amp; beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. BCV</td>
<td>Gender Policy, equal participation in staff and programmes</td>
<td>No quantitative targets, just principles</td>
<td>Will update to reflect 50% W in beneficiaries and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Media 1</td>
<td>Gender Policy: special consideration for vulnerable groups in hiring, staff orientation on gender policy, in project proposals, plans and MEL</td>
<td>No quantitative targets</td>
<td>MT to monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. NAS</td>
<td>Gender Policy</td>
<td>25% W in staff 55% W in beneficiaries 50% W community leaders / volunteers</td>
<td>Reviewed during annual staff retreat, VBNK facilitated an assessment of all policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. MVI</td>
<td>No Gender Policy. Policy Manual includes a para on gender and IP</td>
<td>No quantitative targets</td>
<td>Unclear reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. 3SPN  Gender Policy updated in 2017, covers both internal staffing, parental leave, recruitment, performance assessment, programming. Developed disability policy (8/18) at DFAT request.  No quantitative targets  It has yet not been translated and disseminated to staff.

11. HA  Gender Policy  HR Policy: 100% IP  No quantitative targets, just set of principles

12. PKH  Gender Policy in Kh  Personnel Policy in Eng: W/IP staff committee, equal opportunities for recruitment and training, harassment, parental leave.  Target 47% women prog participation, no IP targets  No regular monitoring, Gender Focal Point in MT

A.2. Staffing: What is the representation of women, ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, etc among our staff at different decision making and management levels?

The table below shows the representation of women and IP in each partner organization (only one partner has a PWD on staff). A third of the partners is led by an woman Executive Director (ED), which is fairly significant in a male-dominated field such as governance and natural resource management. Supporting CSOs with female leaders is also a key component of the USAID Gender in DRG strategy. This trend is mirrored in the average representation of women in the partners’ Board of Directors and Senior Management Teams. In terms of staffing, the average is 40% women, partners that work with interns and volunteers report a higher representation of women in these roles. In the case of ODC, 50% of their staff were former volunteers, indicating that this is a strategy for increasing opportunities for women in this field. One partner, HA, is led and staffed 100% by IP, 4 (33%) of the partners have IP on staff, and only 2 have IP on their Board of Directors and Management Teams. This is linked to the location of the partners’ office and programs in provinces with a high concentration of IP.

Most partners stated that it was difficult to recruit female staff due to the security risks for women working in the field, that it was not acceptable for women to travel overnight away from home by the themselves (without their husband), and that many women leave their jobs after they get married to care for their family or move to their husband’s village. Most partners also claimed that it was difficult to increase the representation of women in the BoD and MT due to ‘lack of capacity’, although given the recent trends in educational outcomes in favour of female students, this rationale may be more perception rather than evidence-based. That said there are women-led CSO partners that are breaking the mold, such as CCSP and HA, by pushing back on these stereotypes and demonstrating that women are fully capable of both leading and working in remote areas.

A third of the partners have an official gender focal point. 3SPN has an external Advisory Group which includes 40% women and 40% IP. This is a good strategy for other partners to ensure that the voices and perspectives of under-represented groups are heard at the highest level of partners’ decision making and management. Alternatively, CCSS could establish an umbrella GESI advisory group consisting of expert advisors in the areas that are currently under-represented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Executive Director</th>
<th>Board of Directors</th>
<th>Management Team</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Gender Focal Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ODC</td>
<td></td>
<td>17% W 60% W</td>
<td></td>
<td>46% W / interns: 71% W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. YRDP</td>
<td>1 W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20% W</td>
<td>41% W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>40% W 33% W</td>
<td></td>
<td>42% W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. YCC</td>
<td></td>
<td>40% W 0</td>
<td>17% W / 1 PWD</td>
<td>45% W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CCSP</td>
<td>1 W</td>
<td>40% W 67% W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45% W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. BCV</td>
<td>1 W</td>
<td>80% W 60% W</td>
<td></td>
<td>48% W/ volunteers 60% W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Media 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57% W 20% W</td>
<td>33% W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.3. Capacity Development: Does our staff have GESI expertise? Is there a focal point? What is their role? Have we organized GESI training for our staff?

Only 3 partners claimed to have GESI expertise, a third have gender focal points, approximately half have had some sort of gender training for selected staff through other Donor or NGO funded initiatives, and most requested further GESI training from CCSS. While a formal / traditional workshop style GESI training would be useful, it might not be feasible to effectively reach all the key decision makers and implementers across the CCSS portfolio of partners. Another option is to follow up with GESI assessment exercise with further accompaniment through the CCSS M&E function, the capacity development services provided by VBNK, the regular quarterly partner and grantee meetings, and other regular CCSS planning and reporting instruments. This is further explored in the recommendations section.

B. Program assessment: How inclusive are our programmes and operations?

B.1 Sector/Mission: What are the key GESI issues related to our sector/mission?

While partners’ vision and mission statements do not explicitly mention GESI, for the most part they address the needs of ‘vulnerable or marginalized groups’, including women, IP and youth. Mainly challenges related to women and gender in staffing and participating in project activities were raised, the key GESI issues reported include:

Gender:

- Young women start out participating in the project but then drop out when they get married, have to take care of their family, and sometimes they move to another village. There is a perception that women are not permitted to travel away from home overnight as it is not culturally acceptable, both as staff and as participants, or that women can’t participate in community activities because they have too much work to do at home. Some partners also cited ‘lower capacity’ as a reason for not having gender balance in staff and community leadership roles.
- Domestic violence (in the household) and ‘sexual harassment’ (in the community) when women travel outside their community for work or project related events was raised by most partners, the latter as a rationale on why women avoid working in the field, or why women cannot participate in events far from their homes. There is a strong perception that it is not safe for women to travel to participate in project activities such as training, patrolling, meetings, etc both as staff and as project beneficiaries. This lack of mobility is further reinforced by women’s domestic and family responsibilities, and the need for them to stay at or close to home, as noted above. Some partners such as CCSP and HA disprove that theory as their female staff are involved in all the field work. Some partners respond by allocating women staff to office-based work, or field work in nearby communities, and organizing community events in locations convenient for women. While this may help on a case-by-case basis it does not address the deeper structural issue that lies at the heart of gender inequality: women’s constant fear of assault and harassment, and the lack of sufficient public behavioral change and security measures to ensure that women can participate equally in all activities without the threat of violence.
- While there is a perception that women tend to be the majority of participants in public forums, women’s voice and representation in decision-making and leadership is limited in the home,
community, local government, and even partner organizations. The partners are working on increasing women’s voice in the home, and in community forums, however they have no control or impact on the local government level and some seem to be struggling within their own organizations.

- Women are primary carers of family, household income, and natural resources, and this heavy burden is exacerbated by male migration to look for work. Partners emphasize women’s role in natural resource management (NRM), and the impact of NR issues on women’s time, income and labor. Women tend to be more affected by natural resource management issues, as they are responsible for collecting NTFP, they have more demands on their time than men do due to the combination of domestic/household work as well as income generation and livelihood.

**Indigenous People:**

- IP are most affected by land grabbing and displacement and rely on natural resources for their survival. It is more challenging to have IP demands met (related to land concessions, etc) due to the entrenched business interests at stake.
- It is difficult to recruit IP on staff due to language and capacity constraints. Indigenous women experience more burdens because in IP culture men cannot help with housework.
- Other ethnic minorities are closely assimilated into Khmer society and do not wish to identify as ethnic minorities for fear of discrimination.

Partners’ main GESI metric is quantifying participation in project activities, as staff and in community structures and events. While representation matters and is a necessary starting point (possible transmission mechanism) there is a need to broaden the focus to also include the substance and issues being discussed and addressed (results).

**B.2 Planning:** Does our program planning explicitly take GESI into consideration? Do we use a mainstreaming or targeted approach? What GESI data do we collect, how and how do we use it in our program planning?

**Gender:** The majority of the partners state that they use a mainstreaming approach to gender, although this is implicit rather than explicitly documented in the reporting. A few partners are deliberately targeting women by creating women’s networks, and supporting women in leadership initiatives. Some partners include gender sessions in their training programs.

**Indigenous People:** Due to the regional and issue specific nature of working with IPs, all partners working on IP issues take a targeted approach, as it is difficult to mainstream IPs into ‘non-IP specific’ interventions.

**Disability:** While partners state that they welcome the participation of PWD in their events, there is no deliberate needs assessment or planned activities addressing their specific needs under CCSS. (One partner is implementing a project targeting PWD supported by Handicap International.) The CIP dialogue provides a platform to include advocacy for increased support to PWD, which is one of the key GESI issues included in the NCDD IP3.3 GESI Strategy.

**GESI data collection and analysis:** One important observation relates to the absence of systematic GESI data collection to inform evidence-based planning. For the general community-government dialogues around CIP, partners take a more ‘organic’ approach to identifying the ‘key issues’ to take forward to higher levels. This is through community stakeholder consultations and public forums, which are facilitated in an open-ended manner by community-selected leaders, resulting in a consensus-driven issue selection process which risks leaving out the voices and concerns of marginalized groups. While records are kept on which issues are selected for further advocacy, this is not backed up by records.
on the ‘frequency’ with which these issues are raised (ie how many people prioritize these issues) and who is raising them. The danger is that only issues raised by louder confident ‘voices’ are taken forward and more sensitive or invisible issues are left out. While partners are following a community driven approach, in light of the risk of exclusion of marginalized groups, an ‘inclusive facilitation’ process should be considered whereby the diversity in voices and issues in the community are heard and recorded. While it is understandable in the context of limited resources that more weight should be allocated to issues that affect the majority in the community, this should not be at the expense of the needs of marginalized groups.

**B.3 Engagement with beneficiaries: Who are our main beneficiaries? What are their specific needs and are their needs being met? How does our engagement with our target beneficiaries address GESI? What has been the result?**

In order to provide a more granular GESI analysis of beneficiaries, a typology of direct and indirect beneficiaries was developed to track to what degree women and IP were benefiting from the projects, and how. While not all partners’ beneficiaries were able to fit neatly into these categories due to the different nature of their programs and objectives, the majority of partners with direct operations in communities have broadly similar operational structures. The table below shows the representation of women and IPs in the different levels of direct and indirect target beneficiaries, classified in terms of the roles and functions that are created and supported by the project, such as community or network leaders, members, volunteers, participants in trainings and public forums, CIP meetings, etc.

The data below were collected mainly through recall method used in the consultations with partners (in some instances supplemented with data from partners’ annual reports), and thus may be more anecdotal than evidence-based. It is therefore advised to continuously monitor and update this table through the regular M&E process, including the quarterly and annual reports. It will be useful to have an aggregate table by the end of the project to demonstrate overall impact on women and IP at various levels. It should be noted that this is only one type of impact related to direct participation in project activities at different levels, another analytical instrument discussed later in this report looks at actual GESI issues being raised and addressed by partners. Given the need to update and validate the data reported by the partners, it would be premature to draw definitive conclusions, however the below table does provide an indication of who is participating in project activities, and where the gaps are.

ODC does not fit neatly into this typology given its upstream data collection and online dissemination program. That said, ODC conducts training on open data and mapping, and can report on the GESI breakdown of training participants. It also analyze its online data users through Google Analytics and find what percentage of its visitors to their site are female. The analysis below covers all partners with the exception of ODC.

Direct beneficiaries include those who play an active role in the project activities and receive logistical support and training from the project:

- **Community / network leaders**: all partners operate through a system of community or network leaders who are usually either already in place through previous interventions, and/or elected or selected by the community. Their role as the main interlocutors for the partners is to lead the project activities at the community level. The responses provided suggest that for at least seven partners the majority of the community leaders are women, (not all reported on IP so this needs follow up), some reporting up to 80% women in leadership roles. HA reported 100% IP in leadership roles. One project supporting community forestry committees reported no women at all in leadership positions.
- **Community volunteers**: most partners operate through a system of community level volunteers who mobilise and facilitate participation of community members in public forums and related meetings with local authorities. While the information in this category is incomplete, at least half of the partners report that the majority of their volunteers are women. In some cases, these roles are more ‘skilled,’ such as community journalists or radio reporters who are trained to actively research and report on issues in their community and publicize them to a wider audience.

- **Group/network members**: At least 7 partners reportedly support issue-based community groups or networks, of these five partners report having 50% or more women as their community group or network members. It is highly likely that this figure is under-estimated due to the complexity of counting and recording group membership composition, which probably changes frequently and is difficult to keep track of. Often these groups receive training, or logistical support from the project.

Indirect beneficiaries are more ‘passive’ participants in the project activities, such as the community-level stakeholders who are ‘consulted’ or invited to attend public forums or CIP meetings with local authorities to discuss issues. The majority of the partners engage with this type of beneficiary, and most report 50% of more women in this group. It would appear that for CIP meetings, which are smaller and more selective, this might be lower. The data in this category are incomplete but can be extracted from the participants’ lists that all partners are requested to complete for all events, and must include information on gender, IP, disability for each participant. Under this category there are more IP and PWD than among the direct beneficiaries.

As will be discussed later, for some women beneficiaries, playing an active role in the project has led to formal leadership roles in their communities, which will have an impact on their communities beyond the life of the project. Thus targeting women and other marginalized groups as direct beneficiaries contributes to sustainable systemic changes. Thus it was decided to include a new category of beneficiaries (which are by definition a sub-set of the others) to count the number of women beneficiaries who have moved into formal leadership roles in their communities. While causality is hard to prove, correlation is still significant. This is also backed up by findings drawn from USAID studies on women in leadership at sub-national level which suggest that active participation in CSO projects are a gateway feeding into the ‘value chain’ of women in leadership (see situation analysis in Section 2 above). As this is not a formal indicator that partners normally report on the data presented below are based on recall at the time of the second round of consultations, and it is likely that the actual figures are even higher. So far approximately 24 women fall into this category. It is recommended that partners keep track of this data as it provides a powerful proxy indicator for systemic change in gender equality.

The averages for the indicators below have not been calculated as there is a high probability that the numbers do not fully represent the actual situation, which should be validated through the partners’ records. It will be very useful and interesting to track this and report on it in the final project evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Community/ network leaders</th>
<th>Community Volunteers</th>
<th>Group/network members</th>
<th>Public Forum/CIP meeting participants</th>
<th># women promoted to formal leaders in community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ODC</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Training participants: W, 9% IP</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. YRDP</td>
<td>75% W</td>
<td>59% W</td>
<td>71% W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PDP</td>
<td>25% W / steering committee 30% W</td>
<td>52% W</td>
<td>45% W</td>
<td>67 became leaders: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
became commune chiefs, 32 commune councilors and 32 village leaders.

4. YCC
67% W  59% W  34% W
Training youth network members: 45% W
7 W became leaders: 5 as chairs of the commune committees on women and children, 2 as chairs of the village committees on women and children

5. CCSP
50% W (CC) 49% W 80% W 1

6. BCV
Community Forestry committee 0% W
CR: 80% W  CJ: 39% W
CF members: 31% W

7. Media 1
NA  CR: 83% W
Three podcast trainings to a total of 28 youth and women (23 females, 6 IPs) 51% W

8. NAS
33% W  CET: 74% W
Training: 41% W
64% W
Village outreach: 60%
CIP workshop: 60%
6 female CET became CC assistants, 1 will become village chief.

9. MVI
Governance body: 57% W
Implementation body: 40% W
40% W  60% W
1 W became provincial IP network leader.

This data was anecdotal

10. 3SPN
Leaders from CBO network: 56% W 50% W 61% IP
Ratanakiri: 75% IP
Stung Treng: 100% IP
5 W have become leaders: 1 district council, 1 deputy village chief, 3 NGO staff.

11. HA
80% W  100% IP
9 W became leaders: 7 deputy village chief, 1 commune chief, 1 cc member

12. PKH
35% W  32% W trained in data collection app.
48% W
2 W became leaders: 1 deputy village chief, 1 assistant to village chief.

Average 48% 56.4% 36.7% 54.6%
Total: 32 W

One area that is less understood is intersectionality: The USAID ADS205 recommends that we “should not treat men and women as monolithic categories, but should reflect the intersection of sex with other characteristics such as age, marital status, income, ethnicity, race, disability status, geographic location, sexual orientation and gender identity, or other socially relevant category as appropriate.” Partners currently treat IP, women, poor, PWD, youth as mutually exclusive categories, and do not explicitly target groups who belong to more than one category, who are the most vulnerable and
excluded. In particular it would be useful to specifically target IP women as this seems to be the most likely intersectional target group for this several partners in this project.

**B.4 Engagement with government counterparts: Who do we engage with in Government? How does our engagement with our government counterparts address GESI?**

For the most part engagement with government counterparts consisted of preparing for and facilitating community advocacy dialogue with local authorities such as commune and district councils regarding CIP, with the Departments of Fishery and Forestry regarding natural resource management. The agencies responsible for IP and other vulnerable groups were never mentioned. Very rarely were the government agencies responsible for women mentioned, and when they were it was a certain degree of dissatisfaction with their ability to address gender issues such as violence against women. That said, ensuring GESI is in principle the responsibility of whole of government, and not just those smaller and under-resourced agencies.

Partners noted that there are very few women in sub-national councils, thus the main government interlocutors are male. GESI issues are sometimes raised in the context of the CIP, however they tend not to be the primary issues on the agenda, which are focused on public services related to civil registration, delivery of social services such as education and health care, transparency and accountability, road construction, etc. CCSP works directly with commune councils by providing training – including gender awareness - and ensure that 50% of the participants are women. CCSP also has a working relationship with NCDD/S and as such is in a strong position to partner with them on rolling out the IP3.3 GESI Strategy which highlights building stronger CSO partnerships.

**B.5 Results: What results have we achieved in terms of GESI to date and how are they measured? How does our M&E system address GESI?**

In addition to counting the number of women and IP among the beneficiaries, GESI results can also be measured through the project outcomes. As mentioned in the Approach section above, this assessment looks at GESI in the context of USAID’s three key gender policy priorities, related to 1) access to resources and opportunities, 2) elimination of gender-based violence, and 3) increasing women’s capacity and voice to realize their rights. The table below summarises the coverage of partners’ activities and the potential impact, given the early stages of their activities some of which have yet to result in downstream outcomes, mapped across the three USAID Gender Policy goals and extended to include IP as well as women. The points in red font are suggested recommendations for each partner to deepen their impact in these domains. It would be useful to update this table for all partners at the end of project stage to get a fuller picture of GESI outcomes at a higher level, which are designed for sustainable systems change.

**Table 4: GESI Results/Outcomes**

| Partner | 1. Reduce gender disparities in access to, control over and benefit from resources, wealth, opportunities and services (economic, social, political, and cultural) | 2. Reduce gender-based violence (GBV) and mitigate its harmful effects on individuals and communities | 3. Increase capability of women and girls to realize their rights, determine their life outcomes, and influence decision-making in households, communities, and societies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ODC</td>
<td>Equal access to online information and evidence, and related training, necessary for GESI responsive advocacy. Currently 71% of the interns are female. Take the lead on GESI in Mekong Open Data project.</td>
<td>Increased capacity for evidence based GESI responsive advocacy by including online data and documentation on gender and IP/EM, partnering with CIPO on data contribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. YRDP</td>
<td>Equal access for female youth to participate in leadership and capacity development opportunities.</td>
<td>Addressing and raising awareness of GBV in community work.</td>
<td>Increased capacity for female youth to promote GESI in community work, promoting gender equality in youth leadership training. Covered gender issues on radio program in partnership with GADC and SILAKA. Include a gender and inclusive transformational leadership theme, as well as GESI in social analysis, to the youth training, ensure that every training includes at least one male and one female trainer, and that community visits and dialogues, and 6 month volunteer projects always include a GESI dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PDP</td>
<td>Women’s access to NR is enhanced (and thus incomes increased) through stronger legal and policy framework implementation.</td>
<td>(yes but not in EWMI CCSS)</td>
<td>Women have increased capacity for developing and advocating for stronger legal framework on NRM. Women’s dialogue with local authorities increased through community score cards. Increase in women taking formal leadership roles in their communities. Include criteria on GESI in community score cards (representation of women in CC, in consultations, gender issues being addressed by CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. YCC</td>
<td>Increased women’s access to transparency in public services, engagement with CIP/DIW process, addressing unemployment. Gender issues included in CC dialogue. Ensure that GESI issues are systematically raised in initial consultations and addressed at each stage of CIP/DIW process.</td>
<td>Share information about the legal framework, prevention and response mechanisms as per the NAPVAW/CGA and advocate to LA as per the commitment from NCDD IP3.3 GESI Strategy.</td>
<td>Increased women’s understanding and capacity for advocating for good governance and democracy. Training includes GESI. Include a gender and inclusive transformational leadership theme, as well as GESI in social analysis, to the training,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CCSP</td>
<td>Through commune dialogues, increased access to public services, DV issues are raised at commune forums and</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased women’s access to training and capacity for successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and NR. Women engage in resource allocation decisions. Increased capacity of women deputy village chiefs. PWD are included in CC meetings, and their needs included in CIP. Demonstrate through role model how women can do field work.</td>
<td>dialogues. Police attend meetings to share information about DV and commune safety. Ensure that DV is addressed according to the official response channels rather than informal ‘reconciliation’ methods. Share information about the legal framework, prevention and response mechanisms as per the NAPVAV/CQA and advocate to LA as per the commitment from NCDD IP3.3 GESI Strategy.</td>
<td>engagement in Commune Development Planning process. Increase community and local authority’s awareness of gender equality. 90% of issues raised in public forums are from women. Empower female CC members. Provides a role model for women staff working in the field. 1 woman became local leader through participation in the project. Coordinate with NCDD to implement the IP3.3 Gender and Social Inclusion Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased access to and protection of rights related to land, forest, fisheries which have significant impact on women’s incomes and livelihoods. Women perform fishery patrolling functions. Demonstrate through role model, promote through community journalists (CJ), how women can lead patrolling work.</td>
<td>Increased awareness about DV through articles posted articles on FB by community journalists. Ensure that DV is addressed according to the official response channels rather than informal ‘reconciliation’ methods. Share information through CJ about the legal framework, prevention and response mechanisms as per the NAPVAV/CQA and advocate to LA as per the commitment from NCDD IP3.3 GESI Strategy.</td>
<td>Increased women’s capacity for facilitation, understanding of legal framework, community journalism (IP women participate equally to IP men.) Encourage CJ to cover GESI issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase women’s access to health care, information about gender, women in agriculture and leadership, social services through community reporters’ storytelling and videos. Increase women’s access to training on ICT. Content is heavily focused on women and gender issues. Radio call in included issues related to IP, PWD access to services. (Address LGBT through another USAID funded project.)</td>
<td>Rape and DV are discussed at public forums and in videos. Ensure that DV is addressed according to the official response channels rather than informal ‘reconciliation’ methods. Share information about the legal framework, prevention and response mechanisms as per the NAPVAV/CQA and advocate to LA as per the commitment from NCDD IP3.3 GESI Strategy.</td>
<td>Increase women’s civic engagement and capacity to communicate, advocate and report on democracy and social accountability issues, and to access leadership opportunities through community reporters. Direct engagement with CCWCs and national level government agencies. Develop video on women leader role models demonstrating the business case for increasing women in leadership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised gender issues in CIP meetings, support revolving fund for 350 poor families. Women have better access to health care. (Handicap Int project for PWD, HIV project)</td>
<td>Raise GBV in public forum and CIP, police and CC explain legal penalties, emergency contacts for DV. As a result GBV has reduced.</td>
<td>Providing information about the Gender and Social Inclusion Strategy of the IP3.3, Gender training. Gender and IP/PWD rights are included in CET training and all Public Forums. Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9. MVI  | IP have increased income from NTFP and fishing as a result of forest and fishery conservation activities. IP communities increased access to health and education services. | DV is raised in public forums and with CC. Ensure that DV is addressed according to the official response channels rather than informal ‘reconciliation’ methods. Share information about the legal framework, prevention and response mechanisms as per the NAPVAW/CGA and advocate to LA as per the commitment from NCDD IP3.3 GESI Strategy. | have equal decision making rights in the family. 7 women from NAS project have become local leaders. Strengthen partnership with NCDD and SNL for implementing the IP3.3 GESI Strategy. |}

| 10. 3SPN | Increased incomes for women and IP from eco-tourism and farming through strengthening CBO leadership and management capacity. | Supporting CBOs to promote women leaders by training to apply for grants for women’s leadership and NRM. Promoting more women in community fishery committees. Providing women access to public speaking, action research and advocacy skills. 5 women have become leaders. Demonstrate through role model, how women can lead patrolling work. | |

| 11. HA  | Changing gender norms by raising awareness to indigenous communities and men that women should be allowed to participate and lead activities. Providing opportunities for IP communities to engage in policy and advocacy dialogue at national level. IP communities that were resettled successfully claimed their right to Collect data on GBV, rape, trafficking and report to CC. LA try to resolve cases of DV first by ‘traditional’ means, followed by ‘official’ means. Ensure that DV is addressed according to the official response channels rather than informal ‘reconciliation’ methods. Strengthen indigenous women’s capacity to successfully advocate with LA, patrolling the forest. During the CIP process women communicate their demands. Demonstrate through role model, how women can lead patrolling work. All focal persons in the village are indigenous women. |  | |
| 12. PKH | better social services, land titling and infrastructure. More families are sending their girls to school. Gender has been integrated into the CIP. Provide scholarships and dormitories to young IP women in the provincial capital. Collect data on gender issues in the community and advocate with CC. Established a handicraft center for women’s weaving group. | Share information about the legal framework, prevention and response mechanisms as per the NAPVAW/CGA and advocate to LA as per the commitment from NCDD IP3.3 GESI Strategy. | Created a gender and indigenous women’s empowerment project and expanding women’s IP network in 5 provinces. Link the IP women’s networks to other CCSS partners to leverage impact. 8 women became community leaders. |
| 12. PKH | Provide opportunities for more women to play lead roles in the project activities. | Emphasise working with women leaders in the community. Women are being training in data collection with smartphone app. Women are 50% of the forest patrollers. 2 women became community leaders. Use women leaders and patrollers as role models in other communities to encourage more women to participate in local leadership. Actively identify and support women leaders to take on leadership roles in community forestry management. |

This table shows that the outcomes in the last column related to increased capability of women and IP to realize their rights and influence decision making in all spheres are the most immediate to CCSS partners activities which are focusing on strengthening citizens’ strategic communications. All partners contribute significantly to this goal. The instances where women participating in the project have taken on official leadership roles are also recorded in this column as this falls under capacity to influence decision making.

The partners are also well aligned to the first goal related to access to resources and opportunities, in so far as they provide opportunities for training, as well as access to natural resources and enhanced incomes as a result. CIP discussions around improving access to public and social services such as civil registration, education and health care also fall into this category of outcomes.

With respect to the 2nd goal related to reducing GBV, approximately half of the partners mentioned that this issue is raised by stakeholders, and in some cases discussed with local authorities. That said, it seems that resolution tends to be more based on informal agreements between families rather than prevention or resolution through the formal legal context, which would strengthen the systemic side of eliminating GBV. Given that this was one of the most frequently mentioned gender issues in the
consultations with partners, it seems that more could be done to strengthen the systemic response from government based on the legal framework, as discussed in the situation analysis in Section 3.

One observation from the partner consultations is that their reported GESI-related achievements usually referred to outliers or exceptions, in order words accomplishments of individual women who stood out as ‘brave and confident’. While these individual cases are interesting and important as role models leading the way to demonstrate what can be achieved, partners’ GESI outcomes should ideally not consist of a small set of aggregated outliers / individual exceptional cases such as these, rather in order to demonstrate sustainable systemic change it will be necessary to document the specific transmission mechanisms which create the enabling environment for a critical mass of such cases to become normalized. Thus partners should be aiming for institutionalized responses which do not depend on personal relationships, but are authentic demonstrations of a positive shift in government accountability. This requires emphasis on strengthening partners’ ability to stimulate the supply (government response) side, and to capture this in their reporting.

As stated before, by mapping out partners’ outcomes across these three broad goals, the objective is not to ensure that every partner is covering every issue but rather that as a whole the CCSS partner portfolio can demonstrate that CCSS is contributing to reaching these goals in a meaningful way, and most importantly contributing to sustainable systemic change, as complimentary parts of the ‘GESI eco‐system’. To this end developing a partnership with other government, donor and civil society programs addressing these goals at a policy and program level would leverage efforts and deepen the impact. The NCDD IP3.3 GESI strategy provides a strategic policy platform to convene such partnerships.

5. General conclusions and observations

The following is a summary of the main conclusions and observations emerging from the GESI assessment across the CCSS portfolio, which form the basis for the recommendations in the next section.

As can be inferred from the tables above covering all key GESI aspects, many GESI components are in place but they are not always visible. They remain obscured by lack of access to accurate and useful data to form the evidence base for demonstrating progress and results. Recall and observation are not always reliable monitoring methods, so there is a need to keep accurate and representative records in the M&E system, annual reports, etc.

Partners’ main GESI metric is quantifying participation in staffing and project activities in community structures and events. While representation matters and is a necessary starting point and a possible transmission mechanism, there is a need to broaden the focus to also include the substance and issues being discussed and addressed which will lead to GESI responsive results (noting that GESI is not just about having GESI issues raised by women/IP/PWD but also women/IP/PWD raising “mainstream issues” and men/non-IP raising GESI issues.

To date the GESI emphasis has been mainly on the process rather than outcomes: partners have focused on GESI in participation in project activities, however they also need to ensure GESI is reflected in the identification of advocacy issues and follow up on results. Partners’ success stories tend to highlight examples of ‘outliers’ by providing examples of a ‘brave women’ (or IP, PWD) who ‘raised their concerns’ with local authorities in a meeting: while this is important to showcase, ultimately the project is looking for sustainable and lasting change to the systems that will allow equal opportunities to all women (and IP, PWD, etc) to ‘raise their concerns with local authorities’, and more importantly for those concerns to be addressed by government. In other words, on the demand side
it is not sufficient to rely on community led demand side processes with individual ‘heroes’ to demonstrate GESI results, but to aim for a more inclusive and representative citizen movement. On the supply side it is important to ensure that GESI related requests are addressed systematically and according to due process, a recurring example is that of cases of domestic violence which tend to be handled through personal reconciliation rather than through the legal channels where it belongs.

The selection of issues raised and addressed by partners is based on an organic ‘people-led’ process and not necessarily ‘evidence based’, and is characterized by:

- Little or no concrete data is collected in planning, planning is based on ‘consultations with communities’.
- Treating the community as a homogenous entity, there is a danger of limiting the dialogue to ‘familiar or popular’ consensus-based issues, without reflecting the diversity in needs and priorities.
- A lot of information and ‘evidence’ is anecdotal and based on individual cases.
- Community demands and government responses reported are case based rather than systemic or institutionalized.
- A risk that ‘sensitive’ GESI issues will not be raised in public forums.

EWMI is addressing this through developing capacity on facilitation skills and use of evidence in strategic communications campaigns through its work with VBNK. However, it would be useful to integrate a ‘GESI-responsive’ approach to evidence-based facilitation.

The CCSS GESI work can be assessed through this framework lens:

- Demand side: most partners focus on community-led demand side processes, see above point on selection of issues, and there is a need for a systematic mechanism to ensure that GESI issues are raised.
- Supply side: more robust follow up with government response is needed. It would be strategic to embed demands in the context of specific government policy commitments (eg NCDD/IP3, NAPVAW, other policies related to GESI as per the situation analysis) and systems. This requires partners to have a comprehensive understanding of the policy framework related to their sector of interest, as well as local to national mechanisms for holding government accountable for the implementation of these policies. The ISAF process is also addressing the supply side, and will be expanded in the coming year. There is an opportunity for partners to get more involved in the supply side by aligning with the ISAF modality which is fully owned by government.

Several partners rely on existing structures to appoint community leaders which are not necessarily demographically representative of the community and its diversity. Based on their GESI policies they should try to positively influence these structures by promoting more women and shifting the balance of power rather than validating and reinforcing existing gender biased structures.

With respect to PWD, there is a perception that this requires specific interventions that the project is not set up to address (physical access, etc), however partners can still support communities to represent and raise PWD issues in public forums and dialogue with local authorities.

Overall partners are very open to improvement and honest about their weaknesses. As can be seen by the tabulation of findings above, partners are actually achieving a lot in terms of GESI, however this is not highlighted or leveraged for deeper impact. There are ‘low hanging fruit’ type opportunities that would lend themselves to scaling up the impact that is already being seen through this GESI assessment. While some specific recommendations have been made for each partner in the table on results, more general cross cutting recommendations for all partners follow below.
6. Recommendations

This section will provide some suggested recommendations for EWMI CCSS to embed GESI into its own systems as well as its support to partners directly and through service providers such as VBNK, as well as cross cutting recommendations that can apply to all current and new/future partners.

EWMI/CCSS

1. GESI Policy: EWMI and the CCSS Program do not have explicit Gender and Social Inclusion policies or guidelines. Some EWMI/USAID programs in other countries (eg. SEDA in Azerbaijan and CEP in Macedonia) have developed Gender Mainstreaming Policies, this might be an example the CCSS program might wish to follow, based on the findings and recommendations of this assessment. This would also provide more leverage and a framework for the EWMI/CCSS team to support partners to deepen their GESI efforts. A proposed outline based on the two above examples could include the following and the policy principles can be drawn from this report.

   1. CCSS Overview
   2. GESI Definitions
   3. GESI Legal Framework and Institutions in Cambodia
   4. Contract Commitments
   5. Guidelines for GESI Mainstreaming
      a. Grant Programs
      b. CSO Capacity Development
      c. Public Outreach
      d. Monitoring and Reporting
   6. Responsibilities

2. Integrating GESI into CCSS systems including:
   a. Theory of change
   b. Results framework
   c. Outcome indicators
   d. M&E and reporting templates (quarterly and annual reports)
   e. USAID CSO Strategic Communications Index Interview Guide
   f. USAID Organizational Development Interview Guide
   g. Quarterly partner meetings
   h. CCSS mid-term review and final evaluation (if applicable)

Examples of GESI integration in the above CCSS systems include:

2a. CCSS Theory of Change (TOC)

The ToC gives an overall picture of what the ‘eco-system’ looks like at a CCSS portfolio level by formally capturing causal relationships between CSO partners interventions and their beneficiaries based on Impact Logics. The basic assumption is that CSO partners improve their knowledge and practices and this leads to an improvement in the support they provide to their beneficiaries (target communities). These improvements, for example, are better understanding and capacity to demand access to services, responsive and accountable government agencies, and compliance with NRM and protection policies. These changes improve citizens’ ability to effect positive change in democratic processes and leads to better local government performance. Integrating GESI into this approach is based on the premise that different demographic groups (men, women, IP, PWD, etc) have different relationships and status within the system, and different needs and requirements from government, and thus
different transmission mechanisms may be necessary to effect the desired change. Following (red font inputs) is an example of how to ‘visualise’ GESI in the CCSS ToC:

1: Train, raise awareness (include GESI as part of training and awareness raising content, ensure women and IPs are represented in trainings)
2: Support Citizens (ensure balance of women and IP), gather evidence (including on gender and intersectionality issues), present demands (including related to GESI)
3: Government responds (behaviour change) (monitor and follow-up response to GESI demands)
4: CS more engaged, valued by community (including women and IP) & government (system change) (ensure CS and government are systematically addressing GESI issues in policy dialogue)
Impact: Citizens (including women and IP) have higher quality of life and receive services (that meet their specific needs)

2.b. Results framework
Following (red font inputs) is an example of how to ‘visualise’ GESI in the CCSS Results Framework:

1.3 – Cambodian CSOs and citizens (disaggregated by GESI) are more engaged in the promotion of democracy and human rights (including from GESI perspective.)
2.1 – Increased technical (including GESI analysis and planning, targeting, addressing GESI issues in facilitation and issue identification and follow up), operational (ensuring GESI balance in staffing and leadership, implementation and monitoring of GESI Policies, capturing GESI results in M&E), and financial capabilities of select civil society organizations.
2.2 – Developed and/or strengthened partnerships, collaboration, and coordination among CSOs needed to support continued organizational growth and project implementation. Sharing lessons learned and mentoring with CSO partners that are strong on GESI and who can provide technical leadership on GESI such as HA, CCSP.
2.3 – Enhanced ability of selected CSOs to deliver quality (GESI responsive in terms of targeting and addressing issues) programming.
3.1 – A heightened, thorough understanding of Cambodia’s Civil Society sector and political environment, including opportunities and challenges (including for promoting GESI) based on the produced (GESI responsive evidence) analysis.
3.2 – Clear and actionable recommendations developed for meaningful capacity development (including in GESI analysis and planning) of Cambodian civil society in key sectors.
3.3 – An enhanced ability of USAID Cambodia to quickly respond to opportunities to protect or advance democratic development, human rights, and/or political reform (from a GESI perspective) in Cambodia.

2c. CCSS Outcome Indicators
CCSS outcome indicators can be adapted to include/mainstream GESI, and/or create new parallel indicators. Following (red font inputs) is an example of how to include GESI in the CCSS outcome indicator framework:

a. **Indicator 1.8:** Percentage of Cambodian citizens (men/women, IP, PWD) that report engagement in activities organized/sponsored by CSOs.
b. **Indicator 1.10** (New-Outcome): Number of commune public forums held where citizens (men/women, IP, PWD) provide input and/or feedback to commune councillors. (DGF)
c. **Indicator 1.11:** Number of issues (related to GESI) raised with subnational authorities as a result of CCSS grantees’ activities. (DGF)
d. **Indicator 2.6:** Number of civil society organizations receiving CCSS assistance to improve organizational capacity, and who successfully integrate GESI into this process.
e. **New Indicator:** Number of CSOs who are successfully completing GESI action plans: this can be turned into to composite GESI index (made up of key sub-indicators for each area) to
measure progress similar to the one VBNK are using. (Noting that not all sub-indicators are equally weighted, eg while internal representation matters, at the end of the day partners’ success will be assessed based on their external deliverables.)

f. **Indicator 2.8**: Percentage of CSO partners that have developed a multi-year planning document identifying the needs and priorities (breakdown priorities related to GESI) of stakeholders (breakdown men/women, IP, PWD), against which they target strategic fundraising.

g. **Indicator 3.2**: Percentage of citizens (breakdown men/women, IP, PWD) with perception of the positive contribution of CSO activities.

2d. M&E and Reporting templates

**Attendance list template:**
Disaggregate by participants, community group leaders, community group volunteers, members, etc, to be able to report GESI breakdown by these categories (see table 3 for template)

**Partners’ Quarterly Report template:**
Include GESI in Section II on Significant Accomplishments, and Section III Reflection and Learning.

**Partners’ Annual Report template:**
- Include GESI tables on beneficiaries and results
- In section on ‘Assessment of the Project Results’: highlight any GESI achievements under each objective.
- In section on ‘Engaging the Beneficiaries’: disaggregate each question by men/women, IP/EM, PWD, etc.
- In section on ‘Most notable success’: include at least one example of success in achieving GESI outcomes.
- In section on ‘Problems/obstacles encountered’ and ‘Lessons learned’: include any issues related to implementing the GESI approach.
- In section on ‘Additional information’ and ‘Recommendations’ include GESI related issues.

2e. USAID CSO Strategic Communications Index Interview Guide
The intention behind this recommendation is not to change the guide itself but to administer it with a GESI lens.

*Please tell us about three advocacy initiatives that you have undertaken* Who was impacted and how?
Consider differences according to gender, ethnicity, region, age, disability, income, etc.

*What evidence do you have from stakeholders themselves that the issue is important to stakeholders or beneficiaries?* What were the implications for the different groups mentioned above?

*To what extent is the advocacy initiative important to the organization or its beneficiaries?* Describe the impact/implications for different groups of stakeholders (men/women, IP, PWD, etc).

2f. USAID Organizational Development Interview Guide
The intention behind this recommendation is not to change the guide itself but to administer it with a GESI lens.

*What is the breakdown of beneficiaries in terms of gender, age, region, ethnicity, income, PWD, LGBT, etc. What are their specific needs, how are they addressed in the strategy, programming, workplans? Is this included in M&E?*
How does the HR policy and practice reflect GESI, in terms of recruitment and hiring, job descriptions, management and staffing, performance reviews, ability to carry out all necessary functions, etc.

2g. Quarterly partner meetings
Include GESI in each quarterly partners’ meeting, as it relates to the overall theme of discussion, and include an hour GESI review on specific issue at least once a year, for example by discussing the progress on achieving results using Table 4 as a reference.

2h. CCSS mid-term review and final evaluation (if applicable)
Include updated aggregated tables and analysis (as in section 4) in both MTR and final end of project evaluation. This could include a longitudinal case study using CCSP and HA as examples of analysing impact of GESI in the ToC, highlighting the linkages between GESI in staffing and leadership positions at the community level, and GESI in programs substance and outcomes.

3. Partners’ ToC: Support partners to understand the GESI issues in their ToC based on their own GESI assessment, and the CCSS ‘GESI lens ToC’. The following steps can be workshopped with partners together, and followed up with individual accompaniment sessions.
   a. Look at the big picture: partners should articulate their ‘results objective’ in terms of systemic change, focusing on their comparative advantage, each should not try to do everything. The point is to create an ‘eco-system’ that covers GESI at an aggregate level (CCSS end of program outcomes and indicators, USAID portfolio)
   b. Know your context: strengthen the evidence base, through more systematic data collection and analysis (refer to CGA, policy docs, etc) this can be done collectively and shared across the partners working in similar areas. The text box in Section 2 provides USAID’s definition of Gender Analysis, this can be extended to include other vulnerable groups and in particular the ‘intersectionality’ between gender and other forms of exclusion.
   c. Be strategic: of the GESI issues, identify the binding constraints on supply side, what issues are policy and governance amenable?
   d. Strengthen the ‘transmission mechanisms’: how do we get from GESI intent and action to GESI outcomes, what are the specific interventions and conditions required for success, (in ToC terms: how to ‘get from one arrow to the next’) which should be embedded in systems and institutionalized: this should be included in strategic plan and project workplans and budgets.

4. Deepen partnerships: CCSS partners as a whole are in a strong position to create a mutually beneficial and synergistic partnership with on-going national level social accountability and good governance programs, such as ISAF and NCDD IP3.3 GESI Strategy. EWMI can take the lead in furthering dialogue and possibly even broker a partnership agreement with these initiatives to enhance alignment and identify joint strategies to reach common objectives. This would also serve to strengthen CSO/Government understanding and working relationships.

5. Establish an informal GESI advisory group for CCSS consisting of experts in gender, IP, disability, LGBT, etc to provide up to date information on these issues as well as guidance on furthering GESI goals in the overall program.

6. Align GESI and VBNK approaches: discuss with VBNK and partners how to integrate GESI into the VBNK capacity development work: this should not add to the existing VBNK TOR but should come from the partners themselves when they engage with VBNK. This could be a discussion in a quarterly partners’ meeting.
   a. Strategic Plan
   b. M&E
c. Organizational development: HR, staffing, policies, CD & training
d. Advocacy (see comments on the USAID Advocacy Template)
e. Inclusive facilitation: provide training on ‘guided, evidence based, or GESI informed facilitation’ skills for partners which actively seeks out voices of women and marginalized/less vocal groups, and GESI issues during Public Forums, stakeholder consultations, meetings with CC and CIP.

Cross cutting recommendations for all partners

1. Review and discuss GESI assessment and recommendations with team, and with CCSS and VBNK as appropriate. Integrate recommendations into strategic plan and workplan.

2. Monitor and document implementation of their own Gender/GESI Policy by assessing the current situation in relation to policy targets together with management team and key staff. Include a brief report on the policy implementation in the CCSS annual report.

3. Pro-actively integrate GESI into VBNK work on the Strategic Plan, M&E, CD, etc.

4. Monitor and report against the GESI targets included in initial EWMI proposal, include this in the annual report.

5. Maintain updated GESI tables 2, 3, 5 below and include this in the annual report.

- Table 2: Internal structure (staffing, policy, etc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner name</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>women</th>
<th>% women</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>% IP</th>
<th>PWD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Table 3: Project Beneficiaries: (mapped against the GESI targets included in EWMI proposal)
  o direct beneficiaries, positions and functions created/supported by the project (eg. community leader, committee members, community reporters, journalists, etc)
  o indirect beneficiaries (citizens who participate in formal project events (meetings, consultations, public forums)
  o number of women/IP beneficiaries who become community leaders as a result of their participation in the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner names</th>
<th>total #</th>
<th>Women (#/%)</th>
<th>IP (#/%)</th>
<th>PWD (#/%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants in Public Forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries (from above) promoted to formal leadership roles as result of CCSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: GESI results mapped according to the 3 USAID Gender Goals:

1. Reduce gender disparities in access to, control over and benefit from resources, wealth, opportunities and services (economic, social, political, and cultural)

2. Reduce gender based violence (GBV) and mitigate its harmful effects on individuals and communities

3. Increase capability of women and girls to realize their rights, determine their life outcomes, and influence decision-making in households, communities, and societies.

Table 5: Types of issues raised in Public Forum, Commune Council, CIP meetings by Men/ Women/IP/PWD, how they relate to GESI issues and frequency, resolution by local authorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Raised by whom, frequency</th>
<th>Addressed by LA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples of issues (to be completed based on consultation with communities)</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ GBV/DV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Livelihoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Domestic work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Livelihoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Displacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Sacred lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Land grab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Fishery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Climate change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Water/San</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Irrigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ School or health buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Civil Registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 1: List of consultant meetings/activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date / Time</th>
<th>Meeting / Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 August:</td>
<td>Prepare slides for Partner Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 September:</td>
<td>prepare GESI self-assessment tool, Desk Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 11 September</td>
<td>Travel from Singapore to Phnom Penh, meeting with EWMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 12 September</td>
<td>09.00 – 12.00 Meeting with CCSS team, USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 17.00 Consultation with Cambodian Civil Society Partnership (CCSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 13 September</td>
<td>09.00 – 12.00 Consultation with Youth Council of Cambodia (YCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00-17.00 Consultation with People Center for Development and Peace (PDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.60 – 20.00 Meeting with Gender-Based Violence Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 14 November</td>
<td>09.00 – 12.00 Open Development Cambodia (ODC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.30-13.30 Meeting with representative of UNW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00-17.00 Youth Resource Development Program (YRDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 15 September</td>
<td>09.00-12.00 Building Community Voices (BCV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.30 – 16.00 Meeting with international gender advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 17 September</td>
<td>09.00-12.00 MEDIA for Education and Development in Action (Media One)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.00-13.30 Meeting with representative of Oxfam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00-17.00 Drive to Kampong Cham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 18 September</td>
<td>08.00-12.00 Nak Akphivath Sahakum (NAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.00-17.00 Drive to Mondulkiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 19 September</td>
<td>08.00-12.00 My Village (MVi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.00 – 15.00 Travel to Ratanakiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.30 – 18.00 Highlanders Association (HA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 20 September</td>
<td>08.00-12.00 3S Rivers Protection Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.00-17.00 Travel to Preah Vihear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 21 September</td>
<td>14.00-17.00 Ponlok Khmer (PKH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 22 September</td>
<td>06.00 – 13.00 Travel to Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 23 November</td>
<td>17.00-20.00 Meeting with EWMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 24 September</td>
<td>07.00-21.30 Report writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 25 September</td>
<td>07.00-17.30 Report writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.30 – 20.00 Meeting with representative of VBNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 26 September</td>
<td>07.00-17.30 Report writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 27 September</td>
<td>Report writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00-11.00 Meeting with Disability Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 28 September</td>
<td>09.00-10.30 Meeting with representative of Winrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00-1230 Meeting with EWMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00-15.00 Meeting with representative of PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 1 October</td>
<td>Report writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 2 October</td>
<td>14.00-15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-16.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 3 October</td>
<td>10.00-11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 4 October to Monday 15 October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 14 January 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 15 January 2019</td>
<td>10.00-12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 16 January</td>
<td>09.00 – 12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 17 January</td>
<td>09.00 – 12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 18 January</td>
<td>09.00 – 12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 20 January</td>
<td>12.00-14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30 – 17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 21 January</td>
<td>09.00-12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 22 January</td>
<td>08.00-12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00-17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 23 January</td>
<td>08.00-12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 24 January</td>
<td>08.00-12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00-17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 25 January</td>
<td>06.00-12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 26 January - Monday 28 January</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 29 January</td>
<td>14.00-15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00 – 17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 30 January</td>
<td>08.00-09.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 31 January – Thursday 14 February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 1 March – Saturday 2 March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: GESI Self Assessment Form

CCSS GESI Assessment
4/9/18

Background:

What is Gender Equality?

Gender Equality is the equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women, men, girls and boys. Gender equality is achieved when the different behaviours, aspirations and needs of women and men are equally valued and accounted for. It is relevant for internal operations and project activities.

What is Social Inclusion?

Social Inclusion is the process of improving the ability, opportunity and dignity of people, disadvantaged on the basis of their identity (such as sex, ethnicity, disability, age, poverty, etc.) to take part in all socio-economic activities. Social inclusion can help to achieve multiple development goals simultaneously. It promotes universal rights and capabilities, ensures basic needs are satisfied, promotes full participation, and recognises and respects identity, free from discrimination. In the context of CCSS, this GESI Assessment and Planning process will define the specific social inclusion focus for each partner.

What is the CCSS GESI assessment and planning process?

A GESI self-assessment is proposed to help partners assess and improve on the current level of GESI awareness, understanding and compliance in their institutional set up, procedures, and project activities, as well as to guide the integration of GESI principles in partner project design and implementation.

This assessment tool will be used by the CCSS project to encourage partners and all project staff to practice GESI internally and externally, to ensure equitable representation of women and marginalised groups in processes (meetings, trainings, workshops, etc.), leadership and decision-making positions within organisations, and in project activities. It will enable partners to assess the degree of gender equality and social inclusiveness of their organisations and activities (internal and project) and to identify specific actions needed to strengthen gender equality and social inclusion across their work.

It is a participatory tool promoting discussion on what is working well and what needs improvement. The assessment will be followed up with a concise action plan to improve on areas of weakness. This GESI action plan should become part of the organisation’s regular planning, monitoring and reporting system.

Introduction:

- What is our understanding of GESI as it applies to our work?
- What are the key GESI issues for our organization?
- What previous GESI assessment and/or planning have we done? Pls share reports.
- What was the result?
- What were the key points from the reflection workshop?
• How will this GESI audit and planning process help us and what do we want to get out of it?

A. Institutional self-assessment: How inclusive is our organization?

A.1. Policy:
• What are the key GESI issues for our organisation internally (HR)?
• Does our organisation have a GESI policy or strategy regarding HR, our programs? Pls share relevant documents.
• Which aspects of GESI are covered in this policy?
• How it is implemented and monitored?
• How can we strengthen this policy?

A.2. Staffing:
• What is the representation of women, ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, etc among our staff at different decision making and management levels? Develop GESI organogram
• How has this changed in the past 5 years?
• What is our goal/objective for GESI in staffing for the next 5 years?
• How will we get there?

A.3. Capacity Development
• Does our staff have GESI expertise? Is there a focal point? What is their role?
• Have we organized GESI training for our staff?
• What was the result?
• How can we include GESI training in our CD plan? Pls share a copy of CD plan.

B. Program assessment: How inclusive are our programmes and operations?

B.1 Sector/Mission:
• What are the key GESI issues related to our sector/mission? Pls share your mission statement.
• How are we addressing those issues?

B.2 Planning:
• Does our program planning explicitly take GESI into consideration? Do we use a mainstreaming or targeted approach?
• What has been the result?
• What GESI data do we collect, how and how do we use it in our program planning?
• How do we allocate resources to ensure inclusion in our activities?
• How can we increase GESI in our planning process?

B.3 Engagement with beneficiaries
• How does our engagement with our target beneficiaries address GESI?
• Who are our main beneficiaries?
• What are their specific needs and are their needs being met?
• What has been the result?
• How can we improve this in our planning and targeting?

B.4 Engagement with government counterparts
• Who do we engage with in Government, does it include MoWA, GMAGs, PDWA, WCCC?
• How does our engagement with our government counterparts address GESI?
• What has been the result?
• How can we improve this in our advocacy preparation and delivery?

B.5 Results
• How does our M&E system address GESI?
• How can we improve this to capture our GESI impact?
• What results have we achieved in terms of GESI to date and how are they measured?
• Have we reached our GESI targets/objectives?
• How has this been documented and shared?

Conclusion

What additional issues or reflections and related documents can we share to enhance this GESI audit and Action Plan?

The next step is to prioritise key action points to include in the GESI Action Plan.

The toolkit contains modules on how to integrate gender effectively into the following ten DRG sub-sectors:

1. Human Rights Protection and Promotion
2. Civil Society
3. Rule of Law and the Justice Sector
4. Legislative Strengthening
5. Local Governance and Devolution
6. Political Party Development
7. Electoral Processes
8. Anti-Corruption and Accountability
9. Reconciliation, Peacebuilding, and Transitional Justice
10. Media and Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs)

Following is a summary of sections of the toolkit relevant to CCSS, which can be adapted to include a wider demographic spectrum to capture all GESI related issues.

I. Civil Society

Civil society plays a critical role in aggregating and representing citizens’ interests and needs and in holding government accountable, and provides an arena for citizen engagement and influence on political issues and processes. It is therefore vital that all citizens are equally empowered and have equitable opportunities to participate in civil society. While in many cases CSOs are leading the fight for universally recognised human rights, civil society may also be a space in which gender inequality and other forms of discrimination are reproduced. By failing to be inclusive or gender sensitive in their approach CSOs may inadvertently perpetuate gender inequality and other forms of discrimination, thereby weakening the democratic culture they seek to strengthen. Despite these challenges, civil society remains one of the most important sectors in which to cultivate inclusive participation in support of USAID’s DRG Strategy.

Some issues to consider include:

- What are the barriers or constraints to women’s participation in CSOs, and particularly at leadership levels?
- Do CSOs internal policies and practices foster a supportive workplace for women and men? Are there affirmative efforts to encourage women to hold leadership positions?
- What percentage of leadership positions to women and minorities hold among CSO partners?
- What role have CSOs played in advocating for gender equality and women’s rights issues?
- How does Civil Society participate in implementing the national gender action plan and other gender related policies?
- Which CSOs routinely incorporate gender analysis and gender responsive planning into their work? How has it changed their outcomes?

Suggested opportunities for integrating gender into CSO programming:

1. CSO Membership, Governance, and Organizational Structure

Institutionalizing non-discrimination: Support CSOs in incorporating language on equal opportunity and non-discrimination in their statutes, by-laws, and other formal governance procedures. Encourage CSOs to consider proportional representation of women and men in their leadership.
**Tailored capacity building:** Design capacity building activities to help CSOs become more inclusive and to integrate gender equality principles more consistently into their internal policies and practices so that they are better able to model gender equality. This may include implementing an internal gender audit, reviewing and revising human resources practices, including recruitment and promotion, conducting sexual harassment training, or providing training on gender awareness and analysis.

**Gender audits:** As part of efforts to build local capacity, support CSOs to institute the use of gender audits. Gender audits are participatory tools to identify roadblocks to integrating gender equality in an organization’s systems, operations, and programs. Ensure that these audits reflect the different experiences of men and women, persons with disabilities, LGBTI individuals, indigenous persons, youth, rural-urban distinctions, class divisions, and religious and ethnic groups. Help organizations to use the results of this audit to create an action plan that strategically builds on an organization’s strengths and sets forth concrete steps to address its areas of weakness.

**Recruitment and hiring:** Work with CSOs to ensure that their policies and processes for recruitment and hiring do not contain implicit biases (e.g., prioritizing advanced degrees in a country with an educational gender gap), and are flexible enough to bring in people with a variety of experiences and perspectives and to create opportunities for traditionally marginalized people. Support the development of internal mentoring programs for new and younger staff members.

**Family-friendly policies:** Support CSOs to enact policies and practices that are sensitive to the demands of domestic and family responsibilities and supportive of men playing a bigger role in such work. For example, CSOs can provide childcare during meetings and schedule meetings/events for times when women are not required to be home caring for the family to better enable women to more fully participate in the organization’s activities.

**Internships:** Support CSOs to establish volunteer and/or internship programs to bring in young women or members of traditionally marginalized groups to gain valuable skills and experience and entry into the civil society sector.

**Budgeting and resource allocation:** When training organizations in budgeting and financial planning, include analysis of how targeted programs and spending are likely to involve women and men. For example, in a human rights organization, support assessment of resources dedicated to calling attention to the jailing of LGBTI and women human rights defenders compared to the jailing of men political activists. Consider the proportion of resources committed to recruiting traditionally marginalized and rural women activists or providing childcare in relation to the organization’s rhetorical support for gender equality.

2. **Supporting Gender Equality and Empowering Women in Civil Society, Increasing women’s participation and leadership.**

**Participation at events:** Ensure that an equitable or representative proportion of women- and minority-led CSOs participate in meetings, activities, and training events by identifying and addressing potential barriers to their engagement prior to organizing events. Potential barriers might involve factors like timing and location of meetings and participants’ access to and need for transportation and childcare. Adolescents and young women, as well as women with disabilities, may face particular barriers. Recognize that many women’s sphere of activity may be very small, and meetings or activities may need to go to them where they are, in their homes or close community.

**Capacity building:** Provide targeted training and skills building for emerging and established women leaders within civil society, as well as of leaders from minority populations, if these groups identify
training or skill gaps. Inclusive trainings for both men and women CSO activists should take into account the particular challenges women civil society members may face, and should also provide opportunities for women to meet separately to facilitate networking and coalition building.

**Access to resources and professional development:** Facilitate equal access to funding opportunities, conferences and international exchanges, meetings with decision makers, and training and capacity building opportunities for CSOs led by women and traditionally marginalized groups.

3. **CSO Activities and Outreach:** Helping CSOs integrate a gender perspective into their work.

**Gender analysis training:** Build the capacity of CSOs to institutionalize the use of gender analysis and a gender perspective in their work so that their programs are accessible to and inclusive of men and women.

**Building communities of practice:** Facilitate partnerships and information sharing between CSOs with varying levels of experience in integrating gender and operationalizing inclusive policies and practices.

**Accessible activities:** Support CSOs in enacting policies and practices that are sensitive to formal and informal restrictions on mobility and association so that all people are equally able to participate fully in the organization’s activities. For example, changing when and where meetings and activities are held, making accommodations for travel concerns, and ensuring that adequate safety and security measures are in place are all essential elements in making sure that women and members of traditionally marginalized populations are able to participate meaningfully. In some environments, holding separate events for men and women or for youth and elders may be necessary to facilitate equitable participation.

**Coalition building:** Support the development of diverse civil society coalitions to advance gender equality as well as broader inclusion goals. For example, health or environmental organizations may also have a stake in furthering gender equality objectives. Facilitate and support partnerships among organizations that promote issues of importance to women, indigenous groups, persons with disabilities, and LGBTI individuals, in order to widen and deepen the reach of their efforts.

**Girls and young women:** Support programs and activities that focus specifically on building the capacity and participation of girls and young women, a group sometimes overlooked in both youth programming and programming for women. At the same time, support efforts to make existing organizations, programs, and activities more sensitive to and inclusive of the specific needs and interests of young women.

**Literacy and language:** Work with CSOs to develop civic and voter education campaigns that are sensitive to differences in oral and written literacy and do not utilize technical jargon or terms of art. Build the capacity of CSOs to utilize existing data regarding varying levels of literacy among, as well as between, certain groups. For example, while women and men in an indigenous community may not read the dominant language, women within that community may not even read the indigenous language. Where feasible, promote civic education campaigns that are integrated with literacy training and other forms of basic education, as this may engage a broader range of people.

**Media and communication:** Prioritize the use of varied means of communication appropriate to the target audience, including drama, performance, door-to-door canvassing, radio, television, SMS, and the Internet, including social media. Make sure that the people and images portrayed in these campaigns reflect the target audience.
4. Advocacy and Policy Influence: Supporting civil society to ensure more inclusive and responsive public policy.

Knowledge of domestic policy processes: Build the capacity of civil society to utilize existing government processes and mechanisms to promote gender equality and human rights agendas.

Human rights education: Conduct activities that raise awareness among civil society of the national, regional, and international mechanisms and opportunities that exist to promote gender equality and human rights.

Using gender policies and human rights instruments: Support the creation or strengthening of civil society coalitions to participate effectively in drafting, advocating for, and monitoring implementation of national gender frameworks and regional or international treaties that promote gender equality, such as the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Protocol to the African Charter on Human Rights and Peoples’ Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa (the Maputo Protocol), or the Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities (CRPD). See Module 1 on Integrating Gender into Human Rights Programming for more information.

Expanding policy discourse about gender: Create opportunities to discuss potentially controversial public policy issues about gender norms and women’s rights within the context of existing groups or gatherings focused on less sensitive topics such as health, microfinance, or education. This may be particularly important in more closed or restrictive societies in which opportunities for women to discuss certain topics may be limited.

Linking service provision and advocacy: Train and support women- and minority-led service-providing CSOs to engage in policy or legal advocacy.

II. Local Governance and Devolution Programming

1. Ensuring that the voices and priority concerns of women and traditionally marginalized populations are heard in the design and delivery of public services.

Gender-sensitive implementation of national policies: Strengthen the capacity of local government officials to utilize gender analysis, public opinion data, and citizen input to implement national mandates and policies in gender equitable and inclusive ways.

Coalition building: Foster coalitions and relationships between civil society organizations working on devolution and local governance issues and those working on gender equality and women’s rights issues. Build the capacity of governance-focused organizations to integrate gender equality into their work, and build the capacity of women’s organizations to advocate on governance issues.

Inclusive public consultations: Initiate and support regular public fora and consultations on public services. Strengthen the capacity of organizers to ensure that these sessions are gender equitable, accessible to all citizens, and provide a safe environment for expressing feedback. For example: schedule consultations at times when women are not required to be at home caring for their families; hold sessions in locations that are safe and accessible for women and persons with disabilities; provide childcare; have a diverse group of people hosting and facilitating the sessions; and if necessary, create a variety of closed consultations for women with female facilitators, or for people with disabilities, etc.
**Inclusive feedback mechanisms:** Support the creation of transparent and accessible complaints mechanisms and grievance procedures that give people different options for how to provide feedback. For example, anonymous complaints or suggestion boxes, SMS or websites to log complaints or service problems, radio or television events for citizens to pose question to local leaders, and publicly displayed reports on spending, legislation, or services.

**Civil society and government linkages:** Foster relationships between CSOs working to advance gender equality and minority rights, service-provision organizations, and government entities in order to help create and maintain open lines of communication regarding public service provision, delivery, and use.

**Participation of civil society:** Build the capacity of local women’s organizations and CSOs representing marginalized communities to more actively engage in official and unofficial consultation, planning, and implementation processes around public services.

**Civil society monitoring of local government:** Strengthen CSOs’ capacity to monitor public services and hold local government accountable. Such efforts may include community scorecards, public surveys, and direct solicitation of user feedback.

**Fostering inclusive public participation:** Support efforts by local governments and CSOs to create more open, transparent, and inclusive opportunities for diverse communities to participate in governance. This may include public fora, public hours in government offices, weekly radio or television programs with local officials, regular public meetings, and user surveys. As women may be disproportionately heads of household, particularly in poor urban areas, as well as the primary consumers of public services, they are well-placed to identify critical community development needs and develop appropriate responses. Launch initiatives that create a pipeline of future local government officials through mentoring or internship programs that are inclusive of or specifically target young women and girls.

2. **Safety and security: Ending gender-based violence.**

**Building local governance capacity to address GBV:** Enhance the capacity of local governments to take concrete steps to end gender-based violence (GBV). This may include: increased funding for anti-GBV efforts, training for police, judges, and healthcare workers; infrastructure changes to enhance safety and security; policies and procedures to identify and root out perpetrators of GBV within the context of public service provision; and strong legislation to prevent, investigate, and punish GBV.

**Connecting government and CSOs to address GBV:** Foster relationships between local governments and CSOs working to end GBV to increase communication and better position these CSOs to inform and advocate on GBV issues.

**GBV awareness raising:** Support local government initiatives to raise awareness of GBV, change attitudes about gender roles in society, and educate women about their rights and the services available to victims and survivors of GBV. Such initiatives may include television or radio programs, signs and billboards, or performing arts.

**Supporting anti-GBV strategies at the local level:** Initiate and support efforts to develop and strengthen government-wide strategies to end GBV which may include coordinating efforts between the justice sector (including police, prosecutors, and judges), healthcare workers, legislators, public service providers, and government functionaries.
Building civil society capacity: Build the capacity of CSOs working to advance gender equality and end GBV to advocate more effectively with local government. This may include monitoring local government compliance with national and international legal obligations, lobbying for increased funding for anti-GBV efforts, or pressing for accountability and transparency within the provision of public services.

3. Accountability Structures: Creating strong, gender-sensitive accountability mechanisms within and among government agencies.

- How inclusive are vertical accountability systems, or systems that enable the public to hold public officials accountable? Are women and other traditionally marginalized individuals able to access and fully participate in these systems to make their voices heard and demand accountability of public officials?
- How gender-responsive and inclusive of traditionally marginalized groups are existing diagonal or social accountability mechanisms, such as budget expenditure tracking, citizen advisory boards, social audits, or public policy consultations?
- What mechanisms are in place for citizen consultation on the provision and delivery of public services? To what extent are these mechanisms gender equitable and accessible to all members of the community?
- How inclusive and gender-sensitive are existing processes and policies—including grievance and compliance processes—to ensure transparency and accountability in service delivery, including healthcare, education, justice systems, and public utilities? For example, if grievances are submitted in person in an office, can women and men both access it conveniently and safely?
- How do civil society organizations (CSOs) advocating for greater accountability and transparency integrate gender and inclusion into their work?

Awareness raising and evidence sharing: Raise awareness among government actors of the impact of gender inequality and discrimination on the public’s ability to access services, including utilities, education, healthcare, and the justice system. This may include providing a broad overview of commonly faced types of discrimination and inequality in accessing these services or, if the data exists, the specific types of discrimination and corruption faced locally by women and traditionally marginalized groups. Civil society or think tanks can play a key role in providing relevant data or other evidence.

Open government: Support open government efforts that seek to make various branches of government more transparent and accountable. This is important in tracking who benefits from public spending, who has access to government, and how decisions are made, thereby helping to better ensure that the voices of women and traditionally marginalized groups are heard and that the needs of all citizens are met equitably.

4. Social Accountability Building strong civil society advocacy for accountability systems.

Social accountability: Support the design and implementation of inclusive, gender-sensitive social accountability efforts at both the national and local levels. These may include citizen score cards, citizen advisory committees, public service user surveys, participatory budgeting and budget expenditure tracking, social audits, and public policy consultations.

Raising public awareness: Provide support for public education and awareness-raisng efforts that focus on women’s rights and gender equality and the accountability mechanisms that exist to report and seek redress for corruption, sexual exploitation, and discrimination within the public sector, including within education, healthcare, the justice sector, and within the provision of basic public services.
services. Such efforts should also aim to reduce the stigma attached to reporting instances of sexual violence and sexual exploitation.

**Monitoring government commitments:** Support civil society efforts to hold governments accountable for their commitments to advance gender equality, whether through CEDAW or other international treaties or national-level strategies or policies.

-----------------------------

**USAID GESI Resources:**


[https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/keyconcepts_twopager_8.5x11_v7_20160907.pdf](https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/keyconcepts_twopager_8.5x11_v7_20160907.pdf)

ANNEX 4

NCDD SOCIAL EQUITY AND INCLUSIVENESS STRATEGY

1. INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

The Royal Government of Cambodia is strongly committed to promoting gender equality, social equity and inclusiveness.¹ These are important rights as well as powerful drivers of development.² Empowering women and other historically disadvantaged groups is one of the best ways to promote economic growth and the welfare of our citizens. In fact, no society can truly develop without providing equitable opportunities and resources to all its members.

This policy provides IP3 implementers with a mandate to act, to realize Cambodia’s commitment to social equity and inclusiveness, and to mainstreaming these goals principles, and actions into all policies, structures, systems, and operations.

2. POLICY AND SITUATION ANALYSIS

Social equity is about treating all groups fairly, according to their respective needs, while inclusiveness is about promoting participation and eliminating all forms of discrimination. The principle of taking into account the different needs of different groups does not mean women and men, or the young and the old are exactly the same. Instead it implies all Cambodians, regardless of gender, age, economic status, or ethnicity are entitled to realize their full potential and that circumstances of birth should not determine one’s opportunities or one’s success.

Given the resources available in the IP3-III, it will not be possible to fully develop comprehensive programs for all disadvantaged groups. While some elements of the IP3-III, in particular the mainstreaming of policies, regulations, M&E, and capacity development, will have a wide coverage, and will address the needs of women, the poor, ethnic minorities, the disabled, youth and the elderly, in other areas activities will be more narrow. Our

---

¹ We sometimes use these words interchangeably because of the length of the full term “gender, social equity and inclusiveness.”
² Some global estimates about the impact of removing inequalities can be found in the Australian Government’s “Gender equality and women’s empowerment strategy” (2016). These include: (i) global GDP could rise by as much as 2% (about $US 17 trillion); (ii) women could increase their incomes by up to 76% if the employment participation and wage gaps closed; (iii) women who are better educated have fewer, healthier and better-educated children; (iv) female farmers provided with equal access to resources could reduce under-nutrition for an estimated 100-150 million people and (v) violence against women undermines communities’ social fabric.

---

Figure 1: Some Definitions

Gender: the social attributes and opportunities associated with being male and female and the relationships between women and men. These attributes, opportunities and relationships are socially constructed and are learned through socialization. Gender is different than sex [i]

Gender mainstreaming, is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action including legislation, policies or program, in any area and at all levels [i]

Gender equality refers to the equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men and girls and boys [i]

Female empowerment is when women and girls acquire the power to act freely, exercise their rights, and fulfill their potential as full and equal members of society [iii]

Social equity means promotion of rights to fairly use and receive the benefits of service delivery, local development and social, political and physical conditions and fully participate in political and cultural affairs in the society [iv]

Inclusiveness means the promotion of an individual or a group situation to participate in and to benefit from any social activity without discrimination [iv]

focus will be on: (i) gender; (ii) disability; and (iii) the elderly. A situation analysis for each of these three groups is described below.

**GENDER**

In 2015 Cambodia’s gender inequality index had a value of 0.479.\(^3\) This ranks 112\(^{th}\) out of 159 countries, and places Cambodia in a lower position (reflecting greater inequality) than its neighbors. Maternal mortality and child malnutrition rates are still quite high, indicating a need to target social protection measures on pregnant women and young children. On the other hand, there have been some significant gains over recent years. In particular, recent data shows a general parity in educational attainment for males and females, including completion and academic performance at secondary school level. This has positive implications for the capacity of young women to take on leadership roles in the future. While women’s participation in the labor force is the highest in the region, their access to political and leadership opportunities remains very low.

22% of Cambodian households are headed by women.\(^4\) A woman’s possibility of employment is 88% of a man’s and her wages are 68% of a man’s. She will have an 8% less chance of attending secondary school and a 38% less chance to receive tertiary education. Women have a 28% less chance to have a bank account. Only 20% of Cambodia’s parliamentarians and 8% of its Ministers are female. Though women make up about 50% of the population they have only an 18% chance of becoming a legislator, senior official, or manager and a 35% chance of becoming a professional and technical worker.

This gender gap is derived from national data. To assess women’s empowerment at sub-national level, gender audits were completed in 2013 and 2016. Recommendations from the 2016 report have been used to develop the IP3-III. Audits investigated 5 areas (Figure 2) and covered 4 central government agencies, 4 Provinces and 4 DMs. In total 55 indicators were collected for each organization. As can be below, the overall index improved by 14% from 2013 to 2016. The biggest increase took place for central government.

Cambodia has a range of institutions, laws and strategies that aim to promote gender equality. This starts with the 1993 Constitution that states that “every Khmer citizen shall be equal before

---

\(^3\) The gender inequality index shows the loss in potential human development due to reproductive health and gender inequalities in and economic participation dimensions. The index ranges between 0 and 1, with higher values indicating greater inequality.

\(^4\) This percentage is higher in Phnom Penh (24.9%) than rural areas (20.7%). 13% of women are widowed compared to 2.3% of men.
the law” and “all forms of discrimination against woman shall be abolished” (Article 45). Cambodia ratified the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) in 1992. The Rectangular Strategy for Growth, Employment, Equity and Efficiency Phase III (2013) recognises gender equity as a key component of national development. Responding to this, the Neary Rattanak IV (Strategic plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Cambodia 2014-2018) focuses on women’s employment, education, health care, safety (including prevention of gender based violence), participation in all levels of decision making, and gender mainstreaming in government development programs and foreign assistance.

Despite these successes, inequality is often the result of the uneven distribution of power and institutional constraints. These factors normalize inequality, entrenching it, and allow it to continue. The IP3-III sees social equity and inclusiveness as a power relation; for this reason, it has been placed under Component #2, and is considered an essential element of good governance.

**DISABILITY**

According to the National Demographic and Health Study (2014) 9.5% of the population reported some form of physical difficulty with 2.1% reporting a “strong difficulty.” Similarly, a 2014 population-based study of children aged two to nine estimated the prevalence of impairment at 15.6%, and disability at 10.1%. The economic activity rate for people with disabilities is 69.3% (for the general population it is 82.2%). The rate for disabled men is lower than the overall population by 8.4 percentage points while for disabled women it is 19.4 points lower. Household wealth of people with disabilities is about half that of non-disabled people. Employment is a significant concern for persons with disabilities.

In terms of the regulatory framework, in 2009, the RGC published the Law on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2012 and followed this up with the development of the National Disability Strategic Plan (NDSP) 2014-2018. Key measures of the NDSP include

---

5 According to the Cambodia Inter-Censal Population Survey (2013), 2% of the population has disabilities, with 10.6% of these being children of 14 years or less. The prevalence of disability increases with age, reaching 44 % of those aged 60 and over. There is an association between disability and education. Disability is significantly higher for persons with no education (20%) than those achieving primary (8%), secondary (5%) and higher education (2%). Disability is likely a significant barrier to educational attainment.

6 38.5% of people with disabilities in Cambodia earn an income, 42.6% cannot earn an income and 18.8% are under 18. The percentage of women with disabilities who earn an income is lower than men, at 25.8% and 44.8% respectively.

7 The law seeks to (i) protect the rights of persons with disabilities, (ii) protect the interests of persons with disabilities, (iii) reduce discrimination of persons with disabilities; and (iv) ensure access to rehabilitation services.

8 It focuses on reduction of poverty for persons with disabilities and has 10 key objectives: quality and equal health services; access to justice and prevention from discrimination, abuse, mistreatment and exploitation of persons with disabilities; access to education and participation in expressing their voices; access to information and participation in political and development work; access to physical environment, public transport and facilities, knowledge, information and communication; assurance of gender equality and
requests for free health services, a quota for employment (2% at government institutions and 1 percent for companies with more than 100 employees), and reasonable accommodation for disabled employees. The Social Protection Policy Framework’s (SPPF 2016-2025) action plan includes cash transfers for people with disabilities and a disability allowance scheme at community level which targets ID poor households. There are 11 physical rehabilitation centres, a spinal cord injury centre, and an orthopaedic component factory.\textsuperscript{9} Despite this, many children with disabilities still lack access to education and services are highly dependent on NGOs.

**THE ELDERLY**

6.34% of the population is over 60; this proportion is expected to rise, given increased average life expectancy and other demographic changes. 58% of the elderly are women and 42% are men. In general, older women are more vulnerable than older men. The National Policy for the Elderly (NPE: 2003) was developed to address growing vulnerability, with a goal of full integration, participation and promotion of wellbeing of older adults, and ensured access to opportunities and benefits. The NPE addresses social welfare, health, economic needs, and inclusion.

**3. VISION AND DESIRED CHANGES**

Our vision is that:

- **SNAs promote and uphold social equity and inclusiveness, dignity, respect, and fairness for all**

Some of the outcomes we wish to achieve, related to decentralization, include:

- Women and other historically disadvantaged groups are empowered to demand their rights, participate fully in all areas of public life, and reach their potential
- Disparities between groups (gaps) are reduced
- All decentralization related policies, plans, strategies and activities adequately address social equity and inclusiveness
- SNA decision makers and IP3 implementers consider the impact all the decisions they make will have on social equity and inclusiveness
- SNA and IP3 resources are increasingly devoted to promoting social equity and inclusiveness
- SNA service delivery addresses and promotes social equity and inclusiveness
- SNAs take firm action to eliminate violence against women and children in their communities
- The workplaces of SNA and IP3-implementers are conducive and safe for all and they respect and promote diversity

Social equity and inclusiveness has been mainstreamed into the IP3-III from the beginning. It is integrated into all outcomes, targets, and outputs. As such, in the formulation of our annual work plans and budgets, implementation of social equity-related activities will be found within each component. To promote social equity and inclusiveness, we will work in the following areas:

1. **Strengthening leadership:**
   - most leaders are men and most power is in the hands

---

\textsuperscript{9} The PWDF under the MOSVY is expected to take over physical rehabilitation centers and the prosthetics and orthotics factory; however the Ministry is constrained in terms of human and financial resources. NGOs have started special schools for children with hearing and visual impairment in 4 PCs. These have been integrated under the MOEYS.
of men. For our vision to be realized men must champion social equity and inclusiveness.

2. **Mainstreaming** social equity and inclusiveness into all policies, regulatory instruments, systems, and capacity development

3. Improving the delivery of services which most benefit women, children and other disadvantaged groups, in particular providing social services, social protection and eliminating violence against women. As functions are transferred DMs and CSs are expected to take a stronger role in providing social services, interacting with communities. Currently, most SNAs invest heavily in infrastructure; devoting few resources to social services.

4. **Developing capacity** to address social equity and inclusiveness,

**FOCUS**

As described earlier and consistent with the *Technical Document on Social Equity and Inclusiveness*, actions will cover all disadvantaged groups, especially in terms of mainstreaming policy, regulation, service delivery, and CD. However, in some areas, where very detailed programs are required, we will focus on gender, disability, and the elderly. Wherever possible we will work with civil society organizations to reach the widest range of groups and beneficiaries. Without strong civil society partnership it will not be possible to fully and effectively work with many target groups.

**KEY TARGETS**

We will manage performance to meet the following IP3-III targets:

### Table 1: Key targets related to social equity and inclusiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABBREVIATED RESULT</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>TARGET 2018</th>
<th>TARGET 2019</th>
<th>TARGET 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2.1 Space for intra-government debate</td>
<td>1. Number of NCDD meetings which include performance against targets, annual quality assurance reports, bi-annual policy briefs and an annual social equity and inclusiveness report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.3.1 Civil Society partnerships</td>
<td>2. New program, partnership and areas of cooperation with civil society/the private sector identified and financed [*]</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Financed</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.5.1 Leadership social equity</td>
<td>3. Develop web-enabled database to monitor staffing composition, quotas, etc.</td>
<td>Analyzed</td>
<td>Piloted</td>
<td>In use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Implement a strategy to promote women in SNA non-management positions</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. % of Governors/Deputy governors completing mandatory gender awareness</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. % of women in PC management positions</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. % of women in DMK management positions</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.5.2 Mainstreaming social equity and inclusiveness</td>
<td>8. Number of new programs implemented to support youth, handicapped, ethnic minorities and other groups</td>
<td>Program Designed</td>
<td>1 Program implemented</td>
<td>2 program implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. % increase in the gender audit mainstreaming score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.5.3 Social protection services</td>
<td>10. SNA funding for social protections services through fiscal transfer mechanisms ($US Millions)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. SCOPE

This policy outlines social equity and inclusiveness principles, goals, objectives, and measures that should guide the work of all IP3-III implementers. Since the IP3 is coordinated by the NCDDS and since the Ministry of Women’s Affairs (MOWA) has the mandate to promote women’s equality nation-wide, MOWA and the NCDDS will take the joint lead in managing, supporting, and monitoring this strategy. This strategy updates:

- The NP-SNDD’s Annex 2 on gender mainstreaming in SNAs
- The IP3-I Appendix 3 (“Gender Strategy”) and IP3-II Annex 3 (“Strategy for Promoting and Supporting Social Equity and Inclusiveness in NP-SNDD Phase 2”)

This strategy is consistent with national policies identified in Section 5. The IP3-III and this annex are supported by a series of subsidiary documents and plans, including: (i) a Strategy to promoting women in SNA management positions, (ii) a technical document on social equity and inclusiveness, and (iii) a gender mainstreaming manual and materials. The first half of this document outlines “policies and principles,” while the second half summarizes implementation. Policies are adjusted every 3-4 years as we revise our decentralization strategies.

5. PRINCIPLES TO APPLY ACROSS THE IP3

We take a dual mainstreaming and empowerment approach. Transforming relations relevant to social equity and inclusiveness is a long-term endeavor, requiring a long term commitment. The following principles and commitments will guide all IP3-related work:

1. Social equity and inclusiveness is a priority. Because addressing social equity, and inclusiveness within organizations will not happen accidentally, it must be actively encouraged and cultivated
2. We will tirelessly promote the core values of fairness, respect for diversity, and inclusiveness
3. We will integrate social equity and inclusiveness more effectively in all our work, no matter what the sector or focus. Social equity and inclusiveness will be mainstreamed from the start, in a genuine way, not as an afterthought
4. All decisions we make will take into account how they affect different groups
5. We will work closely and in partnership with civil society to promote social equity and inclusiveness. A successful partnership will include having a shared vision; meaningful stakeholder involvement and consultation; and long-term commitments, including joint-financing. We are committed to supporting and working with all organizations that share our common goals and vision
6. We will hold ourselves accountable for meeting our targets

7. We will continuously analyze social equity and inclusiveness. Any key action we take and strategy we develop will be evidence based, describing what activities are needed, with whom and why; what results are expected; how activities and results contribute to achieving the overall objectives of the intervention; what resources are needed; and what indicators will be used to monitor the strategy and its results.

The remainder of this document describes key activities to promote social equity and inclusiveness in the following areas: (i) leadership development; (ii) gender mainstreaming; (iii) service delivery and governance; and (iv) capacity development.

6. LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Achieving true equality requires profound cultural and attitudinal change. This depends significantly on leaders. A good leader considers the impact of his or her decisions on all groups. A good leader ensures all staff reach their potential. A good leader listens and respects a diversity of opinion, and creates a positive, conducive work environment. To achieve our goals we must:

1. Influence and change the attitude of leaders, most of which are men. We must create male champions of social equity and inclusiveness

2. Promote a more diverse leadership, especially female leaders, but also diverse leaders in terms of ethnic minorities and the disabled

Although still under-represented relative to men, the number of women in formal leadership positions has increased. For example:

- The proportion of PC women councilors increased from 10% in 2009 to 13% in 2014
- The proportion of DMK women councilors increased from 13% in 2009 to 14% in 2014
- The proportion of female commune councilors increased from 15% in 2007 to 17.8% in 2012. This, however, dropped to 16.8% in 2017. Over the same period, the proportion of women commune chiefs increased from 5.8% to 7.8%, and deputy commune chiefs from 11.6% to 14.2%.
- Women’s participation increased in the civil service from 32% in 2007 to 37% in 2013, however many women are still concentrated in junior positions.

According to a 2013 USAID survey, nearly 65% of selected women councilors are over the age of 50, and 55% have only obtained a primary education. As of mid-2016, women comprised 12.1% of all PC-level managerial posts and 21.5% of all DMK-level managerial positions.

MANDATORY AWARENESS FOR LEADERS

A major finding of the gender audit was that the degree to which gender was being actively addressed greatly depended on those in leadership positions, who are mostly male. These principles—that to get results leadership must be improved—likely applies more broadly to social equity. During the IP3-I significant awareness creation and training was provided across SNAs. This tended to focus on administrators and mid-level staff. Some training was designed especially for women, regardless of their positions, and some technical training of leaders (for example in gender mainstreaming tools) was provided. The focus was not on changing attitudes. According to the 2013 DMK capacity assessment, 77% of all DMK staff had been provided gender training.

In the second IP3 the focus gradually shifted to leadership, in particular, providing mandatory awareness training to those in power, who can most strongly influence policies and the allocation of resources. CD is envisioned to be dynamic, participatory, experiential, interesting, and convincing, aiming to: (i) create awareness, genuine interest, acceptance, and appreciation for the
importance of social equity; to change attitudes and behaviors; and (ii) help leaders design, resource, and implement one high profile activity impacting social equity and inclusiveness. The audience will be Governors and Council Chairs of each DMK and Deputy Governors and Deputy Chairs in each PC.

**WOMEN IN SNA MANAGEMENT POSITIONS**

The IP3-II and National Strategic Development Plan target an increase in women in SNA management (by 2018: 20% in PCs and 25% in DMKs). To meet these targets, a strategy was developed in 2016 and approved by the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Interior and Chairman of NCDD in early 2017. Some reasons why a diverse organization is likely to perform better are summarized in Figure 8.

Reversing the low fraction of women is a priority of the Royal Government. When HR practices are unfair, the true potential of staff is not realized and organizations do not properly use the talents available to them. They under-perform.\(^{10}\)

To remedy the situation, actions must be taken at each step in the HR management process, in terms of developing HR policies and regulations, recruitment, retention, promotion, and capacity development. As depicted in Figure 9, we will implement four main strategies. In the IP3-III we will also:

1. Extend the principles and procedures underlying the *Strategy to Promote Women in SNA Management Positions* to cover a wider range of groups, including ethnic minorities and the disabled

2. Develop a strategy to increase women and other disadvantaged groups in non-management positions. It is important to attract women into the public service, including at SNAs. Women in entry level positions may eventually be promoted into management positions, though with seniority being an important factor this will take a while. This strategy is likely to involve: (i) developing,

---

**Figure 8: Why diverse organizations perform better**

- Members of different groups are likely to have different views, opinions and work habits.
- Diversity of opinion improves the quality of decision making.
- Where teams are used, diversity often results in increased innovation and improvements in the work produced.
- Women are more likely to advocate for decisions which promote women’s empowerment.
- Women are likely to provide a strong voice to promote social services.
- Members of disadvantaged groups are likely to promote the future employment and improve the work environment for other members of disadvantaged groups.

**Figure 9: Strategies to promote women in SNA management positions**

**STRATEGY #1: DEVELOP POLICIES AND REGULATIONS**

- Develop and monitor guidelines for promoting women into management positions within SNAs (quotas, targets and incentives)

**STRATEGY #2: PROMOTION AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT**

- Implement succession planning, including skills upgrading of potential female leaders
- Mentor women and develop women’s networks

**STRATEGY #3: IMPROVE WORKING ENVIRONMENT**

- Create a positive work environment
- Hold SNA workplace training to reduce sexual harassment
- Mandatory training to SNA leaders on gender in leadership

**STRATEGY #4: MAINSTREAM GENDER INTO LONGER TERM REFORMS**

- Encourage competitive recruitment and codes of HR practice
- Develop a strategy to promote women into entry level and non-management positions
- Integrate gender into inspection and incentive processes

---

\(^{10}\) The MCS is committed to the *Strategy to Promote Women in SNA Management Positions*, and will ensure every woman manager who retires is replaced by a woman. When male managers retire, at least one woman must be shortlisted. Both MOWA and MCS have developed strategies (Neary Ratanak IV and the MCS Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan) that include targets and actions to increase women’s participation in leadership and decision making.
promoting and implementing internship programs; (ii) targeted recruitment, for example, at universities; (iii) developing a young professionals program, aimed at giving young women a wide range of experience; and (iv) including gender related topics during public service orientation programs.

**KEY ACTIVITIES**

Key activities in terms of leadership development are outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>IP3-III OUTPUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement the Strategy to Promote Women in SNA Management Positions, including development, implementation and monitoring of quotas, targets and incentives, succession planning, skills upgrading of future female leaders, and improving the work environment (see Figure 9 for a more complete list) <em>(MOI)</em></td>
<td>2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the principles and procedures underlying the Strategy to Promote Women in SNA Management Positions to cover a wider range of groups, including ethnic minorities and the disabled <em>(NCDDS)</em></td>
<td>2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a strategy to increase women and other disadvantaged groups in non-management positions including recruiting at University level, providing internship opportunities, etc. <em>(NCDDS)</em></td>
<td>2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete mandatory social equity and inclusiveness awareness for SNA leaders, focusing on attitudinal change and taking concrete and monitorable steps to address social equity and inclusiveness in each SNA <em>(NCDDS, MOWA)</em></td>
<td>2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the Association of SNA Councils to advocate with Political Parties on increasing the number and position of women on the candidate lists, and ensure regular networking opportunities for women councilors and leaders at all levels <em>(Associations of SNA Council)</em></td>
<td>2.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7. MAINSTREAMING**

Mainstreaming ensures social equity and inclusiveness perspectives are central to all activities: the formulation of programs and the setting of objectives, policy development, regulations, research, M&E, communications, service delivery, resource allocation, and the creation of management systems and processes, including planning and gender based budgeting. To mainstream gender, central government implementers have Gender Mainstreaming Action Groups and Action Plans *(GMAGs, and GMAPs)*.

The IP3-III describes the importance of improving policy development processes, making policy more participatory, strategic, evidence based, and analytical. Improving policy processes is essential for promoting social equity and inclusiveness.

**KEY ACTIVITIES**

Key activities in terms of mainstreaming are summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>IP3-III OUTPUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In formulating the next NP, ensure it addresses and mainstreams social equity and inclusiveness; align it to all key conventions and national strategies and plans (such as social protection, elimination of violence against women, disability, children, elderly, gender, ethnic minorities, etc.) <em>(NCDDS)</em></td>
<td>1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise key issues about social equity and inclusiveness, including in an annual assessment of social equity and inclusiveness as an input into NCDD meetings; monitor and evaluate all key social equity targets and disaggregate all relevant indicators <em>(NCDDS)</em></td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In undertaking quality assurance assessments ensure social equity and inclusiveness is mainstreamed <em>(NCDDS)</em></td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate social equity and inclusiveness into key communications campaigns; implement specific campaigns promoting social equity and inclusiveness <em>(NCDDS)</em></td>
<td>1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address social equity in policy forums, and where relevant in policy experiments and learning exercises <em>(NCDDS)</em></td>
<td>1.2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Activity Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>IP3-III Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form partnerships with civil society that promotes social equity, especially in terms of disability, youth and ethnic minorities (NCDDS)</td>
<td>1.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In implementing a matrix structure to the IP3-III, ensure social equity inputs are included in all “project” documents and activities (NCDDS)</td>
<td>1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In coordinating DP projects, during annual conferences, exchange and adopt lessons learned on social equity (NCDDS)</td>
<td>1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In revising NCDD planning, financial management, M&amp;E, administration and policy development procedures, substantially mainstream social equity and inclusiveness (MEF, MOP, MOI, NCDDS)</td>
<td>1.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the effectiveness of social accountability and the degree to which it is addressing the different needs of women and other potentially disadvantaged groups; revise the program based on findings (Civil Society)</td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate elimination of violence against women, disability and other social equity issues into the next phase of social accountability (through 14Cs, scorecards, etc.) (NCDDS, Civil Society)</td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the design of the complaints handling system addresses social equity and inclusiveness, and other key differences that may inhibit complaining (MOI)</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In empowering councilors, stress their role of representing all citizens, especially those from historically disadvantaged groups (MOI)</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure compliance inspection processes assess whether rules and regulations relevant to social equity and inclusiveness are being adhered to; these should be later incentivized through performance grants (MOI and each sector Ministry)</td>
<td>2.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure SNA performance assessment includes measures for social equity and inclusiveness; these are later incentivized through performance grants and should be part of performance improvement plans (MOI and each sector Ministry)</td>
<td>2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure SNA MIS systems capture important and relevant information on social equity, and that this information can be used effectively by decision makers (NCDDS)</td>
<td>2.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and revise planning processes, supporting social service delivery, targets for social equity, and means to allocate resources to social equity so priorities in terms of social equity can be translated into action (MOP)</td>
<td>2.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the PFMRP Ensure financial management processes support social service delivery and the allocation of resources to activities that promote social equity and inclusiveness; promote gender based budgeting and planning and the allocation of resources to poverty reduction (MEF)</td>
<td>2.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand gender audit procedures to cover social equity and inclusiveness (NCDDS)</td>
<td>2.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With civil society, develop specific, costed programs to support youth, the handicapped, ethnic minorities and other groups within specific D&amp;D initiatives (NCDDS)</td>
<td>2.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with key partners, including the PFM reform, UNICEF, ISAF implementers, and others implementing international conventions and national strategies to promote social equity (MOWA, NCDDS)</td>
<td>2.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream social equity into all SNA HR management processes, especially recruitment and staff appraisal, with social equity being part of all job descriptions (MCS)</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream social equity into relevant CD guidelines, ensuring all CD takes social equity and inclusiveness into account (see Annex 4) (MOI)</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address social equity and inclusiveness, especially once functions have been transferred, by strengthening the capacity of WCCCs and other relevant offices to promote social equity, to advise councils and to monitor differential impact in terms of service delivery (MOWA)</td>
<td>4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work closely with Ministries transferring key social protection functions to SNAs, in particular Ministries responsible for Social Affairs and Women’s affairs (all sector Ministries)</td>
<td>4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As sector Ministries revise their service delivery standards and regulations, better mainstream social equity and inclusiveness (all sector Ministries)</td>
<td>4.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In developing performance grant systems, for conditional and unconditional grants, ensure social equity is incentivized (MEF)</td>
<td>5.1.1 and 5.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and revise SNIF guidelines to better incorporate social equity and inclusiveness (MEF)</td>
<td>5.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in partnership with UN women, UNDP/Sida’s LWGE project, the CNCW, and MOWA, as described below (NCDDS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partnerships and Projects**

55
Related projects the IP3-III expects to work with include:

- **UN Women**, which supports the MEF (PFMRP) and NCDDS to integrate gender responsive budgeting and social equity into planning and budgeting processes.
- The **UNDP/SIDA Leading the Way for Gender Equality (LWGE)** project. Potential areas of partnership may include CD for GMAGs, gender audits, and strengthening MOWA and other agencies to address the needs of elderly women and women and girls with disabilities.
- The **Cambodian National Council for Women (CNCW)** prepares annual reports on women in leadership positions and the degree to which Neary Rattanak IV is integrated into Ministries’ plans and budgets. This can be extended to SNAs and linked to incentives rewarding high performance at the annual CNCW conference.

8. **SERVICE DELIVERY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE**

As functions are transferred, such as those under the Ministry of Women’s Affairs, the Ministry of Social Affairs, and other central Ministries, SNAs will take a greater role in the delivery of services which matter to women, children, and traditionally disadvantaged groups. The IP3-III will support SNAs to implement transferred functions and provide higher quality services.

However, even if key functions are not transferred, the general mandate advances SNAs’ right and obligation to address the most pressing needs of their local communities. Currently, the general mandate is being mostly used for infrastructure development (local roads, water, etc.) rather than provision of social services. The IP3-III will promote the general mandate, particularly social protection and service delivery, local economic development, and climate change. It will promote partnerships between SNAs and civil society and the private sector. It is expected these partnerships will strengthen SNA capacity to meet local communities’ demands for social services and better serve disadvantaged groups. Finally, fiscal transfer mechanisms should encourage spending on development which directly benefits citizens including marginalized and vulnerable groups.

Within the general mandate, and in terms of social equity, the IP3-III will focus on:

**Social protection, the elimination of violence against women (EVAW) and programs to support the disabled**

**SOCIAL PROTECTION**

Social protection includes:

“Public actions taken in response to levels of vulnerability, risk and deprivation”

Social protection is usually provided by the state, as part of its role to protect the most vulnerable, to address levels of risk and deprivation that are viewed as unacceptable within a given society. Typically social protection is divided into: (i) social assistance or grants to the most vulnerable; and (ii) social insurance against shocks and risk. “Safety nets” are a form of social protection that helps people meet their immediate, basic needs in times of crisis. Although social protection actions vary widely, examples include health or crop insurance, labor market policies and employment support, social assistance, tax subsidies, price support, microfinance, and land reform.

The government, under the leadership of the MEF, recently launched the **Social Protection Policy Framework (SPPF) 2016-2025**. Activities relevant to the IP3-III include:

- **Cash transfers to vulnerable women and children**: The intention is to cover pregnant women and children faced with malnutrition. The program is based on World Bank and UNICEF

---

12. It has 4 components related to social assistance: (i) human capital development; (ii) emergency response; (iii) vocational training and (iv) welfare for vulnerable people. The latter relies on SNA identification and targeting.
pilot projects. Support will also be provided to encourage pregnant women, especially those from poor families, to receive adequate counseling and check-ups. SNAs are potential implementers and could possibly receive funds through fiscal decentralization mechanisms.

- Scholarship programs in primary and secondary education and school feeding programs. The government will develop scholarship mechanisms, ways to encourage and retain children from poor families in school and provide food to the most vulnerable children. SNAs can play an important role in both identification and fiscal transfer.
- Social welfare of vulnerable people will provide cash transfers to the most vulnerable elderly and disabled people, supporting this with nutrition supplements and healthcare.

ELIMINATION OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN
SNAs are expected to increasingly play an essential role in both preventing and addressing violence against women. This is a foundation of the general mandate and part of SNAs’ responsibility to solve local community problems.

According to recent data, in their lifetime 1 in 5 partnered Cambodian women reported experiencing physical or sexual violence by an intimate partner. 8% experienced it in the past 12 months. Rates were higher in rural areas. Many affected women do not seek help, and if they reported violence, it was most likely to local leaders (14.5%) or the police (11.9%). The low level of assistance sought is attributed to a lack of available services; difficult access due to geography and cost; the need for sensitization among agencies such as village authorities, police, magistrates, and health services to encourage women to approach them; a lack of trust that their interests will be considered; and constraints in the current legal system, making it difficult for cases to be effectively prosecuted.

In 2010, the Government issued the Village/Commune Safety Policy that includes “no prostitution, trafficking of women and children, and domestic violence” in its safety criteria. It tasks Communes to take action to eliminate these occurrences “for security and safety for citizens especially for women and children.” There are detailed sector plans to address these issues such as the National Action Plan for Preventing Violence against Women (NAPVAW2). The Provincial Department of Women’s Affairs’ (PDOWA) coordinates with state and non-state providers to ensure an effective referral system and to convene service provider network meetings on gender based violence. Both Provincial and District Women’s Affairs offices are under-resourced, as they lack skilled staff, adequate supervision, and funding to fulfill their functions.

The Ministry of Women’s Affairs has not decentralized its service delivery, from District Offices of Women’s Affairs (DOWAs) to DMs, and this reduces DOWAs’ ability to access local funding and hinders local authorities’ effectiveness to respond to community needs.

NGOs currently provide the bulk of frontline services, particularly in rural areas. For the system to be improved, the connection between NGOs, the police, CSs, and DMs which have been transferred functions to address violence against women needs to be strengthened. Further capacity development and support to implement guidelines and protocols is also necessary.

KEY ACTIVITIES
The table below summarizes key activities in the IP3-III related to promoting service delivery improvements that are likely to benefit women and children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>IP3-III OUTPUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 The NAPVAW2 has the overarching goal to reduce violence against all women and girls through increased prevention interventions, improved response, increased access to quality services, and multi-sector and cooperation. Ministries, donors, and civil society with programs related to violence against women are expected to align with and contribute to one or more of the plan’s 20 objectives. The plan prioritizes three forms of violence (domestic violence; rape and sexual violence; and violence against women at high risk).
Assess and identify constraints to the general mandate and to social service delivery; make revisions to the regulatory environment or implement activities to remove these constraints, focusing on the impact of social service delivery to women and children (MEF, MOP) | 4.1.1

Mainstream social equity into the development of key pilot grant systems (NCDDS, MOWA) | 4.1.3

In facilitating DMs and CSs to make use of their general mandate, mainstream social equity and inclusiveness issues and principles (NCDDS, MOI) | 4.1.4

Projectize (and implement) a coherent approach to eliminate violence against women, including: (i) with MOWA and civil society (including CCC), review and revise referral and protocol procedures, ensuring SNA participation as the “community’s voice”; (ii) continually develop capacity; (iii) implement behavioral change communications campaigns; (iv) partner with the DFAT ACCESS program (and others) on EVAW (e.g. implement guidelines and a training program for minimum standards of essential services, basic counseling referral and mediation for women subject to violence, ensure that sub-national plans are inclusive) (NCDDS, MOWA) | 4.1.5

Working with the MEF (under the Social Protection Policy Framework) and UNICEF strengthen SNA social assistance programs by: (i) promoting SNA’s roles in linking vulnerable people to social protection programs; (ii) improve registration and identification mechanisms of the poor and vulnerable; (iii) integrate social protection into the general mandate, (iv) strengthen WCCCs in social protection; and (v) develop or improve fiscal transfer mechanisms to better channel social protection funds to SNAs (MEF, NCDDS, MOWA) | 4.1.5

Continue implementing SNA social service delivery projects (NCDDS, MOWA) | 4.1.6

Transfer DOWA functions, staff and resources to DMs (MOWA) | 4.2.3

Strength the support and supervision functions of PDOWAs, in light of decentralization (MOWA) | 4.4.1

PARTNERSHIPS AND PROJECTS

To implement our focus on social protection, disability and the elimination of violence against women, the IP3-III will work with the following partners.

- **DFAT Australia-Cambodia Cooperation for Equitable Sustainable Services (ACCESS).** ACCESS is a 5 year project starting 2018. Amongst others, it will provide grants to work with DMs and PCs to ensure investment programs promote social inclusion and responses to gender based violence and to partner with NGOs to build SNA capacity in these areas.

- **CCC** recently launched the *Strengthening Civil Society for Democratic and Sustainable Development in Cambodia Project* (funded by the EU). This will promote CSO partnership at sub-national level, probably starting with the ISAF.

- **UNICEF** is piloting village level vulnerability mapping to identify households and individuals for targeted support. Data collected can be used as the basis for CS planning, investment and targeting of social protection activities.

9. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

The IP3 aims to strengthen SNA’s organizational and individual capacities. Section 7 describes how social equity and inclusiveness will be mainstreamed into the development of systems and processes, while Section 9 outlines some of the capacity development initiatives relevant to leaders.

**KEY ACTIVITIES**

The table below summarizes key CD initiatives to promote social equity and inclusiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>IP3-III OUTPUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue strengthening female councilor and female staff networks in order to exchange relevant experiences and advocate for women in sub-national policies (ASAC, NCDDS)</td>
<td>1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure gender, social equity and inclusiveness is integrated into job descriptions and TOR of all advisors and contract staff and that the recruitment of women, especially in higher level positions is actively promoted (NCDDS)</td>
<td>1.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a CD program to strengthen Ministerial GMAGs, aiming to strengthen their lobbying and influencing capacities in terms of decision makers in their Ministries (MOWA)</td>
<td>2.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement priority CD initiatives to promote social equity (MOI, NCDDS, MOWA)</td>
<td>2.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop networks and mentoring arrangements to exchange experiences (MOI)</td>
<td>2.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>IP3-III OUTPUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen key organizations, like WCCCs, and GMAGs; clarify roles and responsibilities between MOWA, NCDDS and other key institutions and ensuring they are increasingly financed through state budgets <em>(MOWA, NCDDS)</em></td>
<td>2.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete a TNA for new female CS councilors and develop and implement an orientation program <em>(MOI)</em></td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTNERSHIPS**

Some key partnerships, in terms of CD, were identified in Section 8. In addition, the UNDP is developing a “post-ACES” project which is likely to include important capacity development initiatives for councilors.