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<tbody>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>GFU</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRBA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAP</td>
<td>Humanitarian Accountability Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>DanChurchAid Head Quarters in Copenhagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>Job Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDU</td>
<td>Programme Development Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRA</td>
<td>Participatory Gender and Rights Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLWHA</td>
<td>People Living with HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM</td>
<td>Programme and Project Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Programme Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Programme Type Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Regional Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDDirect</td>
<td>Social Development Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToRs</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACC</td>
<td>World Association for Christian Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

DanChurchAid (DCA) contracted Social Development Direct to conduct a Participatory Gender and Rights Audit (PGRA) of the organisation between August and October 2009.

The audit was divided into four distinct stages:

- Consultation with key members of DCA Gender and Rights Audit Team and review of documents
- Interviews and Focus Group Discussions during visit to DCA Headquarters in Copenhagen
- Follow-up Skype interviews with senior managers and staff in three country offices
- Analysis, reporting writing and drafting

General Findings on Mainstreaming of Rights and Gender in DCA

- RBA is generally well understood in DCA and there is a clear commitment to taking the approach forward. This understanding and commitment is linked to both the general ‘fit’ of RBA to DCA’s organisational values and the specific importance of the PT1 Political Space programmes which are present in all country offices, forming the ‘backbone’ of the programmes and which use a rights-based contextual analysis. However, there are still areas where this basic understanding and commitment can be strengthened, as set out in the specific recommendations below.

- Gender equality, by contrast, is much less well understood, although there are good examples in the organisation and the programme of a very clear commitment to the objectives in DCA’s policy. There are good examples in the programme, such as in Cambodia and India, although these often rely on personal commitment. DCA’s organisational commitment to gender equality in the workplace is clear, although there is still a need to continue with efforts to ensure that it is taken forward. Therefore, it is generally concluded that particular efforts need to be made to build understanding and strengthen commitment to gender equality.

Key Achievements

Staff Competence and Commitment: Almost all staff members reported strong commitment to using a gender and rights-based approach in their work. The fact that this Audit has been conducted also demonstrates significant buy-in and support from senior staff.

Networks: DCA is well connected to gender and rights NGO networks and plays an active role in these. For example, DCA hosts the Danish NGO Gender forum, GenderNet, which its Gender Adviser chairs. DCA’s Gender and Rights Advisers are both active in the Association of World Council of Churches related Development Organisations in Europe (APRODEV) gender and rights groups and DCA’s Secretary General is part of the Danish Ministry of Development’s MDG2 Champion’s network on gender.

International Work: Significant efforts have been made to develop clear guidance for staff at all levels of the organisation about how the cross-cutting commitments on gender equality and the rights-based approach should be taken forward in DCA’s work. The rights-based principles of accountability and participation/voice are clearly addressed in most of DCA’s programme policy documents.

Personnel and Work Place Policies, Practices and Procedures: DCA has policies and procedures in place to ensure that staff is treated equally, without discrimination and that staff member’s individual employment rights are respected and protected. Staff felt that DCA was sensitive and respectful towards all employees and promoted equality in the workplace.
Communications and Advocacy: An effort, though not always consistent, has been made to ensure a balance of men and women are represented in publications and communications documents.

External Stakeholders and Partners: DCA has a number of policies and procedures which aim to ensure that DCA works to ensure a corruption free practice, and does not violate human rights. These contain examples of best practice, particularly the Partnership Policy and Ethical Guidelines which are based on human rights frameworks.

Challenges

Mission and Mandate: DCA's Mission and Mandate documents, including Statutes and Vision and Plan 2006-10 do not explicitly indicate the organisation’s commitment to gender equality and rights-based development.

Organisational Plans and Budgets: Vision and Plan Part II, contains some good examples of ways in which analysis of DCA activities reflect a rights-based and gender equality perspective, though this is not consistently reflected across all areas. DCA does not collect data on how budgets reflect a rights-based and gender equality perspective.

International Work: There is a lack of attention to issues of discrimination/inequality, in programme policy documents, raising questions about who participates in decision-making processes, whose entitlements and claims are being identified as key objectives to be monitored and to whom duty-bearers are being made more accountable. Overall, there is a lack of integration of international policy frameworks on gender equality and rights-based approaches. Policy documents also lack indicators of DCA's own performance on gender and rights.

Staff Competencies: Gender and rights expertise were not always reflected in priorities for staff recruitment and ensured in staff competencies at relevant levels within the organisation.

Personnel and Workplace Policies, Practices and Procedures: Currently DCA does not collect statistics on staff recruitment, advancement or retention disaggregated by sex, ethnicity or other variables, which means that the organisation is not able to monitor its diversity commitment.

Communications and Advocacy: Communications and Advocacy strategies do not outline rights and gender approaches into their key objectives. They are also absent from key success indicators.

Fundraising Strategies and Materials: Gender and rights are not systematically mainstreamed across all fundraising materials and activities. Barriers to ensuring that fundraising documents reflect gender and rights commitments include the drive to achieve fundraising targets through the 2012 strategy, which may take priority over a GRBA.

External Stakeholders and Partners: Mechanisms for ensuring partner competence on gender equality and rights based commitment are weak as are mechanisms for facilitating participation and influence of partner organisations. There are no formal mechanisms through which rights-holders can participate in and influence DCA strategies.

Recommendations

There are two broad messages in the recommendations that are made as a result of these findings:

- The need for greater consistency in building the understanding of RBA and gender equality and in ensuring a commitment across the organisation; and,

- The need for increased accountability as a means for ensuring
consistency. DCA needs to make a public statement of its accountability against its cross-cutting policy objectives and carry out transparent monitoring of its progress in taking these objectives forward.

Overall Recommendations

Overall it is recommended that DCA should develop:

i) A framework of commitments on Gender Equality and Rights and

ii) A corresponding implementation plan with clear commitments and indicators on Gender Equality and Rights for all of its departments and all programmes

This framework and plan for Gender Equality and Rights can be based on the HAP model and should become a central part of the 2011-15 Vision and Plan.

As part of the process of developing this framework DCA should:

- Commit to programme and departmental Gender Equality and Rights self-assessments to establish a baseline
- Increase accountability for Gender Equality and Rights by ensuring that responsibility for gender and rights are included in the Job Descriptions of Senior Management and Programme Officers across all departments and in country offices
- Establish virtual support networks¹ across the organisation on Gender Equality and Rights to help in sharing good practice and developing approaches to dealing with problems and obstacles
- Ensure more systematic analysis of issues of discrimination and inequality and better policy connection to formal mechanisms of the international human rights framework.

It is also recommended that as part of this process DCA should continue with programme and departmental Gender Equality and Rights self-assessments, started in Uganda and continued in HQ with this audit. These self-assessments provide an opportunity for staff to discuss and debate gender and diversity issues, something that is particularly important as DCA becomes a more international and diverse organisation through the process of decentralisation. The self-assessments should provide a clear idea of where the different departments and programmes in DCA currently are and provide an opportunity to set out commitments for the future. If it is not practical to carry these out in all offices, then a selection of regional offices could be made.

It is recommended that work to develop a framework of commitments and an implementation plan for Gender Equality and Rights should start from the bottom up, building on these self-assessments to set out a way forward. In turn, this process of setting out ways forward for individual departments and programmes will help to build understanding and ownership. Senior management in DCA should continue to play a supportive role, working to develop an overall framework of commitments and an implementation plan for regular review.

Within the programme it is recommended that Programme Officers should take on responsibility for all cross-cutting principles. The process of capacity-building of POs has already begun with training and workshops and there is need now to find innovative ways to ensure that these opportunities are consistently provided. For example, virtual support networks across the organisation (such as those in GFU) and approaches such as Communities of Practice can be used to support POs in taking forward the programme commitments. PDU’s role should be focused on ensuring that all staff in DCA understand policies and the implications for their work.

¹ See Annex 2 for best practice examples of virtual support networks and communities of practice
Methodology

DanChurchAid (DCA) contracted Social Development Direct (SDDirect) to conduct a Participatory Gender and Rights Audit (PGRA) of DCA between August and October 2009. DCA’s Programme Type Adviser (PTA) with responsibility for Gender Equality (Elsebeth Gravgaard) and PTA with responsibility for Rights (Carol Rask) were the key drivers behind the audit. In 2007, they, together with an external consultant and country level staff undertook a PGRA in Uganda as a pilot for this organisational wide audit. There had been a commitment to an organisational wide audit for a few years, but although management supported this, time had not previously been found to carry this out. DCA’s Secretary General also made a commitment to undertake such an audit as part of his role as MDG 3 Champion in a group organised by the Danish Minister for International Development. In order to establish ‘buy-in’ from across DCA, an Audit Team consisting of staff from Human Resources (HR), Communications and Advocacy Department, Humanitarian Response, Global Funding Unit (GFU) and the DCA Secretariat was formed. The Audit Team met together during the tender process for the Audit and met with SDDirect at the start and end of their visit to DCA Headquarters (HQ) in Copenhagen. They also plan to meet to discuss and implement recommendations made in this report.

SDDirect’s team for the PGRA consisted of two main consultants: Francis Watkins (Team Leader) and Alice Kerr-Wilson. DCA also requested that the team include specific rights and communications/ advocacy expertise. An additional two consultants with responsibility for these two areas were brought on board: Clare Ferguson and Gayatri Persad.

There were four main phases to the Audit.

**Phase 1: Preliminary Assessments**

The preliminary work was split into three parts:

- Teleconference with DCA Audit Team
- The development of a framework and initial review of relevant programme documents;
- The development and implementation of a short self-assessment questionnaire for selected staff

**Teleconference:** To establish a good working relationship with DCA staff and to ensure their participation from the start, a teleconference was held with the PTA for Gender Equality Advisor and PTA for Rights-based Commitment to agree scope of work, selection of documents to be reviewed and questionnaire. This teleconference was also used to establish that there was significant support from senior managers, crucial for the success of the audit.

**Document Review:** A selection of DCA documents was reviewed to assess the extent to which DCA has mainstreamed gender equality and rights-based approaches (GRBA) in its work. As the Audit covers a number of DCA’s departments and different issues, there was a large amount of possible literature to be reviewed, all of which could not be covered within a restricted timeline, so a selection had to be made. A review framework was developed to be used as a tool for assessing whether gender equality and human rights commitments have been met (See Annex 3). Alice Kerr-Wilson was responsible for reviewing documents in Danish and translations used in this report are hers, apart from some translations in the Communications and Advocacy section which have used GoogleTranslate.

As a starting point the consultants reviewed the Gender Equality and Rights-Based Commitment Policies, and the two audits reports from Kampala and the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP). Further documents reviewed involved key systems and
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processes within DanChurchAid. There was a specific focus on Personnel and Workplace policies; Information, Advocacy and Fundraising strategies; External Communication and Organisational Culture which had not previously been systematically analysed from a rights-based and gender equality perspective. Specific questions outlined in the TOR relating to the different organisational areas were addressed (See Annex 3). As Section F in the TOR had specific issues on Information and Advocacy and then on Fundraising, this was split into two sections.

Self-assessment Questionnaire: In order to examine understanding, attitudes, perceptions and behaviour of DCA staff relating to gender equality and rights, a short self-assessment questionnaire was sent out to a group of 46 selected staff members from HQ and three country offices. The questionnaire and document review framework were developed as a tool for future audits (Annex 3).

Staff members were selected in consultation with the DCA audit team and included staff from Head Office, and from three country offices: Cambodia, Kyrgyzstan and Zambia, which represented old and new offices from Africa, Asia and Central Asia. SDDirect requested that DCA selected staff with a representing a diverse mix of people by sex, age, seniority, race, ethnicity, disability. Questions were designed to capture staff perceptions of organisational culture and the extent to which DCA promotes equality and a rights-based approach within its own working environment. Analysis of questionnaire responses helped to guide the consultants in developing questions for focus group discussions and interviews.

The main products of this preliminary phase were:
- A review framework and an initial review of the extent to which DCA systems, procedures and mechanisms mainstream gender equality and rights-based development through evidence provided in documentation.
- A self-assessment questionnaire and an initial analysis of completed questionnaires on internal capacity and organisational culture, identifying issues for exploration in the visit to HQ.

Phase 2: Visit to Headquarters (HQ), Copenhagen

Two of the SDDirect team (Francis and Alice) visited DCA's Head Office (HQ) in Copenhagen for one week from the 28th September - 2nd October. The approach taken for the HQ visit was participatory, in that SDDirect met with the Audit Team at the start and end of the visit, fed back initial findings at an end of visit workshop and tried to also to discuss these during interviews/ focus groups. However the Audit Team were not involved in interviews/ focus groups with other staff members in order to allow for a confidential and objective process. Preliminary assessments from the document review and questionnaire response were shared with members of the DCA Audit Team at the start of the visit. The structure of the visit was planned to be based on a process to be used for future self-audits by DCA. The process involved:
- Initial individual work (in this case through semi-structured interviews) to identify the key issues for the Audit.
- Small group work to focus on key issues highlighted, to identify best practice and to develop ways forward.
- A final short workshop to present, bring together and agree on the final products of the Audit.

Semi-structured interviews: Seven semi-structured interviews were held with HQ staff to explore particular aspects of staff understanding and attitudes relating to their ability to mainstream a gender equality and a rights-based approach into their work.

Focus Group Discussions: Alongside the interviews, eight small group discussions were
held on key issues arising from the analysis of the completed questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The use of interviews and focus group discussions allowed for cross-checking of information and ensure that findings were representative and accurate.

**Workshop:** At the end of the visit a workshop was held with key staff members who were involved in the Audit to present initial findings on the degree to which DCA has successfully mainstreamed gender and rights-based perspectives within the organisation. Strengths, weaknesses and gaps were highlighted, along with a discussion of possible implementation tools to improve performance.

The main products of this second phase were:
- Collection and analysis of detailed data through semi-structured interviews and Focus Group Discussions with HQ staff on key issues arising from document review, questionnaire and interviews
- Workshop presenting initial findings, discussion of possible tools to improve performance and agreeing on the way forward for the final phases of the Audit.

**Phase 3: Follow-up Phone Interviews**
To follow up on issues arising from the questionnaire, document review and visit to HQ, Skype interviews were held with the International Director and Director of Secretariat, who were travelling during the HQ visit, plus three selected members of staff from the three decentralised country offices: Regional/ Country Representative (RR) and two programme/finance officers.

The main products of this third phase were:
- Completed phone/ Skype interviews with country office staff
- A set of examples of best practice for inclusion in the final report (shown in boxes in the main report and listed in Annex 2)

**Phase 4: Report writing and analysis**
Francis Watkins as team leader had overall responsibility for ensuring the production of the final report and for overseeing quality. Alice Kerr-Wilson as a Danish speaker, had particular responsibility for reviewing Danish language documents. Clare Ferguson provide specific input on the extent to which rights had been mainstreamed into DCA’s mechanisms and processes and Gayatri Persad had responsibility for DCA’s communication, media and advocacy work. All team members contributed towards the final report.

Where appropriate, efforts have been made to quantify findings, for example from questionnaire responses and assessments. The final report, which incorporates DCA feedback on a draft report, also draws out a number of examples of best practice in order to develop concrete recommendations for future work.

In summary, this report contains the following outputs:
- Findings and recommendations
- A set of agreed and piloted tools for future audits, including a review framework and self-assessment questionnaire and a process for carrying out the Audit (Annex 3).
- A number of examples of best practice to illustrate both the process and the results that can be achieved for wider circulation in the DCA (Annex 2).

**Report Structure**
The report is structured along the lines of the components (A-I) and questions outlined in the original TOR. Each section has a box with the TOR questions at the start and key recommendations at the end. The recommendations are also summarised in a final section.
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at the end of the report, which also gives an indication of prioritisation. Some sections such as D: Staff Competencies and Commitment and E: Personnel and Work Place Practices, Procedures and Practices follow the TOR questions directly, whilst others such as F: Information, Communication and Advocacy Strategies and Materials use the TOR questions more as a guide. Examples of best practice, both conducted by DCA or other sources are provided in boxes where appropriate.

Reflection on Methodology
The main limitations to the methodology included:

- There were no interviews with DCA partners, rights-holders or the public due to time constraints
- There were no interviews with service level staff in country office, due to time constraints and language barriers
- It was only possible to review a limited selection of the vast number of DCA documents (see Annex 6)
- 38 members of staff responded to the questionnaire, although there was a limited response from fundraising, communications and advocacy staff and none from local consultants.

Overall the methodology used in the audit produced an excellent response in the percentage of staff that replied to the questionnaire (81%) and the number of staff that agreed to be interviewed, particularly in terms of senior management. Looking specifically at the elements of the methodology in turn:

Document Review – This is a useful mean to check for consistency in the various documents that the organisation has produced, to update guidelines and examples after policy has been updated, and, to ensure ease of use, particularly for materials such as the Programme and Project Manual.

Self-assessment Questionnaire – The questionnaire response provide useful preparatory material both for individuals and for the audit process. A significant number of those who responded felt that the questionnaire had helped them in reflecting on their own knowledge of policy and how they put it into practice. The responses as a whole provide a useful baseline assessment of staff knowledge and understanding of the organisation's policy and an assessment of practice across the organisation.

If the questionnaire were to be used in the future some questions which were not well answered or misunderstood (highlighted in Annex 3) should be taken out and there should be more specific questions for staff from different departments. Some staff who attended had completed the questionnaire and attended the FGDs thought that they would be directly asked about the questionnaire, which was not always the case as not all attendees had been sent a questionnaire.

Focus Group Discussions – The discussions and exercises carried out were very effective ways of encouraging reflection on practice within different parts of the organisation and helped in highlighting areas where there was a need for greater focus. Such discussions are potentially a useful way to share examples of good practice and to work on areas where further work is required.

Workshop – The final workshop was a useful way in which share preliminary conclusions and test initial recommendations, with a view to obtaining further feedback. A final workshop could be used in future audits to share departmental and individual commitments across the organisation in order to emphasise their importance and to identify shared objectives and problems.
Follow-up Interviews with Country and Regional Offices – The interviews with staff from country and regional offices showed a clear enthusiasm to be involved in the process and highlighted numerous examples of good practice. In future there is a need to identify more effective ways of more directly involving a wide range of staff from these offices both in the process and in the final commitments.
Overview
On the whole, DCA’s Mission and Mandate documents do not explicitly indicate the organisation’s commitment to gender equality and rights-based development. DCA’s Statutes, along with DCA’s mission and vision statements in the Vision and Plan 2006-10 Part 1 do not directly mention rights or gender at all. An example from ActionAid is provided as an example of how rights and gender could be more strongly integrated into the organisation’s mission and mandate.

Statutes
DCA’s Statutes (2007) establish its foundations in the Christian faith: DCA shall provide assistance to church activities (Article 2), work in collaboration with other church based organisations (Article 4) and a large number of Council Members shall represent church-based organisations (Article 9). There is no specific reference at all in the Statutes to DCA’s commitment to gender equality or rights-based development, although Article 5 does mention non-discrimination: DCA shall pursue its objects on a non-discriminatory basis. The language used is more that of a welfare approach based on need, rather than of empowering rights-holders to claim their rights and holding duty-bearers to account.

Neither DCA’s Statutes nor Vision and Plan discuss how their core Christian values and a rights based approach work together, or the approach that DCA will take if tensions between the two occur. Whilst there are many examples of Christian organisations utilising a rights-based and gender equality approach e.g. Christian Aid and CAFOD, more conservative interpretations of Biblical texts have resulted in tensions between a Christian and a rights-based approach, for example in relation to gay and women’s rights. It might therefore be useful for DCA to provide a statement on how they see gender and rights fitting into their Christian values.

Vision and Plan 2006-10: Part 1
DCA’s Mission and Vision statements are shown in Box 1 opposite and reflect the Articles in the Statutes. Again, more of a welfare, rather than a rights-based or gender equality approach is taken, focusing on need. There is an indication that DCA’s work is transformative and will involve challenging the structural causes of inequality in the third Mission statement, in line with a rights-based and gender equality approach, but the link to rights and gender is not explicit.

The rest of the Vision and Plan document emphasises DCA’s Christian foundation and how it works through the concept of Diakonia meaning to serve. Diakonia, is to some extent linked to human rights as it has five objectives based on the notion that all human beings are equal, and that all human beings have certain

Box 1: DanChurchAid’s Mission and Vision Statements

Mission
It is the mission of DanChurchAid
- to assist disadvantaged and oppressed communities and to assist in church activities, usually outside Denmark;
- to carry out emergency aid and development activities in cooperation with local religious and popular organisations; and
- to inform the public about the causes of need and inequality as well as to mobilise popular and political will and power to change them.

Vision
DanChurchAid’s vision is a world at peace, free from poverty, discrimination and oppression. A world where resources are evenly distributed and where the individual’s dignity is respected.

Source: Vision and Plan 2006-10: Part 1
fundamental rights. The first of these objectives mentions rights and has a sub-objective on gender equality:

Objective 1: To become a strong advocate of poor and excluded people and support their rights and influence on their own lives
Sub-objective B: To ensure that in all our activities, we work on the basis of rights and equality between women and men;

There is also some analysis within the Vision and Plan of different types of rights including civic, political, social and economic rights and a specific mention of land rights. However, no reference is made to international human rights frameworks.

Gender is not mainstreamed within the Vision and Plan at all. Apart from in Sub-objective B there is one other mention of women, which is in relation to discrimination and inequality ...women, who are still subjected to massive and systematic discrimination in many countries, and who are deprived of basic civic, political, social and economic rights. There is no gender analysis regarding the ways in which men and women are differently affected by poverty or experience discrimination, or of the gender power structures which result in inequality. There is no indication that gender, or rights, are cross-cutting themes.

**New Mission and Vision Statements**

DCA is in the process of developing new mission and vision statements, shown in Box 2 below. These indicate DCA’s commitment to rights-based development and gender equality to a greater extent than previous statements. The first mission statement emphasises respecting the rights of all people and the third is also clear on non-discrimination, listing different ways in which discrimination might occur.

**Box 2: DanChurch Aid New Mission and Vision Statements**

**Mission statement (by-laws):**
DCA’s purpose is to strengthen the world’s poorest in their fight for a dignified life. This is based on a Christian approach with respect for **rights for all** and the equal worth of all human beings.

DCA conducts humanitarian and development work in close partnership with the church and other partners. This includes engaging with civil and political forces and influencing decision-makers in order to improve the conditions for the world’s poorest. This happens both locally, nationally and globally.

DCA does not discriminate. We work where need is greatest, without regard to religion, gender, political beliefs, race, national or ethnic origin, disability or sexual orientation.

**Proposal for new vision not yet finalised.**
DCA’s vision is a world free from hunger, poverty and oppression, where civil and political forces strive for an equal distribution and use of the world’s resources.

*Source: DCA Audit Team (translated from Danish)*
Whilst the new Mission and Vision statements make direct reference to rights, non-discrimination and gender, these statements still do not demonstrate completely that DCA is committed to a rights-based and gender equality approach. To fully demonstrate the commitment to rights and gender equality within its mission and mandate, DCA could take inspiration from other organisations where this commitment is more fully integrated into mission and mandate. Both ActionAid and Oxfam International are examples of organisations that have mainstreamed rights and gender well into their overarching strategy objectives. Oxfam International’s Strategic Plan 2007-2012 has five broad aims, all of them focusing on different rights. Gender and rights are also reflected into its four main areas of work. These are shown in Box 4. ActionAid’s rights based approach comes across clearly in its vision and goal statements shown in Box 4, taken from its 2005-10 Strategy. The Vision statement has a rights focus as do all the goal statements, including one specifically focusing on women and girls.

**Box 4 Best Practice: Integrating Rights into Vision and Goals – ActionAid International Strategy 2005-10**

**OUR VISION**
—a world without poverty and injustice in which every person enjoys their right to a life of dignity

**OUR MISSION**
—to work with poor and excluded people to eradicate poverty and injustice

**OUR GOALS**
—poor and excluded people and communities will exercise power to secure their rights
—women and girls will gain power to secure their rights
—citizens and civil society across the world will fight for rights and justice
—states and their institutions will be accountable and democratic and will promote, protect and fulfil human rights for all.

*Source: Rights to End Poverty: ActionAid International Strategy 2005-10*

**Recommendations**

- In developing new mission and purpose statements and the next Vision and Plan, DCA could be more explicit about its commitments to gender and rights, drawing inspiration from other NGOs such as ActionAid.
- DCA could also provide a statement on how it sees rights and gender fit with its Christian values.

---

B: Organisational Plans and Budgets

- To what extent does DCA’s Vision and Plan part II, including budget, reflect a rights-based and gender equality perspective?
- Do selected activities from the Vision and Plan document reflect this priority?

Overview

There is a lack of systematic analysis in Vision and Plan Part I regarding gender and rights. Vision and Plan Part II, which reports annually on the Vision and Plan, contains some good examples of ways in which analysis of DCA activities reflect a rights-based and gender equality perspective, though this is not consistently reflected across all areas. DCA does not currently collect data on how budgets reflect a rights-based and gender equality perspective.

Vision and Plan 2006-10, Part I

As mentioned in Section A, DCA's Vision and Plan 2006-2010 Part I does not make a very strong or explicit case for either gender equality or a rights-based approach to development. It does not have a clear statement of what human rights mean to DCA or how it intends to address human rights systematically in their work.

The lack of systematic analysis of these issues in the Vision and Plan means that although policy documents do contain commitments to mainstreaming, these commitments are not reflected in DCA’s overall objectives:

- Objective 1 is about becoming a strong advocate of poor and excluded people but does not include an explicit commitment to strengthening people’s participation in decision making including participation in DCA's own decision making processes.
- Objective 3 is about effective partnerships but does not include an explicit objective of increasing accountability to partners and beneficiaries.

In contrast, the Association of World Council of Churches related Development Organisations in Europe (APRODEV)'s Joint Position Paper on Rights-based development from a faith-based perspective provides a much clearer commitment to rights-based approaches and non-discrimination as well as including a useful discussion of the links between Christian principles and the human rights framework. DCA is a member of APRODEV and its PTA for Gender and Rights play active roles within it and contributed to this paper.

Budgets

There is currently no data collected by DCA on how the budget reflects a rights-based and gender equality perspective. The DCA Audit Team reported that DCA has found it difficult to ensure that budgets reflect their work on rights and gender. They have however, submitted proposals for the new ERP financial system to help facilitate this. Programme officers have to complete a registration of all projects, which includes rating them against gender, rights and environmental markers, before funding is released. While these markers are used to report externally, to DANIDA and the EU, they are not used internally to report against DCA’s own policy commitments.

For the first time in 2008 a Global Annual Programme Report was produced, looking at progress against the Vision and Plan objectives. The reporting was in terms of general progress and did not look at commitments by budget. The DCA Audit Team said that the report did ask for budget figures, but DCA’s system at the time could not facilitate this. In addition, this report was an internal document rather than being part of DCA’s external reporting. The report does provide examples of specific activities and progress reflecting rights-based and gender equality principles.
Vision and Plan Report 2008
DCA’s Vision and Plan Part II refers to its annual reports against Vision and Plan I. A review of Vision and Plan Reporting 2008 reveals that whilst there are examples of individual countries reporting on gender and rights, this is inconsistent across the board. Cases where a gender and/or rights analysis has been used to demonstrate key achievement or challenges is shown in Box 5.

Budgets in the Vision and Plan 2008 are broken down by geographical region and type of work e.g. development, information and mine clearance, but from this it is not possible to tell how much money was spent on rights or gender activities.

Box 5: Best Practice examples of integrating gender and rights analysis into Vision and Plan Reporting

- In spite of increased awareness about gender and rights issues amongst partners and beneficiaries, awareness does not seem to be translating into change in partners’ work.
- Women have been targeted in many programmes but the involvement and sensitisation of men is neglected and targeting of more powerful community groups inadequate.
- PT1 Political Space Programmes report increased access of women to resources and services, increased participation of women in decision-making and a reduction of various kinds of gender-based violence. However, challenges are still reported in terms of women’s control of resources. Involvement of men in gender equality work, although progressing in some programmes, remains unexplored or weak in others.
- Challenges exist with respect to incorporating rights based and gender sensitive programming into PT3 Right to Food Programmes, not to mention the newly formulated climate guidelines which require adjustments in current practice.
- In response to the increasing feminisation of the epidemic DCA produced a position paper on HIV and AIDS, Human Rights and Gender Inequalities which was discussed with and co-signed by six other APRODEV agencies.
- An evaluation of the DCA Tsunami programme in India documented remarkable and largely positive change in economic, social and political status of women through joint ownership of houses and women’s involvement in disaster preparedness interventions. A case study on rights based practice in the Guatemalan movement Agrarian Platform was carried out and forms part of the documentation of partners working with a right based approach.

Source: Vision and Plan Report 2008

Recommendations

- Future revisions of DCA's Vision and Plan need to make a clear statement of what human rights mean to the organisation and how they intend to address human rights systematically in their work.
- DCA needs to consider how the indicators and benchmarks for its broad policy objectives can best be measured, including assessments of budget commitments.
- Establish a mechanism through which DCA's work on gender and rights can be reflected in budget reporting, possibly through the new ERP financial system.
C: International Work

- To what extent does DCA have adequate strategies, procedures, tools and learning mechanisms in place to ensure that DCA’s international work within development, humanitarian assistance and humanitarian mine assistance is conducted from a rights-based development and gender equality perspective?

Overview
DCA’s work is divided into three main areas: development (covering political space, HIV and AIDS and food security), humanitarian relief and humanitarian mine action. All of these areas are covered by DCA’s Vision and Plan, programmatic policies and cross-cutting policies, including gender equality and the rights-based commitment. Significant efforts have been made to develop clear guidance for staff at all levels of the organisation about how the cross-cutting commitments on gender equality and the rights-based approach should be taken forward in DCA’s work. A variety of programme and project documents, guidelines and processes are available through the Programme and Project Manual (PPM) on the DCA intranet. This section looks at these strategies, procedures, tools and learning mechanisms to assess how effective they are in ensuring that DCA’s international work is conducted from a rights-based development and gender equality perspective.

DCA’s Overarching Policies
DCA’s work is set within a broader framework of their international commitments and alliances:
- Action by Churches Together (ACT) International has set out its own clear gender policy and refers to international resources such as the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Gender Handbook.
- ACT International members, such as APRODEV (Association of World Council of Churches related Development Organisations in Europe), have worked together to produce joint position papers, such as Rights-based Development from a Faith-based Perspective.
- DCA was one of the first organisations to go through the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) audit process. The framework developed in response to the audit sets out a number of specific commitments with regard to DCA’s own programme policies and international standards, which cover both gender and rights-based commitments.

Rights and Gender Programme Policies
DCA sets out its own commitments on gender equality and rights-based approaches in two cross-cutting programme policy documents, Gender and Equality and Rights-based Commitment. Like DCA’s other programme policy documents these contain two statements which set out the overall objectives, more detailed and specific objectives and explore a number of areas of DCA focus. The focus areas in particular seek to provide concrete examples of how the objectives can be taken forward. Both policy statements are concluded with similar statements that:

The present policy represents DCA’s current organisational understanding of the issue and outlines corresponding strategic decisions made by DCA. Various tools and guidelines to help operationalise the policy already exist and/or will be developed in response to demands expressed by staff and partners. Further information can be found in the DCA Intranet (Programme & Project Manual) or by contacting the Programme Development Unit.

The one main area of difference worth noting is that in practice in country programmes, clear links have been developed between the rights-based commitment and the development and
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implementation of the programmes. As will be explored below, the Guidelines for Developing Political Space Programmes provide a useful foundation and guide, particularly as the guidelines use a specifically rights-based approach and rights language. This emphasis on the importance of a rights-based approach is supported by the fact that all DCA programmes have PT1: Political Space programmes. The understanding of the importance given to the rights-based approach in DCA’s work in the field is reflected in the fact that some staff in interviews described it as the backbone of the programme.

In contrast, there are some ambiguities about the Gender Equality policy, described as a programme policy in the publication document and seen by some as referring only to the programmes and not to the organisation as a whole. This latter area in particular was one where there were mixed messages from those who were interviewed. Whatever the nature of the policy document, it seems that whilst there are examples of work on gender equality in the programmes (and there are many good examples), these are often as a result of individual commitment and there are other examples in the programmes where gender has not been mainstreamed. It is currently planned that the PDU will develop specific context analysis guidelines for both the rights-based approach and gender equality. These guidelines should build on the current Guidelines for Developing Political Space Programmes, setting out the formal mechanisms of the international human rights framework that should be referred to and providing clear guidance and definitions of the underlying principles and guidance.

Policy Documents
DCA’s overall commitment to mainstreaming rights-based approaches and gender equality is reflected in the fact that all policy documents refer to the key underlying principles of participation/voice, accountability and equality/non-discrimination. However, there is more emphasis on the first two of these principles. While all of the policy documents reviewed refer to the principle of non-discrimination and identified the most discriminated against as the primary target group, policy documents do not, in general, provide a strong explanation of this issue or clear guidance on how to address it. To give two specific examples:

- The DCA Programme Policy on Rights-Based Commitment uses, but does not unpack the phrase the most discriminated against. Who are the most discriminated against? How would you identify them?
- The Programme Policy on Gender and Equality does not provide a robust analysis of how different social identities cut across and, in some cases, reinforce gender discrimination.

As indicated above, the rights-based principles of accountability and participation/voice are clearly addressed in most of DCA’s documents. However, the lack of attention to issues of discrimination/inequality, weakens this analysis and raises questions about who participates in decision-making processes, whose entitlements and claims are being identified as key objectives to be monitored and to whom are duty-bearers being made more accountable? One particular example of this is:

- The Programme Policy on Political Space, which provides a strong account of informal channels for justice and voice. However, there is a lack of comprehensive attention to why the people who are most marginalized, such as women and people with disabilities, may not recognize their lack of rights or have a shared group identity and so may not consider using these channels in the first place.

Human Rights Frameworks
Overall, there is a lack of integration of policy frameworks on gender equality and rights-based approaches. For example, the gender equality policy is weak on issues of

---

4 DCA has 5 programme types: PT1: Political Space, PT2: Right to Food, PT3: HIV/AIDS, PT4: Relief and Disaster Preparedness, PT5: Humanitarian Mine Action
participation and accountability. Women are defined as vulnerable rather than marginalized and it tends towards an emphasis on basic needs rather than rights. Gender equality should be understood in terms of the human rights framework just as the principles of gender equality and non-discrimination are an integral part of the human rights framework.

Overall, there are few references in DCA's policy documents to the formal mechanisms of the international human rights framework. For example, there is no mention of CEDAW in the gender equality document. External documents used by DCA provide examples of helpful commitments and guidance, see Box 6.

The DCA could incorporate these examples into its own policy documents. For example, DCA's Gender Equality policy could start with a statement that women's human rights are defined in the Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination and the Beijing Platform for Action (CEDAW) and that these internationally agreed commitments form the basis of DCA's own approach to gender equality. Under focus areas; actions for increased accountability (section 3.2.2) the document could include a commitment to support civil society engagement in international human rights reporting, such as the preparation of shadow reports for the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), and encouraging effective engagement of organisations representing women with national human rights institutions and processes, such as national human rights commissions, ombudspersons and relevant parliamentary committees. A further example could be a commitment in the HIV and AIDS policy, in the mainstreaming section (3.2.4) to ensuring that all staff members are aware of the human rights that are particularly relevant to HIV/AIDS responses, such as rights to sexual and reproductive health, and are familiar with the International Guidelines on HIV/AIDS and human rights.

Information
A key element missing from discussions about accountability and participation is any systematic analysis of the role and importance of information - who has access to what information? The DCA accountability framework does include a binding commitment on providing information to beneficiaries. It would be useful, however, to have a clearer analysis of information flows in DCA and its partner organizations and analysis of, and commitment to, information and transparency issues in all policy documents.

Indicators
In general, policy documents are lacking indicators of DCA's own performance. For example, the gender equality policy and partnership policy set out visions but no overall indicators or benchmarks so that DCA can be held accountable to its broad policy objectives. While the DCA accountability framework includes a commitment to participation and means for verifying action against this commitment, it does not include a specific commitment on non-discrimination.

Box 6: Best Practice on Integrating Human Rights Frameworks into Policies

The ACT international gender policy principles includes a commitment to ensuring that staff shall be assisted to acquire a minimum knowledge of international humanitarian law and human rights legislation.

The APRODEV joint position paper on rights-based development from a faith-based perspective highlights the importance of the use of international human rights processes, such as UN Treaty Monitoring Bodies and Special Rapporteurs.

Source: ACT International Gender Policy and APRODEV Joint Position Paper on Rights- Based Development from a Faith-Based Perspective
Procedures and Tools

As is set out in the cross-cutting policies, considerable efforts have been made to ensure that both tools and guidelines have been put in place to support staff in taking forward the gender and rights commitments and mechanisms and procedures are in place to ensure that these tools and guidelines are used and followed. All of these can be found in the Programme and Project Manual (PPM), which is available to all DCA staff through the intranet. The manual provides both a guide to the procedures that should be followed in developing and implementing programmes and projects and access to a variety of guidelines, checklists and formats for staff to use. The manual itself and a comprehensive selection of the documents available were analysed to give a sense of how effective they are in supporting the implementation of gender equality and rights-based commitments.

Two main points can be made with regard to these procedures and tools:

i) Consistency

Whilst these procedures and tools are very thorough and provide good guidance and parameters for DCA staff, there is a need to ensure consistency in them, making sure that gender equality and rights are consistently referred to and that the different tools and processes are consistent with each other. In particular, there is a need to revise some of the tools and guidelines developed before the HAP Framework to ensure that they are consistent with the commitments made. To give some specific and notable examples:

- The documents in the programme planning section of the PPM make scant reference to gender equality in particular (such as the guidance on Programme Planning Workshops and the PTA Desk Appraisal), while these provide opportunities to hammer home the point of the need to consistently address gender.
- The Annual Programme Report Format, which includes a clear section on cross-cutting aspects of the programme, while Programme Document Guidelines do not reflect this. The Partner Profile for DCA Partners focuses on both gender equality and RBA, including an assessment of the employment profile of the partner, while again this is not referred to in the Programme Document Guidelines.

Similarly, in the various guidelines on programme and project finalisation there is scope to draw together the various references to RBA and gender equality (such as the Standard TOR for Programme Evaluation and in the Policy and Guidelines) to ensure consistency – for example, stating that cross-cutting issues need to be covered in the assessment as well as the methodology, referring to the standard TOR in the evaluation guidelines, explicitly stating that the consultants need to have gender and rights skills, including generic questions on rights and gender in the Evaluation Matrix, reiterating the point that cross-cutting issues should be covered in the Standard Report Format under findings and conclusions and in the Quality Assurance Checklist.

ii) Devolving and Simplifying

The procedures and tools in the PPM can provide the basis for further devolution of responsibility to the regional and country offices. There is a need, however, to both simplify what is available to make it more accessible and useful and to ensure that these procedures and tools are used. At present, it is somewhat unclear to the outsider which procedures and tools are mandatory and which are there for support purposes. A good example of how such tools can be simplified is the Quality Assurance of Humanitarian Projects in DCA, which ‘walks’ staff through the process and provides guidance on areas that need to be signed off – at the same time, this document was somewhat difficult to find, given the range of documents on the PPM. If more responsibility for following procedures and using tools is devolved to the regional and country offices then PDU can concentrate their efforts less on acting as gatekeepers, through checking and providing comments on documents, and more on ensuring both their usefulness (working closely with programme staff to ensure that the PPM is self-explanatory and that guidance is available where required) and more selectively
focusing on their use (providing training and following up with mentoring support to make sure that mandatory procedures and tools are followed and used).

The procedures and tools available through the PPM could be further supported by more access to examples of good practice and the provision of mechanisms for sharing concrete learning across the programme. This is already underway in PDU with the focus on knowledge sharing and evaluation and the support given through training and workshops. However, the challenge for DCA is in How to continue to support these processes as the organisation continues to decentralise. The PPM currently appears very centrally driven while there is scope to open up sections of the intranet to encourage greater sharing of practice and problems and to develop tools and approaches to encourage greater sharing of experience between widely scattered staff.

**Humanitarian Assistance and Humanitarian Mine Action**

The two policy documents on Humanitarian Assistance and Humanitarian Mine Action both stand out in clearly setting DCA’s own policy within a wider framework of international standards, guidelines and codes of conduct, which in turn relate directly to international human rights conventions and laws. As is set out in the two policy documents, these standards, guidelines and codes of conduct provide a rights-based and normative framework for all of DCA’s work. The policies clearly outline how these frameworks contribute and complement DCA’s organisational objectives and provide overarching guidance as to how they should be applied in the programmatic work. In addition both policies refer in some detail to how programmes should address the key underlying principles of participation/voice, accountability and equality/non-discrimination.

The Humanitarian Assistance policy makes specific reference to DCA having signed up to the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP), and, as is stated in the policy, thereby to the accountability and transparency principle of making humanitarian action accountable to beneficiaries. Perhaps more importantly, DCA was one of the first organisations to go through HAP the audit process. The audit for DCA HQ and for the office in Malawi took place in 2007 and 2008 and resulted in an audit report in May 2008, which found the organisation compliant with qualifying norms. In response to the corrective actions set out in the baseline report DCA committed itself to a Humanitarian Accountability Framework, which was accepted in the audit. The framework sets out a number of specific commitments with regard to DCA’s own programme policies and international standards, such as the SPHERE Standards, which cover both gender and rights-based commitments. DCA’s Humanitarian Accountability Framework and Statement both explicitly cover the work in Humanitarian Assistance and Humanitarian Mine Action. In particular it a commitment is made in the statement that:

- DCA works to monitor, evaluate and learn from its successes and mistakes through a close dialogue and collaboration with its partners and local populations when assessing, designing, monitoring, implementing and evaluating programs and projects. DCA is committed to Humanitarian Accountability Partnership and the accountability principles making humanitarian action accountable to beneficiaries and in its policy work, management systems and implementation of humanitarian activities in the field will strive to involve, respect and react to the valuable input from local partners and beneficiaries with the end goal of improving the DCA humanitarian response to disaster-impacted communities.

DCA’s Humanitarian Framework sets out the quality and accountability commitments that arise from the audit, the baseline analysis focused on what DCA staff and partners know and what needs to be improved, and an implementation plan, including clear indicators for assessing progress and actions with responsibilities. The framework covers key areas, such as DCA’s policies on the rights-based commitment and gender equality, and makes clear and binding commitments to, for example, ensuring an inclusive process of Humanitarian
Assistance Policy development and dissemination worldwide, and objectives to ensure that the policy and toolbox is known and actively in use by staff to support interaction with partners and that projects are in line with policies. As such the Humanitarian Accountability Statement and Framework offer a clear model for an approach to ensuring that the rights-based commitment and gender equality policies are both understood and effectively implemented. Two aspects of this model are worth particular consideration:

- A public reconfirmation of DCA’s commitment to these important key principles and a public statement that the organisation can be held accountable to; and,
- A clear commitment within the organisation to reviewing and ensuring that systems are understood, utilised and are effective in influencing the programme.

**Recommendations**

- PPM documents should be revised to ensure that they consistently refer to DCA’s commitments on rights-based approaches and gender equality.
- PDU should focus their efforts on simplifying the tools and guidance that are available to make them more accessible and useful and on ensuring that these procedures and tools are used.
D: Staff Competencies and Commitment

- To what extent is competence on rights-based development and gender equality taken into consideration and given priority in staff recruitment?
- Is competence and commitment on rights-based development and gender equality ensured within the organisation at the relevant level in keeping with the functions of different staff?

Overview

Although almost all staff members reported strong commitment to using a gender and rights-based approach to their work, this was not always reflected in priorities for staff recruitment and ensured in staff competencies at relevant levels within the organisation.

A sample of DCA Job Advertisements and Descriptions were reviewed to assess the extent to which gender and rights competencies were required as part of the role (for details see Bibliography Annex 6). Somewhat surprisingly, it was found that gender and rights competencies were not required in Job Advertisements and responsibilities for gender or rights were rarely included in Job Descriptions. Whilst many staff did think that all staff had responsibility for addressing gender equality and rights within their work, particular expertise for mainstreaming gender and rights was seen to rest with the PDU.

None of the three Job Advertisements reviewed from 2009 (NGO Forum Coordinator, RR for Sudan, Web Administrator) asked for gender and rights competencies. During interviews with country offices, staff involved in recruitment said that when recruiting programme officers they did ask candidates either in a written exercise or during the interview for examples of previous experience on working on gender or rights. In the Job Descriptions (JDs) for Senior Management (Development, Humanitarian Response, International and Secretariat Directors) there was no reference to rights and only the JD for the Development Director included responsible for….gender, though it was unclear what this responsibility would cover. At the middle management level, the two JDs reviewed (Head of Fundraising and Networks and Head of Popular and Church Networks) had nothing at all on gender and rights and at an administrative level, neither did the JD for International Administrator. The PT1 programme officer JD reviewed contained only indirect reference to rights or gender in that the officer was required to ensure mainstreaming and consistency of cross cutting issues whenever relevant. Only the two Regional Representatives’ (RR) Job Descriptions reviewed (Cambodia and the Great Lakes) contained any specific reference to their work being based on a gender and rights-based approach.

In the Questionnaire responses around a third of respondents reported that they would not be able to communicate DCA’s commitment on GE and RBA to partners. Whilst other staff members said that they would be able to communicate this commitment, several, including some from senior management, said that their knowledge could be improved. Though many staff commented that responsibility for mainstreaming gender and rights lay with all staff, specific rights and gender expertise was generally thought to be based in PDU. As only 50% of one PTA’s time is focused on gender equality and only 50% of another PTA’s time is spent on rights-based work and this is unlikely to be expanded (interview International Director), this is a very limited amount of expertise to be reliant on within the organisation. Whilst programme officers from the country offices tended to have received some form of training on gender and rights, mainly through their induction course in Copenhagen, other staff had not received formal training on gender and rights, had learnt about gender and rights ‘on the job’ and felt that it would have been useful to have had some formalised training. Some staff also mentioned that the training that they had received was not always...
completely relevant to the country context. With the PTAs responsible for gender and rights having such limited time available, it would be worth establishing a database of gender and rights globally who could be used to provide context specific staff training.

In terms of training, the Overview of Local Competence Development Plans 2008-9 and 2009-10 showed training planned for gender equality and/or rights in Central America, Central Asia, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Malawi, Russia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia. In general this training was for programme officers and may include RRs. There also appeared to be more training planned on the rights based approach than on gender.

**Recommendations**

- Specific responsibility for gender and rights to be included in senior staff job descriptions, as well as job descriptions for POs and other relevant staff.
- Establish database of gender and rights experts globally who could be used to provide context specific staff training.
E: Personnel and Work Place Policies, Procedures and Practices

1. To what degree is the principle of non-discrimination respected in employment and recruitment procedures, advancement and access to training, remuneration and benefits (based on objective criteria)?

2. To what extent are work conditions just and favourable for attracting a diverse workforce (working hours, overtime, vacation etc)?

3. To what extent is the freedom of association and right to collective bargaining respected for all employees?

4. To what extent does the organisation protect its employees from physical, verbal, sexual or psychological harassment, abuse or threats in the workplace?

5. To what extent does the organisation ensure access to relevant information for all staff?

6. To what extent is there transparency in the organisation's decision-making, including use of financial resources?

7. To what extent does the organisation ensure adequate staff participation in decision-making? Who is excluded? Is this related to functions, objective criteria or other factors?

8. Does the organisation have mechanisms for resolving grievances for all staff members in a non-discriminatory way?

9. Does the organisation's staff find that there are barriers to equal opportunities (gender, ethnicity etc) within the organisation across all levels of responsibilities?

Overview

Since 2008, DCA has worked to ensure it has policies and procedures in place to ensure that staff is treated equally, without discrimination and that staff member’s individual employment rights are respected and protected. Such policies and procedures include:

- HQ Staff Manual and Manual Guidelines for Regional Offices (2008) which provide minimum standards on staff employment rights
- Diversity and Recruitment Policies (2008) which outline a vision for DCA as a diverse, non-discriminatory organisation in the way it treats its staff
- Well-Being Action Plan (Trivselsmål og -handlingsplan 2008-2010), which aims for more transparency and better time management, as well as allocates time for dialogue with leadership, training and improved communication
- Staff Satisfaction Survey (Trivselsundersøgelsen 2008) carried out every two years.

Almost all of the 38 DCA staff who responded to the Audit questionnaire thought that in general, DCA was sensitive and respectful towards all employees. The majority also thought that DCA promotes equality in the workplace, though a few respondents thought that whilst this was generally true, it could be improved or that there might be ‘subconscious’ discrimination.

Whilst DCA has some solid policies and procedures in place, there is room for improvement, particularly in terms of data collection. Currently DCA does not collect statistics on staff recruitment, advancement or retention disaggregated by sex, ethnicity or other variables. It
has therefore been difficult to measure the extent to which DCA has been able to achieve the vision of equality and non-discrimination outlined in the Staff Manual and other HR policies.

**Staff Manual**

The Staff Manual is DCA’s key document with regard to staff employment rights and merits discussion here, before addressing the specific nine questions related to personnel. For HQ staff and those in regional offices who have been employed by HQ, standard staffing policies are available on the DCA intranet. For local staff in regional offices, there is a country level Staff Manual, based on specific Guidelines (2008) and adapted to local legislation and conditions.

HQ staffing policies and the Guidelines for the Regional Offices are both comprehensive and generous. The Guidelines are clearly rooted in respect for individual integrity and equality and inform staff of their rights, responsibilities and obligations. They provide a minimum standard for local employees on long-term contracts and cover basic issues from recruitment, remuneration, sickness and termination of contract, plus policies which demonstrate DCA’s commitment to staff well-being, including medical insurance, parental leave and staff competence development.

The minimum standards provided in the Guidelines are an excellent basis upon which to develop country level manuals. In countries where labour rights are weak or non-existent, DCA has been able to provide staff with rights that would otherwise not have been available and this is clearly reflected in the staff manual. All staff members interviewed were aware of the Staff Manual and used it as a tool to clarify and claim their employment rights.

However, despite the strength of the Guidelines, several country level programme officers interviewed felt unhappy that the Manual was adapted to the local context and differed from one country to another. They were particularly concerned about differences in pay for the same job and different working hours in different offices. They was also concerned that responsibility for adapting the Manual fell to the RR and did not always feel that they participated in the way that it was developed. They felt that DCA was one organisation which should have the same employment standards in all offices. They thought that these differences led to a division of ‘us’ (local staff) and ‘them’ (HQ staff), with HQ staff enjoying greater benefits, protection and promotion opportunities than local employees.

As there are reasons why these differences exist (eg.varying budgets and cost of living variances), it does not appear to be evident to staff and creates feelings of discontent. HR should respond to these concerns and perhaps consider including more transparent explanations for this in the next version of the Guidelines.

The Manual also does not refer specifically to advancement opportunities for local staff. Given the concerns of the programme officers interviewed regarding advancement opportunities, it would be worth including a section illustrating potential advancement opportunities for local staff and where advancement was not possible what other opportunities might be given.
i) Recruitment

DCA’s Recruitment Policy (2007) is committed to respecting the rights of all and recruiting a diverse staff. However, the lack of available disaggregated data on staff means that it is difficult to know the extent to which this policy commitment is being achieved. There appear to be particular barriers to the recruitment of male staff in some departments and the relatively small number of women in senior management is a concern for some. DCA’s policy on PLHWA is given as an example of best practice.

Recruitment Policy

DCA’s Recruitment Policy covers all DCA staff apart from local country staff, the General Secretary and temporary staff, and states explicitly that it aims to recruit a diverse staff representing the society in which it works and reflecting DCA’s value base, founded on a vision of a world free from discrimination and repression…. where each person’s value and rights are respected. The Policy states that job adverts should be placed on standard websites (eg DCA’s intranet, DCA website) to attract a diverse workforce, can also be placed on other websites such as those for women and ethnic minority Danes, though this is not mandatory. The Recruitment Policy also states that an equal opportunities statement be used in all Job Advertisements, All interested candidates irrespective of age, gender, race, religion or ethnic affiliation are encouraged to apply for the vacancy. This appears to be occurring in practice as all three HO Job Advertisements reviewed (NGO Forum Coordinator, RR for Sudan, Web Administrator) contained this statement.

The Recruitment Policy state that DCA’s Human Resources Department will produce annual statistics, disaggregated by sex and age. However, despite this commitment and a similar commitment outlined in DCA’s Diversity Policy (discussed below), disaggregated data on staff is currently not collected, as was confirmed in our interviews with Head of HR and Director of Secretariat.

Recruitment of Men

During the visit to HQ, the team noticed that some units contained many more women than men, including Media, HR and Programme Finance Unit. In general, there appear to be more women working in DCA, at least in HQ, reflected in the number of men and women in DCA’s largest union, the Academic’s Union, which has 53 Women to 34 Men (Table on Bonus Negotiations, Annex 7). Some staff interviewed said that they had found it hard to recruit qualified men (Focus Group Discussion with Media/ Advocacy staff). One reason given was that men were attracted to better paid jobs. The Focus Group with Media/ Advocacy and Popular and Church Relations mentioned that some departments such as GFU had been better at recruiting male staff as the environment was ‘more competitive’ which men found more appealing. This group also said that it was a ‘special type of man’ that worked in DCA. Outside of HQ, the Kyrgyzstan office also said they had found it difficult to recruit men and only had one male member of staff, largely due to the fact that the NGO/ social sector in Kyrgyzstan was predominantly female dominated and that the salaries offered did not, on the whole, attract men.

Staff Policy on HIV/AIDS

DCA has a particularly strong staff policy on HIV/AIDS which takes a rights-based and gendered approach. To highlight DCA’s commitment to attracting a diverse workforce and being non-discriminatory it should consider developing staff policies for other groups who face discrimination, for example a Staff Policy on Disability.
ii) Advancement
In terms of advancement, two key issues arose during interviews with DCA staff. The first relates to the number of women in senior management and the second to the lack of promotional opportunities for Programme Officers in country offices.

As of October 2009, the ratio of female to male senior managers is 2:5. All of the senior managers and HR stated that there were no barriers to women becoming senior managers. They pointed out that previously there had been more women in senior management and that there were a lot of women at the middle management level. However, the current ratio did appear to concern some staff, particularly women at lower levels of the organisation, who felt that it sent out the message that DCA was not completely serious about its gender commitments. As mentioned in the previous section, there are a larger number of women in the organisation and some staff felt that senior management should reflect this. The DCA Audit Team noted that there have been considerably more men than women who have applied for senior management positions and whilst an equal number of men and women were called for interview, male applicants were found to be better qualified.

There appears to be a lack of upward mobility for local staff, particularly Programme Officers. Several Programme Officers interviewed in Cambodia and Zambia said that there were no promotion opportunities available for them. One possible role could be the Regional Representative (RR) position, yet those interviewed felt that it was not worth applying as this role was ‘only for Danes’, and would probably be given to a Dane already working for DCA. However, a quick scan of current RR nationalities reveals that actually 6 out of 11 DCA offices are currently headed by non-Danes, many of whom are externally recruited and not all of whom are white. According to the Audit Review Team these offices include:
- Ethiopia headed by a locally recruited RR
- Kyrgyzstan headed by a Russian former PO
- Tanzania headed by an Irish RR
- Sudan headed by a South African RR
- Uganda headed by a French RR
- Honduras headed by a Honduran RR

Box 7 Best Practice on Non-Discrimination: Staff Policy on HIV/AIDS

DCA’s Staff Policy on HIV/AIDS takes both a rights-based and gendered approach. The policy makes clear that DCA will not accept discrimination...based on either real or perceived HIV status...either of an employee or of an employee’s family, and that any form of discrimination associated with HIV/AIDS represents a violation of human rights. It also specifically states that actual or perceived HIV status will not be a factor for refusing employment, terminating employment or limiting promotion or training possibilities for the affected person, unless ill health dictates otherwise.

The Policy recognises the gender dimensions of HIV/AIDS, including that women are more likely to become infected and are more often affected by the HIV/AIDS epidemic due to biological, socio-cultural and economic reasons DCA does not require that PLWHA disclose their status.

However, whilst disclosure of HIV status is not a requirement, DCA does encourage HIV positive staff to disclose their status to their Manager to receive maximum benefit from the present policy and its provisions. Despite the existence of this Policy, one interviewee said that in their country office PLWHA felt obliged to reveal their status in order to receive full benefits from DCA’s medical scheme.

Therefore, whilst the concerns of the Programme Officers’ interviewed regarding lack of opportunities for advancement may be well founded, their assertion that RRs are only Danish does not reflect current status.

iii) Remuneration and Bonuses
DCA staff salaries are based upon salary scales annexed to the Staff Manual. This makes them clear and transparent, although, the level at which staff begin working with DCA depends on a negotiation process when they start the job, which is less transparent. In particular, local staff in country offices reported a lack of transparency around salaries.

DCA has a bonus scheme, through which staff can apply for bonuses. Bonuses are not automatically awarded, staff have to apply for them. According to the Director of Secretariat, between 2005-2008 a total of 33 men and 61 women, 35% men and 65% women received a bonus. The larger number of women, possibly reflecting the larger number of women within the organisation.

A table on the outcome of bonus negotiations for staff belonging to the Academics Union (AC)\(^5\) in 2008-9 is shown in Annex 7. The table shows that whilst there is a smaller percentage of men than women in the Union, 40%: 60%, a larger percentage of these men applied for bonuses 53%: 44%. Whilst not all of those who applied received a bonus, the fact that a larger percentage of men applied resulted in the fact that 26% of men received a bonus, compared with 21% of the total number of women in the Union. Therefore whilst there is no direct discrimination in regard to bonuses, the fact that less women apply for bonuses, meant that in this sample, a larger percentage of men ended up receiving them. What this example indicates is that whilst all staff members can apply for a bonus, there may be invisible barriers which mean that certain groups are less likely to apply for them.

iv) Affirmative Action
Affirmative Action refers to a policy or programme that seeks to redress past discrimination through active measures to ensure equal opportunity. This may involve reserving jobs for specific groups of people who have been discriminated against or under-represented in the past or creating specific training schemes for them so that they are better qualified to apply for jobs. DCA does not currently have a formal affirmative action scheme. Two examples of organisations that do are given below.

---

\(^5\) Approximately 65% of DCA staff is employed under the Academics’ Agreement, 30% under the Christian Agreement and 5% under the Journalists’ Agreement (DCA Complaints Mechanism).
SCOPE’s Reserved Post Policy for Disabled Applicants
The UK based disability charity SCOPE uses a Reserved Post Policy to reserve roles for disabled applicants. Details of this are provided in Box 8.

Box 8: SCOPE’s reserved post policy for disabled applicants

According to SCOPE’s Director of Policy and Campaigns, Ruth Scott, UK legislation allows SCOPE to do this as disability discrimination legislation is asymmetric meaning that they can’t discriminate against a non-disabled person on grounds of disability so affirmative action and positive discrimination for disabled people is lawful. This policy has significantly increased the numbers of disabled staff they employ, from around 4% about 4 years ago to 23% in 2009. As only about 4% of disabled people are wheelchair users, means that it is still possible to employ plenty of disabled people even if an organisation does not have good access.

According to Ruth, a lot of disability employment issues come down to confidence, if they are confident about asking the right questions about how someone might need support than the disabled person is more confident that disclosing their needs will result in support rather than discrimination. This in turn leads to more disabled people providing clear guidance on how best to support them and getting better support which makes them better able to do their job which is good for both parties. SCOPE have also found that the more disabled people you employ the more people are willing to disclose hidden impairments like mental health so as the culture becomes more confident about employing disabled people employers tend to find that they’ve already been employing disabled people, they just didn’t know it.

Source: Ruth Scott, SCOPE’s Director of Policy and Campaigns

DFID’s Diversity Strategy
The UK Department of International Development has a specific Strategy for Delivering Diversity and Equality, the key elements of which are shown in Box 9 below.

Box 9: Best Practice on Diversity: UK Department of International Development’s (DFID’s) Diversity Strategy 2008-2011

DFID’s Diversity Strategy is based around four key themes:

- **Behaviour and Culture Change**
- **Leadership and Accountability** with strong leadership on diversity at a senior level and gender-related criteria in senior civil service performance management objectives which impacts directly on bonus payments.
- **Talent Management** - Crossing Thresholds Mentoring initiative aimed at career development for women and other under-represented groups. This 12-month programme involves career planning workshops, peer group support networks, coaching and mentoring
- **Representation** – ensuring representation of minority groups across the organisation

The eight diversity strands covered are age, disability, gender, gender identity, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation and working patterns. There is a Delivery Plan with targets for numbers of staff at different levels of seniority for female, Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) and disabled staff. A specific Diversity Team exists with responsibility for monitoring DFID’s work on diversity and providing technical support. This team conducts diversity monitoring analysis by the different diversity strands as part of the annual reporting process. As a result of its work on diversity and equality, DFID has been awarded the following kitemarks: Age Aware Employer, Positive about Disabled People, Investors in People and has recently become one of Stonewall’s Top 100 Employees for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people.


---

### Diversity Policy and Committee

DCA’s Diversity Policy (2008) states that it is an organisation that reflects a society made up of people of different gender, race, skin colour, religion or belief, sexual orientation, age, disability and national, social or ethnic origin. It also states that there should be equal opportunities for employment, training, promotion and well-being for all. The Policy establishes a Diversity Committee made up of four members, two selected by management and two by the Work Committee set up to provide a link between management and staff. The main tasks of this committee include:

- Annual reporting on the Diversity Policy
- Collection of statistics disaggregated by sex and ethnicity on specific issues including seniority, salary, age, recruitment and well-being.
- The Committee also has responsibility for assessing how to recruit a more diverse workforce, considering the needs of older staff members, flexible working and parental leave.

However, the Policy does not seem to be adequately implemented and the Committee has not met often. Many staff members are not even aware that DCA has a Diversity Policy. To show how serious the organisation is about attracting a diverse workforce DCA needs to begin a debate about the type of organisation it wants to look like in five-ten years time. It also needs to examine the barriers to diversity (e.g., work permits, language barriers, possibility for senior management to live/work in countries other than Denmark). During the interviews at HQ, when diversity issues were raised, DCA staff were not generally able to go beyond discussions of numbers of men and women into other diversity issues e.g., on ethnicity, sexual orientation. The issue of disability was discussed a couple of times, where staff pointed out how inaccessible the HQ office was. However, if DCA really wants to be seen as an organisation that champions diversity it would need to create means by which it could accommodate people living with disability.

DCA seems to be an attractive workplace for Danish citizens - born or naturalised, demonstrated by the long years of service by staff at HQ, who have on average, been in the organisation for several years, in many cases more than 10 years. However, this does not seem to be the case in DCA offices in Cambodia, Kyrgyzstan and Zambia, where staff interviewed, reported that local staff tended only to have been in the organisation for an average of two years. They suggested that one reason for this is due to staff finding more attractive employment elsewhere.

The DCA Audit Team stated that whilst they did not have statistics on this, they believed that globally many local staff had worked for the organisation for more than two years. They also commented that one of the main reasons for much staff having been with DCA for a short time is a drastic increase in staff, see Table X below:

### Table 1: Total Number of DCA Local Staff Excluding De-miners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Local Staff excluding De-miners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>83.3 (budgeted figures)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2. Just and favourable work conditions for attracting a diverse workforce

SU – Samarbæjdsudvalg

Social Development Direct DanChurchAid: Gender and Rights Audit
Trade Unions
In terms of representation and collective bargaining there is a marked difference between the systems set up for HO and those in country offices. At HO, the majority of staff belong to a union, which reflects a trend in Danish society as a whole. Service Staff at HO, who stated during an interview that they were not members of a union as they felt it too much to pay out of their small salaries. However, apart from a relatively new member of staff, they were aware that the Christian Union had offered to represent them. DCA’s Recruitment Policy states that candidates will be told about DCA’s different unions at interview, to allow them to contact the union representatives if they wish. The three unions representing staff in DCA are:
- Academics Union
- Christian Union
- Journalists Union

In the country offices there is a very different picture. None of the locally employed staff interviewed belonged to any form of staff union. However, there appeared to be a real appetite for some form of staff representation, either for elected member of staff to negotiate with management on behalf of others or for some type of staff union/committee either at the country or regional level. At present, locally employed staff felt that they had to fight their causes alone, and usually their personal relationship with the RR determined the outcome of negotiations, and they had the impression that the RR’s decision was final. Examples were given of DCA country offices that have made some moves towards establishing staff unions, include India and Malawi. It was also reported that in Zambia, the Country Coordinator (CC) had encouraged staff to organise a union on a visit to the office and that Norwegian Church Aid, in the same compound as DCA, has a staff union which could be looked at either as a possible model for the DCA union or whether DCA could join this union.

4. Protection of employees from physical, verbal, sexual or psychological harassment, abuse or threats in the workplace.

DCA has clear policies on harassment and takes a strong stand against any form of harassment, abuse or threats in the workplace. Both the Staff Manual for HQ staff and the Guidelines for Regional Offices have sections on Sexual Exploitation and Harassment, which state that any form of harassment will be treated as misconduct and result in disciplinary action. The Guidelines also includes a separate annex on sexual exploitation, which takes a gender and rights-based approach from the start. Within this annex, a staff code of conduct for preventing sexual exploitation is outlined, breach of which will result in disciplinary action, though it is not clear what this will entail.

---

8 According to Danish labour law, any company or workplace with more than 25 employees is obliged to establish a ‘Work’s Council’ (DCA Complaints Mechanism).
Staff experiencing or observing any form of harassment can make a complaint through the complaints mechanism. The Mid-Term report on DCA’s Complaints Handling System (October 2009) includes one account of a complaint regarding inappropriate sexual behaviour, which indicates that staff are clear of DCA’s stand on sexual harassment and are using the mechanism appropriately.

Whilst there are policies and procedures in place to protect employees from harassment in the workplace, it may be harder to ensure that psychological abuse is not occurring as this may be less tangible than the other forms of abuse.

5. Access to relevant information for all staff

Management Minutes
The main means through which staff access DCA information is through the intranet, meeting minutes and emails. Staff reported having access to minutes of management meetings, which many did try and read, though sometimes it was hard to find the time to do this. However, the management minutes reviewed as part of the audit, appeared difficult to understand if you were not present at the meeting and in the interests of transparency and accountability, important minutes would need to be written up in a more accessible form so that all employees can understand what is going on.

Intranet
Most staff reported using the intranet on a regular basis, though it did not appear to be completely user friendly and a quick trawl of the intranet revealed that several documents were not accessible. It was also reported that country office staff who were Danish speakers and had close relationships with HO sometimes had access to information faster than those who were not Danish speakers due to access to discussions held first in Danish.

6. Transparency around decision-making, including use of financial resources and
7. Adequate staff participation and transparency in decision-making and use of financial resources

As questions 6 and 7 have much in common, they have been combined in the discussion below.

In their responses to the questionnaire, senior staff and board members noted ways in which they had tried to make DCA’s decision-making process transparent and participatory though:
  - having elected staff members participate in board meetings,
  - having a practice of ‘dialogue based management’
  - involving staff through their departments via a process of consultation and decision-making

However, despite these efforts, two key issues relating to transparency and participation in decision-making arose out of staff discussions and responses to the questionnaire:
  - RRs and country staff do not feel adequately consulted by senior management in relation to HO decision-making
  - Some local staff does not always feel adequately consulted by RRs in relation to country office decision-making.
On the whole, staff in country offices does not feel that they are always consulted regarding important decisions on budgets, strategic planning and policies made in Copenhagen. Country level staff feels that policies and strategies have been imposed on them from HQ and that they are not sufficiently consulted regarding these. If they are sent documents to look at they are not given enough time to comment on them, and feel that this is not adequate consultation, but merely a ‘tick box’ exercise. In particular, RRs report that they are not well informed about senior management decisions and challenges which they are dealing with, and as a consequence find it difficult to fulfil their management responsibilities, including working out problems to solutions at a critical juncture of DCAs organisational life (Statement from RR Addis Ababa Meeting 2008). In October 2008, RRs met in Ethiopia and came up with a statement to senior management asking to be consulted more and for a review on the decentralisation process.

At the country office level, participation of local staff depends on the individual RR. Some staff reported that the RR was inclusive and often consulted with them before making a decision. In the Zambia office they have developed their own guidelines on ‘communicating professionally’ within the office and at meetings everyone who wants to can takes turns in chairing meetings (including drawing up the agenda) and taking minutes. This builds the staff capacity on how to run meetings and encourages transparency. However, in other offices staff reported not being consulted very much at all. For example one programme officer stated, “We are consulted very little. The Country Representative makes most decisions on their own”.

8. Mechanisms for resolving grievances for all staff members in a non-discriminatory way

Complaints Mechanism
DCA has a Complaints Handling System which has been piloted in 2009. This outlines different complaints mechanisms available for staff at HQ and country offices. Staff at HQ has three means of registering a complaint. They can either contact:

- The Work’s Council, which handle issues and problems related to cooperation between staff and management at general level
- A shop steward for one of the three unions on issues relating to conditions of employment, salary, contractual issues
- Human Resource Group at HQ. HR staff have responsibility for specific types of complaints

For staff appointed in country, if they have a grievance, they are expected to go to the RR first and then have the option of contacting a representative of the Work’s Council, based in Copenhagen, appointed for a two-year period who provides support as a last resort. However, interviews with locally appointed staff revealed whilst most country office staff were aware of the complaints mechanism, they were unlikely to use it. They felt that everyone knew each other at HQ, many had been in the organisation for a long time and that

9 According to Danish labour law, any company or work place with more than 25 employees is obliged to establish a ‘Work’s Council’ with representation from the management and the various staff groups as part of the democratic structure. DCA has such a Work’s Council with five representatives from the management and six from the three trade union clubs presently active in DCA. Approximately 65% of DCA staff is employed under the Academics’ Agreement, 30% under the Christian Agreement and 5% under the Journalists’ Agreement (DCA Complaints Mechanism)
it was ‘like a family’. They felt that it would be difficult to complain about an individual staff member, as they believed that no action could be taken against HQ staff as they had long-term contracts and would be difficult to fire. Country level staff was afraid of being fired if they made a complaint and would rather keep their job than complain. The Complaints mechanism is quite restrictive, staff will only go to HQ if have an issue with RR. Zambia Office reported that once a year the CC comes to the country office and speaks with all staff members individually which allows them to speak freely. Whilst the complaints mechanism does note that local staff members have the opportunity to choose a colleague to accompany them discussions with management, this does not seem to be happening.

9. Barriers to equal opportunities (gender, ethnicity etc) within the organisation, across all levels of responsibilities.

This question has largely been dealt with under the previous questions in this section. The key issues relate to perceived barriers to equal opportunities relating to non-Danes becoming RRs and non-white and female staff becoming senior managers.

Recommendations

- Start disaggregated data collection regarding staff recruitment, retention and promotion. Decide which indicators it would be most useful to collect data on (e.g. sex and ethnicity of managers) and set out a data collection plan.
- Once data has been collected and analysed, where there are issues for concern, DCA could consider the possibility of affirmative action for under-represented groups.
- There needs to be more clarity around advancement opportunities, particularly for management positions and for programme officers. Where there are external restrictions on equal opportunities (e.g. work permits) these need to be made explicit. This could be done through an internal communications document.
- To demonstrate to others that DCA is an equal opportunities employer and is serious about investing in staff, apply for accreditation under an inter/nationally recognised scheme such as Investors in People http://www.investorsinpeople.co.uk/Pages/Home.aspx
- Assess the possibility of establishing staff unions for locally employed staff.
F: Communication and Advocacy Strategies and Materials

1. To what extent are procedures in place to ensure the consideration of rights-based development and gender equality perspectives when prioritising and developing advocacy issues and campaigns?

2. To what extent are rights-based development and gender equality issues reflected in selected advocacy and communication strategies?

3. To what extent does the organisation ensure that gender equality and rights-based development is reflected in its advocacy and information materials and activities?

4. What particular barriers in the above, if any, can be identified?

Overview
Campaigns and Advocacy play a major role in DCA’s vision and work, appearing prominently in the overall Vision and Plan 2006-10. DCA’s website states that the main priorities of DCA’s advocacy work are HIV/AIDS and hunger (food security) and advocacy initiatives consist primarily of lobby activities, media action, popular mobilisation, and alliance-building. Advocacy is one of the International Department's tools to facilitate empowerment and voice of local partners and rights-holders. It is also a key component of the Communications Department work in raising awareness among duty-bearers in Denmark, the EU and globally. Therefore one would expect to find procedures in place to guide this work in key programme policy documents as well as within the communications plan, including a transparent approach to prioritising work and ensuring all corresponding elements to be strong examples of a GRBA good practice highlighting to all stakeholders that DCA embodies its vision. Clear guidelines and bespoke tools would ensure that this is consistent and not dependent on one individual or a small group of people in the organisation.

This section examines overall policies and procedures in place that may assist in prioritising and developing advocacy and campaign strategies; takes a deeper look at the overall organisational Communications Strategy and considers how GRBA is reflected in advocacy activities information and materials. It also considers some of the challenges that may be faced in ensuring GRBA is mainstreamed in advocacy and communications work. The analysis in this section for the most part, takes into consideration advocacy and communication work done on a national or international scale.
Both the International department and Communications department are responsible for advocacy and campaign work which is guided by DCA’s overarching vision, overall programme policy documents and individual department strategies. DCA’s Vision and Plan 2006-2010 clearly states the use of advocacy as a key component of its work and this is highlighted in objective one along with its sub-objectives (see Box 10).

These provide some, albeit vague, guidance on how advocacy issues and campaigns can be chosen – with a focus on Denmark and ‘big picture’ campaigns (national, regional and international). However, there is no explicit link to rights and only reference to one component of a gendered approach. Sub-objective A- which guides the focus of the advocacy work in Denmark, still focuses on the concept of ‘need’ rather than rights, counter to the language and framing of an RBA. Sub-objective B mentions the rights and equality between men and women, but does not directly highlight that gender discrimination exists (and contributes to the poverty and exclusion of women and girls). Sub-objective E focuses on capacity building for country offices and local partners, empowering and supporting partners to carry out advocacy work. These sub-objectives can be strengthened to provide a more powerful organisational vision on rights and gender if the points above are addressed.

Advocacy and Programme Policies
In the five Programme Policies advocacy is expressly mentioned in the overall objectives which also outline the area for advocacy focus – summarised in Box 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 10: DCA’s First Objective and 5 Sub-objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To become a strong advocate of poor and excluded people and support their rights and influence on their own lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Through information and advocacy activities in Denmark to promote awareness of the world problems and of need and the causes of need;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: To ensure that in all our activities, we work on the basis of rights and equality between women and men;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: To make efforts to include advocacy in all development, emergency aid and information projects;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: To increase our participation in global, regional and national campaigns related to DanChurchAid’s long-term activities, including campaigns to support the 2015 goals;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: To reinforce our partners’ capacity to do their own advocacy as well as our capacity to assist them in case help is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong> DCA Vision and Plan 2006-2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On average, the programme policies provide clear outlines of how advocacy will serve to underscore and develop DCA’s cross-cutting policies of gender and rights as displayed in the example taken from the HIV/AIDS policy below.

**Box 11: Ways in Which Advocacy is Integrated into Programme Policies**

- **Right to food**
  - Advocacy for increased and gender sensitive food security at national and international levels.

- **Political Space**
  - Advocacy for legal, policy and budget reform based on interests of discriminated women and men.
  - Media and communication strategies for positive and rights-sensitive discourse

- **HIV/AIDS**
  - Advocacy for increased commitment to scale up the HIV and AIDS response

- **Humanitarian Assistance**
  - Advocacy for increased humanitarian space and access to assistance/protection

- **Humanitarian Mine Assistance**
  - Policy is forthcoming but the website states that human rights are integrated in programme development, execution and evaluation, as well as advocacy.

*Source: DCA Programme Policies*

**Box 12: DCA’s advocacy work on HIV/AIDS**

DCA will undertake **global, regional and national advocacy** on:

- Increased and equitable access to HIV and AIDS response including treatment
- Increased and sustained donor commitment towards financing the HIV and AIDS response including support to the Global Fund to fight HIV, TB and malaria and other international mechanisms.
- Integration of human rights including sexual and reproductive rights and gender equality in HIV and AIDS response
- Fighting stigmatisation and discrimination

*Source: DCA HIV/AIDS Programme Policy*

**Empowering Partners to do advocacy**

DCA’s regional and country offices handle, for the most part, their local campaigns in collaboration with partners and decisions for these appear to be made locally. Work carried out via the International Department to reinforce partners’ capacity to do their own advocacy appear to link closely with the programme areas – see Box 13 below - which are meant to be guided by the cross-cutting programme policies on Rights-Based Commitment and Gender and Equality. One would assume therefore, that local campaigns have a de facto rights-based focus. The presentation of the information though, does not consistently tie these issues back to rights, to highlight the link. Also, it is not evident how partners work with rights-holders to ensure participation and empowerment.
The structures and systems in place to ensure gender is mainstreamed are less robust. Training around gender and rights have been carried out with a number of programmes in the south and though (according to the Vision and Plan 2008 report) there is documented increased awareness it has yet to be translated into change in partners work. Women are supported through programme efforts, but the sensitization of men and their involvement is admittedly neglected.

Promoting duty-bearers’ awareness through advocacy
The central Communications and Advocacy team is responsible for campaigns and advocacy within Denmark as well as broader international campaigns, usually carried out in collaboration with other agencies and partners. As part of their wider strategic vision outlined in the communications strategy, the DCA communications team have focussed on building DCA’s reputational expertise around issues relating to Hunger with the media, Danish public and politicians and have utilised their campaigns to support this effort.

Advocacy and awareness in Denmark and the participation in national and regional campaigns appear to take a more reactive approach to the selection of campaigns and advocacy work as evidenced by the 2008 report which highlights the high levels of unplanned activity in this area. This indicates that there is less of an embedded procedure in place to assist in prioritisation generally, which can mean that proper planning to ensure rights and gender issues are appropriately handled is very limited. The work around this area should be guided by the organisational communications strategy which is analysed next.

Box 13: Best Practice on integrating rights into DCA partners’ advocacy work

**Honduras**: Several partners and DCA put pressure on Congress to secure transparency and anti-corruption measures in the highly corrupt judicial system.

**Guatemala**: The UN Committee on the Eliminations of Racial Discrimination accepted three important cases presented by DCA Guatemalan partners which put pressure on the Guatemalan government to address the rights of indigenous people.

**Central Asia**: Partner platforms work on documenting and advocating the issue of civil registration/‘Propiska’ as the overall limiting factor for poor target groups’ access to social and political rights.

**Russia**: a DCA study on ‘Social and Legal Aspects of the problem of homelessness’ describes in detail the lack of access to fundamental rights of this target group. The DCA partner network produced analyses, handbooks, law reform proposals which led to increased attention, new regional social programmes for the benefit of homeless.

**Landmines and cluster munitions** - In December 2008, a Convention on Cluster Munitions was signed in Oslo by more than 90 countries, including United Kingdom, France, Germany, Norway and Denmark; prohibiting cluster munitions as defined as a weapon category. DCA was actively involved in the process leading up to the Convention signing, as DCA was part of the Steering Committee of the Cluster Munitions Coalition.

*Source: Adapted from the V&P 2006-2010 Report 2008*
2. Communications and Advocacy Strategy Documents and GRBA

An organisation’s Communications Strategy supports the overall vision of the organisation. For DCA this should include clearly defined objectives and goals that improve, embed and sustain GRBA within all communication elements and campaign work. This sub section focuses primarily on the overarching Communications Strategy and other available strategic documents (mentioned where relevant below). Box 14 gives best practice examples of ways to ensure a gender and rights focus in a Communications Strategy.

Box 14: Best Practice on ways to ensure a gender and right focus in a Communications Strategy

- Articulate a clear link between rights and gender issues, organisational vision and communication goals
- Set out standards of departmental accountability through transparent and measurable goals and objectives that tie in gender and rights
- Set targets and outcomes including those relating to gender and rights issues
- Establish ways to facilitate participation of rights-holders and duty bearers in the decision-making process of the content and products of the department
- Reflect communication priorities as determined in collaboration rights-holders
- Convey clear methods for empowering rights-holders and duty bearers (including staff) in and through the messages and products of the department
- Use a stakeholder analysis to produce clear and detailed information on both rights-holder and duty bearer to ensure non-discrimination and attention to marginalised groups
- Identify and produce appropriate messages for all relevant groups that maintains a focus on DCA’s key priorities
- Underscore the use of all accessible and relevant channels to ensure reach and involvement of all stakeholders taking into consideration groups who are unable to access traditional media channels (those with disabilities, unable to read, lack of electricity, not IT literate etc)
- Incorporate ways to engage and educating mainstream media on GRBA ‘language’
- Utilise ‘pull’ rather than ‘push’ factors
- Be provided in an accessible and easy to use format
- Be dynamic and subject to constant scrutiny to see if it is continuing to meet the requirements of staff and the organisational vision

Source: Gayatri Persad

Several strategy documents guide the work of the communications team. The principal document is that of the Communications Strategy 2009-12. This document makes reference to specific sub-strategies including an external press strategy, a strategy for working with business, a Strategy for NØD the monthly newsletter to Danish audiences, the website, and an advocacy strategy among others. The Communications Strategy forms the blueprint for a department’s vision, focus and all operations and as such merit close scrutiny.

The Strategy is positioned as an internal tool, used to highlight to the DCA staff how the communications team is working to make communication more effective. The objectives of the strategy focus on action for the poorest; building DCAs profile, a focus on poverty; clear communication to enhance reputation, exploiting the ACT partnership and the provision of tools and resources to deliver on the strategy. While two of these link back to the organisation’s mission, the others could be strengthened to show how the work of the

111 NØD has now been replaced by Magasinet
communications team will contribute to the gender and rights based agenda, thereby moving one step closer to mainstreaming GRBA.

For example one of the objectives in the Communications Strategy states:

*Cross cutting messages must bind DCA’s range of focus points together and create consistency in our communication*

This objective can be strengthened by highlighting why consistency is necessary – one way could be as follows:

*Cross cutting messages will ensure consistent communication for DCA’s diverse focus points to effectively communicate to duty-bearers the rights and interests of rights-holders.*

Likewise, the six core messages intended for DCA to use in building a more targeted, concrete image with the Danish public and businesses. Of these, only one focuses specifically on rights and gender does not figure at all in the key messages. Given that these key messages are part of the tools used to develop the DCA image, it is critical that they also communicate DCA’s core mission and vision, which will also serve to add value and meaning to audiences. For example the following two messages could be strengthened to reflect a consistent message of rights and gender through considering the questions in the brackets:

- We act with conviction and hope (why, to what end?)
- We fight against poverty (where and how and with whom?)

None of the strategies reviewed specifically outline rights and gender approaches as key objectives within their work. This is also not evident in the activity plans for the Advocacy and Corporate Relations team, neither of which frame GBRA as sub-objectives or part of sub-objectives and indeed, it is also absent from key success indicators. Therefore, there is no requirement to measure success in these areas and successes/challenges in these areas are not necessarily captured.

The existing elements used to measure the success of the advocacy work focus more on raising awareness among duty-bearers about DCA and its work around Hunger. However, it is acknowledged that work on quality control and evaluation mechanisms are in their infancy so there is room to address the lack of gender and rights indicators in these mechanisms.

Some other areas that could be visited to strengthen this strategy document include:

- Addressing the need to ensure accessibility and diversity issues are factored into communication processes to facilitate reaching all groups (both duty-bearers and rights-holders) with the DCA messages.
- Including key elements of participation and accountability to both rights-holders and duty-bearers when carrying out communications work.
- Outlining an approach for engaging with rights-holders and duty-bearers to ensure they feed into the decision making process around communications and advocacy issues that affect them.
- Providing a stronger stakeholder analysis that looks at how stakeholders get their information. Consider whether ‘young and old’ are the best segmentation as this stereotypes and can easily degenerate into discrimination if mishandled. A more contemporary approach would be more relevant such as behavioural segmentation which reduces emphasis on age and more on like-minded population which may cross-cut age, gender, ethnicity and even socio-economic brackets.
This section focuses on advocacy and information materials as it was not possible to directly observe activities within the remit of this Audit. This analysis does not consider material/media articles done by external journalists, as there is far less control of the content and slant of this material. It is primarily focussed on the content created and disseminated by the Communications team. Box 15 provides examples of ways in which to incorporate gender equality and rights-based development into advocacy and information materials.

**Images**
From the sample of online material scanned (see Annex 6) the still images used appear to depict a balance of men and women, often realistic, relevant and positive. There is some, though not consistent effort to ensure women are not always depicted in the stereotypical roles. Children are less likely to be shown in favourable conditions. It is difficult to gauge the level of informed consent of the subjects. However through the questionnaires one media respondent makes reference to training of country staff in ‘interviewing men and women’ as well as encouraging them to seek consent for use of images, which is positive. Surprisingly, the Annual Report 2008, scores lower with regards to choice of images against these criteria. Overall, there is appears to be an effort (though not always consistent) to ensure a balance of men and women are represented in images used in publications and communication documents.

**Content**
On average, the content reflects rights based issues, but is less likely to present this utilising clear rights language and sometime slips into a needs based vocabulary. Subjects, unless it specifically relates to a project to help women are also generalised and rarely attempt to clearly identify the duty-bearers or present disaggregated data to show how broader issues impact on both men and women (as well as age, disability, geographic location, ethnic groups etc). This is likely to be because it is often difficult to get a hold of this data; however even in a few instances where it is available, it’s not consistently utilised. For example a recent article on an FAO report on poverty failed to show the varied impact on men and women, though this information was given in the overall report. Admittedly, the FAO press release generalised the story, however, a brief scan of the document revealed relevant information on men and women that could have been used to contextualise the piece. Additionally, there are very little quotes from subjects to give their interpretation.

**Production**
It is not clear how programmes or campaigns ensure rights-holders participate in the communications output of the programme. This is likely to be very difficult to achieve with no local communications support in country offices. Articles produced also feature rights-holders as the subject, they are rarely, if at all, the producers of content. Again, this speaks to a resourcing issue, however, if a rights based approach were to be truly embedded, a key component of rights-holders participation would also be participation in and co-creation of all aspects of the programme.

**Dissemination**
DCA HQ employs primarily electronic and print communication channels to reach its Danish and international audiences. However, materials do not seem to signpost alternate products, for example, offering large print, Braille or accessible PDFs to cater for duty-bearers and rights-holders who have accessibility issues. Additionally, materials seem to only be available only in English and Danish. It is not clear what channels are used by the international offices.
Box 16: Materials on Ethiopia taken from the DCA International Site

Article on Strengthening Civil Society
This article opens with the statement, DanChurchAid in Ethiopia works to counter the hardships of rural women and girls, and to enable them to exercise their rights and participate in social, economic and political life. The article continues to look at the work being done in Ethiopia under 4 headings – including two specifically on rights issues, (right to equality, economic and political rights violations), the focus on girls and women and concludes with key areas of DCA’s intervention. Within the article the author explains the terms RH and DB and ties this into relevant responsibilities. Data used is disaggregated where possible. Only two things are missing to make this a good practice example – the use of the image of a man to head the article (though some may argue that it’s to balance a piece that is heavily skewed towards women) and the lack of ‘voice’ of the rights-holders – something that would lend credibility and emotive weight to the piece.

Videos: Pastoral people are under pressure
The six video clips explore the work being done in the Southern part of Ethiopia with the Guji Oromos who experience how the climate has changed and how it has brought drought and hunger to their area. Of the 6 video clips – all narrated by the DCA staff member, 2 feature women, one, Hagaya, expressing her gratitude for being given a goat that gives her status and food in her village dealing with drought. The images of Hagaya are primarily silent surrounded by her children. She speaks twice and through a male interpreter. The context and issues are presented by the DCA Rep - a man. This scenario is replicated in the other clip that features a woman, training to be a village vet to help with ill animals in the drought. The other clips look at how essential water is to villagers focussing only on the men tending their crops and the village chief. Women do not have a voice in this piece – or the other two for that matter. The use of the men as the sole voices of authority in these pieces inadvertently perpetuates the discrimination women face and maintains their voicelessness.

Source: DCA Website

4. Barriers to ensure that rights-based development and gender equality issues are reflected in Advocacy and Communications Materials

As most current management theories highlight\textsuperscript{12}, having robust procedures in place is only one way of ensuring change. There are a number of other factors that ensure they take root. Below, a few of these are examined, specifically as they relate to the Advocacy and Communications team.

Staffing Issues
Communication and Advocacy staff \textsuperscript{13} generally hold the view that a gender and rights based approach is important to the organisation and some have also highlighted their personal commitment to rights (see Annex 4 for further analysis). However the level of understanding/interpretation about what exactly is a gender and rights based approach and what this specifically means in relation to the DCA’s programmes and operations is quite varied, with resulting implications (in evidence) for a consistent and effective implantation of GRBA across the media and communications workstreams.

On average, staff has expressed their knowledge of gender in relation to DCA and their work specifically as it relates to resourcing (hiring practices, staff gender breakdown): for example, highlighting that there are more women than men in some teams, or discussing programmes specifically targeting women. Some have also raised the issue of media fatigue around ‘feminist’ issues as a challenge to their work. Overall, there is less awareness around the more comprehensive outlook a gender approach embraces, which calls for the equal

\textsuperscript{12} One popular theory is that of McKinsey’s 7S. \url{http://www.valuebasedmanagement.net/metHQds_7S.html}

\textsuperscript{13} Based on SDD focus groups, interviews and three Communications Team responses to the Questionnaire.
treatment of men and women, while recognising that their experiences, needs and priorities are different.

With regards to rights issues, staff, again, reflect an understanding of the programme areas that DCA focus on. However, there is less evidence of an ability to apply the component elements of a rights based approach\textsuperscript{14} to their own areas of work. There is for example, still the need to consider how to ensure consideration is given to areas such as diversity of viewpoints and choosing channels that reach a wider audience and cater to the rights of persons with disabilities, older people etc. (- language, large print).

While training courses on gender and rights have been conducted for country office staff, it is unclear what training the central communications team have undertaken on gender and rights issues, specifically in relation to communications work to foster a clearer understanding of the application of the approach to their areas of work. A training session developed around rights and communications, highlighting the benefits it would offer to their work is likely to assist in embedding how GRBA can be operationalised across communications processes. This staff group considered that they can benefit from bespoke tools and creative workshops to assist them in understanding how to apply a GRBA to their areas of work.

**Absence of Communication specific guidelines for GE and RBA**

While DCA provides a fair amount of tools and guidance for programmes and projects to guide the implementation and assessment of GRBA, there is no existing guidance that focuses on communications and how to mainstream GRBA. Many tools have been developed by a variety of organisations relating to gender and media, for example a comprehensive *Gender and Media Advocacy Toolkit*\textsuperscript{15} developed by World Association for Christian Communication (WACC). There appears to be very limited resources specifically relating to rights and media. Products that may offer some support in this area are the UNESCO\textsuperscript{16} RBA training manual for Viet Nam journalists that can be used for reference, though it would need to be modified to be relevant to different local settings. However, it does not address the wider communication issues. Another good tool is the CARE international\textsuperscript{17} training manual *An Introduction to Human Rights Issues*, which utilises communication tools (letters and articles) through which a RBA is analysed. Additionally, an Amnesty International\textsuperscript{18} resource offers some very practical elements that can assist in further developing advocacy campaigns and developing media strategies for individual projects, but not for a wider corporate communications strategy development and building brand.

**Brand**

Currently, key elements of the DCA brand reflect the legacy of the former ‘needs based’ development approach as opposed to a rights based approach. DCA’s name still maintains the word ‘Aid’ which is counter to the core messages of RBA as not being aid focused but rather development partnerships. The difficulties and costs involved in a re-brand are obviously factors here, but a long term strategy to address this will be worth considering as an organisation’s name /brand can be powerful symbol of its aims and values and therefore DCA’s good work in building a strong focus on RBA can be undermined by the ‘need based’ legacy of its name with regional offices and international journalists using the English version of its name.

\textsuperscript{14} These are distilled into: Clear link to rights; accountability; participation; empowerment; non-discrimination and attention to marginalised groups

\textsuperscript{15} http://www.comminit.com/en/node/282684/36

\textsuperscript{16} http://www2.unescobkk.org/elib/publications/228/HRBA-Journalism.pdf

\textsuperscript{17} http://www.crin.org/docs/resources/publications/hrbp/CARE_intro_HRA.pdf

Structure
Despite what has been billed as a fairly successful\(^{19}\) re-structuring process towards decentralisation of DCA, the communications arm of DCA remains centralised. A centralised team reduces/limits the country offices ability to access media support for their local work, reduces their participation in media and advocacy work, does not facilitate rights-holders empowerment through acquiring the necessary media literacy and advocacy skills to articulate their own rights. Communications is often neglected as an integral part of the development process, yet is a key component as it provides information and making voices heard in order to break patterns of social and political exclusion\(^{20}\).

More recently, a member of the media and advocacy team has done a six month placement in Ethiopia working with the country office to build awareness of media and advocacy with the local team as well as contribute content to the central office efforts. This has been viewed as a success as there has been a noticeable rise in interest and media outputs from this office and there are plans to possibly replicate this approach across other country offices. What is uncertain is the quality of the output as it relates to gender and rights issues as analysis shows some of the outputs do not reflect a comprehensive GRBA.

Some country offices now assign media and advocacy elements to more junior members of their team who are tasked with producing content and maintaining contact with the central communications team. Training will become a critical factor to ensure these individuals are familiar with articulating gender and rights issues coherently in media and public advocacy work.

Recommendations
- Ensure Advocacy and Communications elements are part of overall organisational strategies
- Reflect communications considerations in all relevant guides, checklists, documents for staff on Gender and RBA and /or and specific tools for Communications/Advocacy such as the GRB Programme self-assessment checklist, checklists, core standards, clear indicators of successful adoption of GRBA.
- Revisit the Communications Strategy and associated documents to ensure gender and rights issues are more effectively woven through the objectives, evaluation and key messages
- Develop/Document a comprehensive stakeholder analysis at both the country and organisational level. A large part of this work may already sit with Programme teams, but need to be brought together and viewed through a communications lens
- Adapt and/or develop tools that are specifically for Advocacy and Campaigns work across the international and central communications team
- Provide local communications support for regional campaigns to allow for a better response to local efforts and the development of local advocacy and campaigning skills
- Develop and conduct bespoke training session around rights and communications to assist in embedding how GRBA can be operationalised within communications work
- Consider the possibility, including cost implications, of producing communications materials in alternative formats include large print and podcasts to allow access to a wider audience.
- Establish a feedback process to encourage rights-holder participation.

\(^{19}\) 2006 - Thematic Review1 of Danish Church Aid:
http://www.danchurchaid.org/what_we_do/monitoring_evaluation
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G: Fundraising Strategies and Materials

- To what extent are rights-based development and gender equality issues reflected in selected international and national fundraising strategies?
- To what extent does the organisation ensure that gender equality and rights-based development is reflected in its fundraising materials and activities?
- What particular barriers in the above, if any, can be identified?

Overview
Interviews and questionnaire responses for this Audit, revealed that staff working in both international and national fundraising units are committed to gender equality and rights-based development. However, an analysis of key fundraising strategies, materials and activities show that gender and rights are not systematically mainstreamed across all fundraising work. Barriers to ensuring that fundraising materials and activities reflect gender and rights commitments include the drive to achieve fundraising targets through the 2012 strategy, which may take priority over a GRBA.

International Fundraising
It was reported that DCA receives around 40% of its funds through a DANIDA framework agreement, 30% from national fundraising in Denmark and around 25-30% from global funds.

DCA’s Global Funding Unit (GFU) is responsible for attracting global funds. According to DCA’s Director of Secretariat, one of the reasons that GFU has been quite successful in securing global funds is that DCA has a reputation amongst donors for its work on gender and rights and donors are keen to invest in an organisation with strengths in these areas. It is therefore interesting that despite this external perception of DCA, GFU staff did not always find it easy to integrate GRBA into their work and fundraising strategies and materials, both national and international, did not always reflect a GRBA.

Interviews with some staff revealed that there could be conflict of interest between the focus of a call for proposals and the cross-cutting principles of rights based development and gender equality. To secure funding, GFU has to design projects that comply with what donors want to fund and sometimes these do not necessarily prioritise gender equality and rights based commitments. In some cases, GFU reported that Global Funding/ Programme Officers found that PDU played more of a controlling, rather than input role and asked more questions than provided answers, which increased officer’s work load (Interview Head of GFU).

An examination of selected DCA’s global funding strategies and tools showed that GRBA were rarely reflected in international fundraising strategies. For example, DCA is engaged in an ambitious 2012 Fundraising strategy. As part of the strategy, departments are required to report on the extent to which they have achieved fundraising targets. In the Report on 2012 Strategy: May -Sept 2009 there is very little mention of either gender or rights, only that the Palestine country office refers to money specifically being raised for women’s activities and the Congo office has had GBV project approved by DANIDA. In terms of targeting donors, it is mentioned in a report written in Quarter 2 that when individual DCA donors were disaggregated by sex and age, older people were shown to donate more. Within the 2012
Strategy reporting system, specific questions on the ways in which departments are using gender and rights approaches in fundraising materials/strategies could be posed. In terms of DCA international fundraising tools, the GFU Project Check List contains a list of questions for the Global Funding/Programme Officer to address during the five phases of project development. Here there are no specific questions on the ways in which the project will address gender or rights issues. However, the checklists do require that assistance is sought from a PTA (in ‘pre-elaboration’ and ‘elaboration’ phases). This PTA support could lead to an in-depth assessment of the extent to which the project mainstreams gender and rights. According to the GFU’s Project-Planning: Definitions document, for projects over 3 million Euro, PDU is always consulted, but for below 3 million Euro this is ad HQc. Whilst this does secure specialist technical input, potentially on gender and rights, depending on the PTA involved, the lack of specific questions on gender and rights takes responsibility away from the Global Funding/Programme Officer. In terms of allowing partners to input into the project process, there are questions on:

- the extent to which beneficiaries have been involved in project (elaboration phase)
- whether a Cooperation Agreement has been signed with the partner (pre-implementation)
- whether reports done in accordance with the reporting plan agreed with the implementing partner and DCA Regional Office (implementation)

National Fundraising
This section looks at the ways in which gender and rights have been integrated into two national fundraising campaigns: Parish Collection and Give a Goat.

Parish Collection
A Focus Group discussion was held with three staff from Popular and Church Relations. They identified the ways in which gender and rights played a role in the Parish Collection Campaign (see diagram below). During the development of the campaign, they stated that they thought about the types of people they wanted to target in the campaign, and focused particularly on women and confirmation candidates. They said that they had previously discussed how to target different ethnic groups, but had not yet been able to develop a clear means through which to target them in their campaigns. The red dots in Diagram 1 below shows the points at which the Popular and Church Relations team think about gender and rights in designing and implementing the Parish Collection Campaign.
Despite staff commitment to gender and rights within their work and ability to identify entry points for gender and rights within their campaign, their materials fail to use a GRBA. For example, an article for a Church magazine on the 2010 Parish Collection *Giv suitlete hjælp til selv hjælp* (Help the hungry to help themselves) fails to use a GRBA. It has a hunger focus reflecting the DCA Communication Strategy model. However, while the model in the Strategy uses hunger as a peg on which to hook the cross-cutting issues of gender and rights, there is no real evidence of this in the article. The article focuses on an abused African woman a mother of five who needs DCA’s help to grow food. She is portrayed as a victim, and the article is about her, rather than allowing her voice. It also focuses on needs rather than claiming her rights. An article for the local press for the same campaign, regarding climate change and Bangladesh\(^2\), does not use a GRBA either.

---

\(^2\) [http://www.noedhjaelp.dk/sogneindsamling/nyheder/1_artikel_til lokal-avisen](http://www.noedhjaelp.dk/sogneindsamling/nyheder/1_artikel_til lokal-avisen)
Give a Goat

Single women and vulnerable families are the target of DCA’s Give a Goat campaign. The selection of women as beneficiaries recognises that female headed households are often amongst the most poor. Case studies on DCA’s English and Danish language websites about these female beneficiaries (e.g. Who Got a Goat, A Goat Story, Gratis Retshjælp til Kvinder uden stemmer) allow DCA to discuss particular issues faced by these women, as well as showing them not just as victims, but as women trying actively to improve their situation. It could therefore be considered to take a gender approach. The story Gratis Retshjælp til Kvinder also incorporates rights issues, where the campaign has been able to fund free legal aid, so that an Ethiopian woman can access a lawyer in order to leave her abusive partners.

One Body Campaign

One example of best practice through which rights-holders are given a voice, was given by the Popular and Church Relations Team, though this is not specifically a national fundraising strategy. This was the One Body campaign on HIV/AIDS, a joint response to HIV/AIDS in Africa and elsewhere by the Nordic-FOCCISA Church Cooperation, a collaborative relationship between eleven councils of churches in Southern Africa and five councils of churches in the Nordic countries. In the One Body campaign, HIV+ people are included in the campaign’s core group and given a voice in campaign materials. This campaign is a very good example of influencing moral duty-bearers and of the participation of rights-holders. In terms of content, rights are not well integrated into One Body Volumes 1 and 2. Gender, and the different ways in which HIV/AIDS affect men and women is addressed well in Volume 1, though not to such an extent in Volume 2. This includes a discussion of intersection between Christian faith, marriage, gender and HIV/AIDS, the need for the Church to take the issue of gender justice seriously in order to prevent further spread of HIV, for an inclusive approach is needed that is based on advocacy for gender equality and that encourages women and men in the local communities to promote social change.

---

22 http://www.noedhjaelp.dk/giv_et_bidrag/giv_en_ged/gaver_der_hjaelpers/gratis_retshjælp_til_kvinder_uden_stemmer
23 An example of One Body material can be found at http://www.norgeskristnerad.no/doc/OneBody-Vol2%20Eng.pdf
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Recommendations

- Analyse more fully the extent to which the 2012 fundraising strategy mainstreams gender and rights commitments and suggest concrete ways to ensure gender and rights based mainstreaming of fundraising activities, whilst focusing on the priorities of specific calls for proposals.

- Within the 2012 Strategy reporting system, include specific questions on the ways in which departments are using gender and rights approaches in fundraising materials/strategies could be posed.

- Use best practice examples, such as the One Body campaign, to ensure that rights-holders are included in campaign materials.
Apart from with the Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) programme, DCA implements all of its work through partners. In addition to its global implementing partners, DCA also works with sister organisations as part of the ACT and APRODEV alliances, as well as with church-based, youth, children and business organisations in Denmark, the Danish public and Government. This is a broad and complex range of partners and ensuring that these organisations are non-discriminatory, do not violate human rights and are corruption-free is a difficult task.

As stated previously, this Audit only consulted with DCA staff and did not have any direct contact with partners, external stakeholders or rights-holders. Findings in this section are therefore only based upon the views of DCA staff and evidence found in DCA literature.

DCA has a number of policies and procedures which aim to ensure that DCA works to ensure a corruption free practice, including through its work with partners and that neither DCA nor partners violate human rights. These include:

- Partnership Policy for International Cooperation
- Ethical Guidelines (2007)
- Anti-Corruption Policy and related Corruption Annual Report dating back from 2004
- Complaints Handling Mechanism (2009)

These contain examples of best practice, particularly the Partnership Policy and Ethical Guidelines which are based on human rights frameworks. However, in countries where some form of corruption is the norm, it may be difficult to ensure that all partners are free from corruption and bribery. Mechanisms for ensuring partner competence on gender equality and rights based commitment are less strong. Although the Gender and Equality Programme Policy recommends that programmes have at least one partner with gender expertise and many of the PT1 Political Space programmes have partners with rights and gender expertise, there is no mandatory requirement to have gender and rights partners. Neither are there strong mechanisms for facilitating participation and influence of partner organisation, Partner Platforms exist though these do not always serve to influence DCA’s...
agenda. There are no formal mechanisms through which rights-holders can participate in and influence DCA strategies.

1. Procedures and Guidelines to ensure that DCA does not work with suppliers and donors whose policies and practices violate human rights and are discriminatory

DCA has a Partnership Policy covering its international partnerships and Ethical Guidelines which cover its work with business partners, both of which take a rights-based approach and contain examples of best practice.

Partnership Policy

DCA’s *Partnership Policy for International Co-operation*, deals primarily with DCA’s international partnerships, although its key principles are meant to be applied to partnerships in Denmark both internally and externally. The Policy refers throughout to DCA’s rights-based commitment and sees this as underpinning the organisation’s understanding of partnerships. It defines accountability as central to its vision of partnership and in Section E, on Ownership and accountability, clearly addresses human rights principles. It therefore follows that if DCA implements the Partnership Policy in its relationship with partners, it would not be possible for partners to violate human rights or behave in a discriminatory manner. However, despite the existence of the Partnership Policy, discussions with staff at HQ revealed that in practice many of DCA’s implementing partners are male dominated and perpetuate discriminatory attitudes, particularly towards women and minority groups themselves.

The Partnership Policy outlines a model for proposed partnership agreements (Box 18), which includes principles and procedures for accountability and transparency and is a good model of what a rights-based partnership agreement might look like. The DCA Partner Agreement, however, is part of the future vision rather than current practice. When DCA enters into a relationship with an implementing partner, it does sign a Cooperation Agreement with the partner, though this is more of a formal contract rather than expression of mutual accountability and partnership.

Another limitation to the Partnership Policy is that it does not provide indicators or benchmarks to provide a rough measure of how much progress is being made toward that vision. Nor does it make explicit reference to human rights conventions or standards. Section F on participation and equality also addresses rights issues of participation. But, as in other DCA policy documents, there is a lack of concrete attention to issues of social differentiation and discrimination (see Section C). There could, for example be reference to specific measures to enable women, children or people with

**Box 18: Best Practice on Partnerships - DCA Partner Agreement**

Partner agreements should be long-term, binding, include all (or most) activities and encompass the following areas:

1. Joint visions and values.
2. Avenues and institutions for regular dialogue and mediation in case of disputes.
3. Mechanisms to set and assess goals and indicators of achievement including monitoring and evaluation.
4. Principles and procedures for accountability and transparency in all directions.
5. General principles and obligations with regard to advocacy initiatives and capacity building activities.
6. Obligations and expectations to funding modalities and global fundraising initiatives.
7. Harmonisation and alignment with other partners.

Ideally, partner agreements are made jointly between several partners active at the national, regional and international level.

*Source: DCA Partnership Policy*
disabilities are able to participate in decision making on an equal basis.

**Suppliers and Donors**

In addition to the Partnership Policy, DCA has Ethical Guidelines (*Etiske Retningslinjer 2007*) which set ethical standards for its business partners including suppliers and donors. These standards are based upon the 10 Principles of the UN Global Compact shown in Box 19 below, including principles on human rights, labour, environmental and corruption. These are themselves based upon international frameworks including:

- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- The International Labour Organization’s Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.

Along with these principles, the Guidelines also state that DCA will not work with organisations that directly produce weapons for the arms industry, in particular anti-personnel landmines and cluster bombs. DCA expects that its business partners have a Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) strategy and if not would encourage partners to develop one and has developed specific CSR tools to support them to do so. As well as the tools, DCA has developed a checklist through which staff can conduct research into a potential partner to check their ethical credentials.

The Guidelines themselves are therefore an example of best practice in that they are based on international frameworks, demand that business partners respect human rights, are not complicit in rights and should uphold the rights of their own staff. As with all policy documents, its strength lies in the extent to which it is implemented and it would therefore be useful to conduct more in-depth research into its partners to check the extent to which they uphold these principles.

**Box 19: Best Practice on Partnerships – UN Global Compact**

**Human Rights**

- Principle 1: Businesses should support and respect the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights; and
- Principle 2: make sure that they are not complicit in human rights abuses.

**Labour Standards**

- Principle 3: Businesses should uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;
- Principle 4: the elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labour;
- Principle 5: the effective abolition of child labour; and
- Principle 6: the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

**Environment**

- Principle 7: Businesses should support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges;
- Principle 8: undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility; and
- Principle 9: encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies.

**Anti-Corruption**

- Principle 10: Businesses should work against corruption in all its forms, including extortion and bribery.

Source: DCA Ethical Guidelines for Business Partnerships and UN Global Compact

[http://www.unglobalcompact.org/AboutTheGC/TheTenPrinciples/index.html](http://www.unglobalcompact.org/AboutTheGC/TheTenPrinciples/index.html)
2. Ensuring a bribery and corruption-free practice

DCA takes a strong stand against corruption. This is demonstrated by its Anti-Corruption Policy, Anti-Corruption report and Corruption Report and documentation of any incidences of corruption on the website. The Ethical Guidelines for business partners also contain an anti-corruption principle. The Anti-Corruption Policy seeks to ensure that there is no corruption in partners, sister organisations or within DCA. When partners sign a cooperation agreement these have an anti-corruption clause. Staff manuals take a tough line on any staff involved in corrupt practices. DCA managed 18 cases of alleged corruption between 2004-8. DCA is also a member of Transparency International. DCA’s Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) accreditation and subsequent HAP Framework looks at quality of administrative systems and the extent to which the organisation has been able to secure a voice for poor people within the organisation also works to curb corruption. Yet despite DCA’s commendable efforts to prevent bribery and corruption internally and externally, in countries where some form of corruption is the norm, this may prove hard to enforce.

3. To what extent are there mechanisms to ensure competence on gender equality and rights based commitment among DCA’s partner base?

When DCA enters into a relationship with a new implementing partner, local staff conducts a partner assessment as part of the PPM. Within this assessment there are questions on partners’ competencies on gender equality and rights. Where gaps are found, DCA can provide capacity building and encourage partners to join gender and rights networks. The DCA Gender and Equality Programme Policy also recommends that at the country level DCA ensures that they include at one organisation working on gender in their programmes. According to the Annual Programme Report, the Political Space programme (PT1) has the largest number of partners working on rights and gender. A quick review of DCA’s website also shows that the HIV/AIDS programme (PT3), due to the gendered nature of the epidemic, also have a large number of partners with a gender or women focus. However, the Food Security and Humanitarian Response programmes appear weaker at ensuring that their partners have gender and rights competencies. Also, in particular contexts, for example Central America and Uganda, it seems to have been more difficult to engage partners who had particular competencies on gender (Country Coordinator Focus Group and Kampala Gender Audit), whereas in other context such as Cambodia, which has a specific Gender Based Violence (GBV) programme, it works with a large number of organisations that have expertise in gender. The RR also has a strong influence over the composition of DCA partners, as noted in the recent COWI Evaluation on DCA’s Partnership Approach (2009), which noted distinct differences between the India and Malawi offices in terms of partner composition.

In the Audit questionnaire, in response to the question What obstacles exist when working with partners to implement gender equality and rights based commitments? (Question 16), staff gave a number of different answers to this question. The most common was cultural issues/fear of violating customs/traditions. Other answers included:

- Some partners may not be aware of gender equality rights-based approaches or not internalised them sufficiently in their work. Changes don’t come about quickly.
- Partners traditionally working with service delivery have difficulties in moving towards a more rights-based approach or moving into advocacy work.
- Lack of competencies in strategic planning and advocacy.
- Partners have poor M&E frameworks and skills
- Partners have limited understanding of gender equality and find it easier to embrace the rights-based concept. During the interviews, one country level programme officer
suggested that this may also be due to the fact that they saw gender equality as more threatening to the status quo than a rights-based approach.

- Partners have a different understanding of a rights-based approach to DCA, though this was not elaborated upon.
- For some partners gender was not a new concept and they made the assumption that they were doing well in terms of their gender commitment and not really monitoring their work in terms of gender.

Whilst there are mechanisms in place to assess gender and rights commitment amongst implementing partners, there do not appear to be specific mechanisms in place to address the extent to which DCA’s national partners have gender and rights competencies. For example, DCA’s Danish language website lists eight national partners\(^{26}\) that they work with. Whilst these have particular emphasis on children and youth organisations, including the girl scouts, there is no mention of the focus that these organisations place on gender equality and rights.

4. Mechanisms for facilitating the participation and influence of partner organisations in decisions taken as part of programme strategy development

The DCA Partnership Policy establishes an ideal of creating horizontal, rather than vertical, relationships between DCA and its partners. Currently, in relation to implementing partners, this appeals to be more of an ideal than reality. Partner platforms are the key means by which DCA implementing partners are able to participate in and influence DCA decision making. At these platforms, implementing partners for a particular DCA programme type (PT) meet together to discuss particular issues, including in some instances gender and rights, and share experiences and skills. However, according to the questionnaire responses, it appears that the extent to which the platforms have been able to function as decision-making bodies is limited. Staff wrote that it has been difficult to engage platforms in influencing broader DCA policy decisions and that a platform was not a formal DCA decision-making body, but if a partner took the initiative, it would be welcomed. Another staff member said that people who attend platforms do not represent the management of partner organisations. The COWI 2009 report on added value of partnerships stated that there was Little room for partners’ feedback….For partner organisations to systematically give feedback or undertake reverse monitoring of DCA no structure is in place. In the Zambia office, staff admitted that the first phase of programmes had not been very participatory and that on the whole, partners tended to tell them what they wanted to hear. However, they said that now that they know the partners better the second phase beginning in 2010 more participatory.

ActionAid is another international NGO which works primarily through partners. To ensure accountability to the poor and excluded people it has established an Accountability Learning and Planning System (ALPS). ALPS lays out a framework for involving communities and partner organisations closely in all aspects of ActionAid’s programme work, including: planning; budgeting; monitoring and reviewing. DCA could learn from examples such as ALPS, ways through which to involve partners and rights-holders more fully in its work. The core elements of ALPS are shown in Box 20.

---

\(^{26}\) These 8 partners include: FDF, De Grønne Pigespejdere (Girl Scouts), Spejderhjælpen (Scouts), Børn I Afrika, støttekredsen in Danmark, Meninghedernes Dageinstitutioner, KFUM of KFUK, Silkeborg Højskole, Y’s Men.
5. Mechanisms in facilitating the participation and influence of rights-holders in the development of programme and project strategies.

As DCA works through partners, the extent to which rights-holders are able to participate and influence the development of DCA programme and project strategies is limited. The only means by which they can do this is through informal contact with DCA staff, for example during monitoring visits, or indirectly through DCA’s implementing partners.

6. To what extent are there mechanisms and procedures for addressing grievances from partners, other external stakeholders and rights-holders

Complaints Handling System
DCA has a complaints mechanism, which has mainly arisen out of the HAP process. Complaints can be delivered hand written in complaints boxes, verbally or through specific complaints forms, which are available on the DCA website. There are two complaint forms available, one for external individuals and the other for DCA staff who receive a complaint to complete. Included on the form are questions relating to the nature of the incident and whether it is sensitive or confidential. As well as specific complaints relating to corruption, it also covers staff behaviour, including sexual exploitation and discrimination.

DCA’s Complaints Handling System began as a one-year pilot project in March 2009. The Midterm report to the board on this system (October 2009) states that there were 16 complaints received in Copenhagen between mid-March and end of September 2009. These range from complaints about DCA fundraising approaches, corruption and sexual exploitation. The report also comments on ways in which individual country offices have developed their own complaints systems Ethiopia, Angola, Cambodia. There is also a list of further countries to have a complaints handling system in 2010.

Whilst DCA is to be commended for establishing this process, local staff interviewed in the country offices thought that partners would be unlikely to complain as they saw DCA as a donor and would be reluctant to bite the hand that feeds them. Rights-holders were said to
be equally unlikely to complain for fear that the service provided by the DCA partner would cease. As DCA works through partners and has no direct contact with rights-holders, the only way through which rights-holders would be able to address a grievance would be informally when a DCA staff member conducted a monitoring visit in the field. It therefore seems necessary that DCA continue making available informal, face-to-face opportunities for partners and rights-holders to discuss complaints with DCA staff exist alongside the formal complaints mechanism.

Recommendations

- Through carrying out PGRAs at the country level DCA will be able to assess the extent to which partner organisations have discriminatory policies and practices.
- Encourage the use of Partnership Agreements when entering into relationships with new partners.
- Consider mechanisms through which DCA can ensure better partner and rights-holder participation and influence in developing programme and project strategies.
- In addition to the formal complaints mechanism, ensure that more informal, face-to-face opportunities for partners and rights-holders to discuss complaints with DCA staff exist alongside the formal complaints mechanism.
I: Organisational Culture

To what extent does DCA staff experience the culture of the organisation to be sensitive and respectful to all employees?

A full analysis of DCA’s organisational culture would require a deeper analysis and a different type of methodology to that which was applied in this Audit. Organisational culture is therefore only briefly discussed here.

The main issues with regard to this question are addressed in considerable detail in Section E. In response to Audit Questionnaire Q.17. *Does DCA promote equality for all in the workplace and ensure that there is no discrimination on the basis of gender, race/ethnicity, sexuality, HIV/AIDS status?*, all respondents said that they thought that DCA was sensitive and respectful to all employees and senior staff said that they tried to promote a culture of openness and participation. It is also worth adding the experience of the consultants who visited the HQ in Copenhagen. Particularly noteworthy was the time and effort that all staff who we met made in responding to the questionnaires circulated and in attending and contributing to the interviews and discussions held. Staff engaged in the process positively and saw the audit as an opportunity to reflect on their own knowledge, attitudes and practice. In virtually all of the interviews and discussions staff was proud to work for DCA because of what it stands for. One notable outcome of this pride and commitment was the fact that many staff have been with the organisation for long periods of time, often in a number of different roles.

The main problems that DCA faces with regard to the organisational culture are in extending this commitment and involvement in the organisation to the increasingly decentralised country and regional offices. Some of the specific problems that were communicated to us were:

- Lack of communication between departments, which can result in suspicion/tension.
- Country staff feeling that there is a family in Copenhagen, but that they are left out
- RRs feeling that they are left out of decision-making

Recommendations for Section E apply here as well.
Conclusions and Recommendations

This concluding section attempts to draw the different stages of the audit together. In general it can be concluded that:

- RBA is generally well understood in DCA and there is a clear commitment to taking the approach forward. As is discussed above, this understanding and commitment is linked to both the general ‘fit’ of RBA to DCA’s organisational values and the specific importance of the political space interventions in the programme, as the basis for the contextual analysis and as the ‘backbone’ of the programmes. However, there are still areas where this basic understanding and commitment can be strengthened, as set out in the specific recommendations below.

- Gender equality, by contrast, is much less well understood, although there are good examples in the organisation and the programme of a very clear commitment to the objectives in DCA’s policy. There are good examples in the programme, such as in Cambodia and India, although these often rely on personal commitment. DCA’s organisational commitment to gender equality in the workplace is clear, although there is still a need to continue with efforts to ensure that it is taken forward. Therefore, it is generally concluded that particular efforts need to be made to build understanding and strengthen commitment to gender equality.

There are two broad messages in the recommendations that are made as a result:

- The need for greater consistency in building the understanding of RBA and gender equality and in ensuring a commitment across the organisation; and,

- The need for increased accountability as a means for ensuring consistency. DCA needs to make a public statement of its accountability against its cross-cutting policy objectives and carry out transparent monitoring of its progress in taking these objectives forward.

Overall Recommendations

Overall it is recommended that DCA should develop:

iii) A framework of commitments on Gender Equality and Rights and

iv) A corresponding implementation plan for with clear commitments and indicators on Gender Equality and Rights for all of its departments and all programmes

This framework and plan for Gender Equality and Rights can be based on the HAP model and should become a central part of the 2011-15 Vision and Plan.

As part of the framework DCA should:

- Commit to programme and departmental Gender Equality and Rights self-assessments to establish a baseline

- Increase accountability for Gender Equality and Rights by devolving more responsibility to staff at Programme Officers level across all departments and in country offices

- Establish virtual support networks across the organisation on Gender Equality and Rights to help in sharing good practice and developing approaches to dealing with problems and obstacles

- Ensure more systematic analysis of issues of discrimination and inequality and better policy connection to formal mechanisms of the international human rights framework.

It is recommended that DCA should continue with the process of programme and departmental Gender Equality and Rights self-assessments, started in Uganda and continued in Copenhagen with this audit. These self-assessments provide an opportunity for staff to discuss and debate gender and diversity issues, something that is particularly important as DCA becomes a more international and diverse organisation through the process of decentralisation. The self-assessments should provide a clear idea of where the different departments and programmes in DCA currently are and provide an
opportunity to set out commitments for the future.

It is recommended that work to develop a framework of commitments and an implementation plan for Gender Equality and Rights should start from the bottom up, building on these self-assessments to set out a way forward. In turn, this process of setting out ways forward for individual departments and programmes will help to build understanding and ownership. Senior management in DCA should continue to play a supportive role, working to develop an overall framework of commitments and an implementation plan for regular review.

Within the programme it is recommended that Programme Officers should take on responsibility for all cross-cutting principles. The process of capacity-building of POs has already begun with training and workshops and there is a need now to find innovative ways to ensure that these opportunities are consistently provided. For example, virtual support networks across the organisation (such as those in GFU) and approaches such as Communities of Practice can be used to support POs in taking forward the programme commitments. PDU’s role should be focused on ensuring that all staff in DCA understand policies and the implications for their work.

**Specific Recommendations based on ToR categories**

Table X provides lists specific recommendations based on ToR category giving an indication of the level of priority each recommendation should be accorded (high or medium) and who is responsible for that activity. This can be used as a basis for further discussion, between the DCA Audit Team and more widely in the organisation.
## Table 2: Recommendations indicating priority and responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Recommendations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a framework of commitments and an implementation plan for gender equality and rights across all the organisation in all departments and programmes, based on the HAP Framework</td>
<td>High. Should be included in Vision and Plan 2011-2015</td>
<td>All, Senior Managers, PDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue Participatory Gender and Rights Audits in selected country offices</td>
<td>Medium. To be conducted when time allows as part of an ongoing process</td>
<td>RRs, CCs, POs, PDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission and Mandate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission and Purpose Statements in the next Vision and Plan to be more explicit about commitments to gender and rights and how they intend to address gender and rights in their work. This should also include a statement on how rights and gender fit with DCA’s Christian values.</td>
<td>High. Should be included in Vision and Plan 2011-2015</td>
<td>PTAs, Senior Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Plans and Budgets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider how the indicators and benchmarks for it gender and rights policy objectives can best be measured, including assessments of budget commitments.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>PTA, Senior Managers, PFU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a mechanism through which DCA’s work on gender and rights can be reflected in budget reporting, possibly through the new ERP financial system.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>PFU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM documents should be revised to ensure that they consistently refer to DCA’s commitments on rights-based approaches and gender equality.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>PDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDU should focus their efforts on simplifying the tools and guidance that are available to make them more accessible and useful and on ensuring that these procedures and tools are used.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>PDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Competencies and Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific responsibility for gender and rights to be included in senior staff job descriptions.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish database of gender and rights experts globally who could be used to provide context specific staff training</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>HR, POs, PTAs, RRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel and Work Place Practices, Procedures and Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start disaggregated data collection regarding staff recruitment, retention and promotion. Decide which indicators it would be most useful to collect data on (e.g. sex and ethnicity of managers) and set out a data collection plan. This may require the Diversity Committee to meet more regularly.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>HR, Diversity Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once data has been collected and analysed, where there are issues for concern, DCA could consider the possibility of affirmative action for under-represented groups.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>HR, Diversity Committee, Senior Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be more clarity around advancement opportunities, particularly for management positions and for programme officers. Where there are external restrictions on equal opportunities (e.g. work permits) these need to be made explicit. This could be done through an internal</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>HR, RRs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To demonstrate to others that DCA is an equal opportunities employer and is serious about investing in staff, apply for accreditation under an inter/nationally recognised scheme such as Investors in People.

Assess the possibility of establishing staff unions for locally employed staff.

### Communication and Advocacy Strategies and Materials

- **Provide local communications support for regional campaigns to allow for a better response to local efforts and the development of local advocacy and campaigning skills**
  - Medium. Part of an ongoing process
  - Comms Team, Regional Offices

- **Develop and conduct bespoke training session around rights and communications to assist in embedding how GRBA can be operationalised within communications work**
  - High
  - Comms Team, PTAs

- **Consider the possibility, including cost implications, of producing communications materials in alternative formats include large print and podcasts to allow access to a wider audience.**
  - Medium. Part of an ongoing process
  - Comms Team

- **Establish a feedback process to encourage rights-holder participation. Use best practice examples, such as the One Body campaign, to ensure that rights-holders are included in campaign materials.**
  - High
  - Comms Team, Regional Offices

- **Revisit the Communications Strategy and associated documents to ensure gender and rights issues are more effectively woven through the objectives, evaluation and key messages**
  - Medium
  - Comms Team, PTAs

- **Develop a comprehensive stakeholder analysis at both the country and organisational level. A large part of this work may already sit with Programme teams, but needs to be brought together and viewed through a communications lens**
  - Medium
  - Comms Team

### Fundraising Strategies and Materials

- **Analyse more fully the extent to which the 2012 fundraising strategy mainstreams gender and rights commitments and suggest concrete ways to ensure gender and rights based mainstreaming of fundraising activities, whilst focusing on the priorities of specific calls for proposals.**
  - High
  - GFU, PTAs

- **Within 2012 Strategy reporting system, include specific questions on the ways in which departments are using gender and rights approaches in fundraising materials/strategies could be posed**
  - High
  - GFU, PTAs

### External Communications and Stakeholder Relations

- **Encourage the use of Partnership Agreements when entering into relationships with new partners.**
  - High
  - Country Level Staff

- **Consider and establish mechanisms through which DCA can ensure better partner and rights-holder participation and influence in developing programme and project strategies.**
  - High
  - Country Level Staff, PTAs

- **In addition to the formal complaints mechanism, ensure that more informal, face-to-face opportunities for partners and rights-holders to discuss complaints with DCA staff exist alongside the formal complaints mechanism.**
  - High
  - Country Level Staff
Annex 1: Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

In its 2006-2010 organisational plan, DanChurchAid states that it will ensure that in all its activities it works from a rights-based perspective and for the equality between men and women. DanChurchAid is committed to working with rights-based development and gender equality as two important cross-cutting approaches. While DanChurchAid, particularly in relation to rights-based development, has had this as an intention for a number of years, it is only since 2001-2002 that the organization has been in the process of developing policies, programmes and systems to facilitate the translation of these policy intentions into practice. DanChurchAid’s first Gender policy was developed in 2006.

The above-mentioned cross-cutting approaches are described in two DCA policies: Rights-Based Commitment and Gender Equality. These two policies highlight the importance of both internal and external mainstreaming of the values inherent in both policies. This underlines the need to go beyond external programming and support and to examine the degree to which the organisation itself has internalised these values and standards.

DanChurchAid sees gender equality and rights-based development as complementary and therefore seeks in its training, its strategies and its tool development to ensure that both aspects are reflected and integrated.

DanChurchAid recognises that Rights Based Commitment and Gender Equality are issues that require broad organisational commitment. For this reason, DanChurchAid has decided to commission an organisational Gender and Rights Audit.

Gender and Rights audits have been derived from a growing awareness of the central role that organisational structure and culture play in the design and delivery of gender and rights sensitive programmes and projects. This is based on the recognition that in order to effectively work from a gender equality and rights-based development perspective, we need to set our own house in order, to “walk the talk” and address aspects of organisational culture that impact on gender equality, diversity and equal enjoyment of rights and privileges for all staff. It is also important that in our external relations with other stakeholders and the general public, that the values of our organisation in terms of the promotion and the respect of rights and gender equality is reflected.

DanChurchAid carried out a Participatory Gender and Rights Audit in one of its local offices the Kampala office in 2007. The audit report is attached as a background document.

In underscoring its rights based commitment, DCA has signed up to the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP), and thereby to the accountability and transparency principle of “making humanitarian action accountable to beneficiaries”. In DCA HAP is not only related to relief but an integrated part of the whole organisation. DCA received its official HAP certification in June 2008. Prior to this, DCA HQ and the Regional Office in Malawi were audited by the HAP certification team. The HAP audit report is attached as a background document.

Programme focus
Concurrently, DanChurchAid has moved from a project approach to a programme approach, in which partner support within particular programme types is now placed in an overall strategic framework with various partners and cross-cutting interventions contributing to the same overall development objective. The present working focus is within five programme types: Political Space, Food Security, HIV and Aids, Humanitarian Assistance and Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA). DCA has during the past 3-4 years launched around 25 partnership-based programmes to be administered together with partners mostly within development and some within humanitarian assistance. These programmes are developed based on context analyses, which to a greater or lesser extent have examined the relevant rights and gender issues in play.
Decentralisation

DanChurchAid is now decentralised with regional offices in 11 regions in Africa, Asia, and Latin America respectively. DanChurchAid works in a number of focus countries through a country office with international and local staff. In all focus countries, DanChurchAid is obliged to have one Political Space programme with one to three other programmes depending on the local context. Most of the current programmes are development programmes. Only recently a few relief programmes have been approved. The major bulk of DanChurchAid relief work is implemented through partners but not within the frame of a programme. Both in DanChurchAid focus countries where DanChurchAid has larger offices, and in countries where DCA does not have presence Humanitarian Assistance projects are implemented through partners.

Getting closer to DCA’s partners through presence and obtaining improved understanding of the local context are two key pre-requisites for improved dialogue with partners and thereby strengthening the DCA value added aspect. Understanding the local context is a pre-requisite for working rights based.

2012 growth objective

DCA board has set an ambitious growth objective and strategy called “2012”. The aim is to increase the annual turnover from DKK 350,000,000/400,000,000 to DKK 700,000,000 by the end of 2012. It is of importance to DCA to maintain a strong focus on gender equality and rights-based development simultaneously with these fundraising goals.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE GENDER AND RIGHTS AUDIT

The overall objectives for this Gender and Rights Audit will be twofold as follows:

a) Strengthened awareness within DanChurchAid of the degree to which the organisation has mainstreamed gender and rights-based perspectives internally within the organisation
b) Recommendations for concrete areas for improvement and possible tools to remedy gaps identified in terms of the mainstreaming of gender and rights-based perspectives internally within the organisation.

3. SCOPE

The audit shall focus on DanChurchAid as an organisation, both at head office in Copenhagen and at the decentralised level. However, the auditors are not expected to visit any decentralised offices but will instead involve a representative sample of no more than 3 decentralised offices and staff through questionnaires, phone conversations, document reviews etc. DanChurchAid’s international programme support will only be assessed from the entry point of the current systems, procedures and mechanisms that are meant to ensure the integration of gender and rights based perspectives in this work. It is therefore not expected that the content of DCA programmes be assessed beyond whether the established DCA programme framework is an adequate mechanism for facilitating the mainstreaming of gender and rights-based development. The impact of DanChurchAid’s support will not be analysed in this exercise.

The following main organisational areas will be in focus for the Gender and Rights Audit:

A DanChurchAid’s Mission and Mandate
B DanChurchAid’s Organisational Plans and Budgets
C DanChurchAid’s International Work
D DanChurchAid’s Staff Competencies and Commitment to Rights-Based Development and Gender Equality
E DanChurchAid’s Personnel and Work Place Policies, Procedures and Practices
F DanChurchAid’s Information, Advocacy and Fundraising Strategies and Materials
G DanChurchAid’s External Communication and Stakeholder Relations
H DanChurchAid’s Organisational Culture

The audit will have a particular focus on the last four areas which have not to date been systematically analysed from a rights-based and gender equality perspective.
A DanChurchAid’s Mission and Mandate

- To what extent does the organisation’s mandate and mission indicate a commitment to gender equality and rights-based development?

B DanChurchAid’s Organisational Plans and Budgets

- To what extent does DanChurchAid’s Vision and Plan part II, including budget, reflect a rights-based and gender equality perspective?
- Do selected activities from the Vision and Plan document reflect this priority?

C DanChurchAid’s International work

- To what extent does DCA have adequate strategies, procedures, tools and learning mechanisms in place to ensure that DanChurchAid’s international work within development, humanitarian assistance and humanitarian mine assistance is conducted from a rights-based development and gender equality perspective?

D DanChurchAid’s Staff Competencies and Commitment to Rights-Based Development and Gender Equality

- To what extent is competence on rights-based development and gender equality taken into consideration and given priority in staff recruitment?
- Is competence and commitment on rights-based development and gender equality ensured within the organisation at the relevant level in keeping with the functions of different staff?

E DanChurchAid’s Personnel and Work Place Policies, Procedures and Practices

- To what degree is the principle of non-discrimination respected in employment and recruitment procedures, advancement, and access to training, remuneration and benefits (based on objective criteria)?
- To what extent are work conditions just and favourable for attracting a diverse workforce (working hours, overtime, vacation etc)?
- To what extent is the freedom of association and right to collective bargaining respected for all employees?
- To what extent does the organisation protect its employees from physical, verbal, sexual, or psychological harassment, abuse, or threats in the workplace?
- To what extent does the organisation ensure access to relevant information for all staff?
- To what extent is there transparency in the organisation’s decision-making, including use of financial resources?
- To what extent does the organisation ensure adequate staff participation in decision-making? WHO is excluded? Is this related to functions, objective criteria or to other factors?
- Does the organisation have mechanisms for resolving grievances of all staff members in a non-discriminatory way?
- Does the organisation’s staff find that there are barriers to equal opportunities (gender, ethnicity, etc) within the organisation across all levels of responsibilities?

F DanChurchAid’s Information, Advocacy and Fundraising Strategies and Materials

- To what extent are procedures in place to ensure the consideration of rights-based development and gender equality perspectives when prioritising and developing advocacy issues and campaigns?
- To what extent are rights-based development and gender equality issues reflected in selected advocacy, communication, and international and national fundraising strategies?
- To what extent does the organisation ensure that gender equality and rights-based development is reflected in its advocacy, information and fund raising materials and activities?
- What particular barriers in the above, if any, can be identified?
G DanChurchAid’s External Communication and Stakeholder Relations

- To what extent are there procedures and guidelines in place to ensure that DCA does not work with suppliers and donors (government, corporate etc.) whose policies and practices violate human rights and are discriminatory (gender/other identities)?
- To what extent does the organisation work to ensure a bribery and corruption-free practice.
- To what extent are there mechanisms to ensure competence on Gender Equality and rights based commitment among DCA’s partner base?
- To what extent are there mechanisms in place for facilitating the participation and influence of partner organisations in decisions taken as part of programme strategy development?
- To what extent are there mechanisms in place for facilitating the participation and influence of rights-holders in the development of programme and project strategies?
- To what extent are there mechanisms and procedures for addressing grievances from partners, other external stakeholders and rights-holders.

H DanChurchAid’s Organisational Culture

- To what extent does DCA staff experience the culture of the organisation to be sensitive and respectful to all employees?

4. METHQD

The method that the auditors intends to use should be clearly developed in their proposals and will be a determining factor in the choice of consultant for this task.

The auditors can use a range of methods including documentation review, semi-structured interviews, questionnaires, individual discussions, workshops for selected groups of staff and focus group discussions etc. Relevant international human rights and ILO standards are expected to be key tools in the methodology.

Participatory tools will be highly valued. It is further important that the combination of methods chosen facilitate adequate cross-checking of information to ensure the representativity and accuracy of the findings. The auditors are not expected to analyse all DCA documentation but rather to present their selection criteria to ensure adequate representativity of the organisation’s work.

Selected staff will be made available for interviews, focus group discussions and for short workshops. However, in order to avoid gender and rights fatigue that can be detrimental in the follow-up process, it is recommended that the interviews and workshops are carefully planned and well-targeted in order to avoid unnecessary drawn-out processes. A careful and representative selection of staff for workshops or interviews needs to be a key aspect of the methodology.

The Kampala Rights and Gender audit report and the HAP audit report findings should be taken into account and be included as a point of departure in this audit in order to avoid double work and to secure the broadest possible material for learning.

5. TEAM COMPOSITION

The team should be composed of two consultants. The team should have the following competencies:

Extensive knowledge of gender equality analyses and tools. Experience from carrying out previous gender audits will be prioritised.
Extensive knowledge of UN human rights standards, ILO standards and of rights-based development Communication and Marketing expertise and knowledge of assessing information and campaign materials from a gender and human rights sensitive perspective. Since most of DanChurchAid’s campaign and information materials are in Danish, capacity to read and analyse Danish texts will be needed in at least one of the team members.

A staff member from Human resource department and the two advisors, one on Right Based Commitment and one on Gender Equality, will be available to participate in the team, where there is no
conflict of interest. However, the audit report and its findings and recommendations will be the sole responsibility of the two external consultants.

A team with one person from each department headed by the Head of administration department will follow the process from discussing the TOR to the final debriefing to ensure broad organisational ownership of the process.

6. EXPECTED OUTPUT

The following output is expected:
A Gender and Rights Audit Report containing findings, recommendations and suggested implementation tools, where these are found lacking.

7. ACTIVITY PLAN AND TIME SCHEDULE

The work at Head office is planned to be carried out as one consecutive period from the 21st September to the 2nd October 2009 (10 working days). The first draft report must be submitted, at the latest, two weeks after finishing the audit process. DanChurchAid has three weeks to comment on the first draft. The consultant must submit the final draft report no later than two weeks after receiving DanChurchAid comments. We estimate that the audit will be completed in 35 man working days including preparation and reporting.

8. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTATION

It is to be noted that this list is not exhaustive and that not all material is meant for analysis some are meant for providing the team with information on organisational practices and priorities. All the below documentation is available through this link:

www.danchurchaid.org/sider_paa_hjemmesiden/procurement/current_opportunities_1/participatory_gender_and_rights_audit

Audit reports
Kampala Gender audit
HAP Audit report

Vision and Plan documents:
Vision and Plan 2007-2010
International Seminar 2008, minutes
Board Minutes
Management Minutes

DCA programme policies:
Political Space Policy
Food Security Policy
HIV and Aids Policy
Humanitarian Assistance Policy

Cross Cutting Policies:
DCA Partnership Policy
DanChurchAid Rights-Based commitment Policy

DanChurchAid Gender Equality Policy

Procedures and Tools for International Work
Intranet-based PPM for Development, Humanitarian Assistance and Global Funding Unit - will be provided to the successful consultant
Gender and Rights Audit Manual
Rights and Gender Self-Assessment
RBA and Gender Project Check List

HMA documents - will be provided to the successful consultant
Human resource
Personnel
Organogram
Staff manuals – DCA HQ staff manual will be provided to the successful consultant
Mangfoldighedspolitik
HIV and AIDS staff policy
Prevention of sexual violence policy
Trivselsundersøgelse - will be provided to the successful consultant
Trivselsplan

Central documents from Advocacy, information and fundraising work
DCA Communications Strategy
DCA Research papers - please refer to www.noedhjaelp.dk
DCA articles and opinion letters - please refer to www.noedhjaelp.dk
NØD and DCA website - please refer to www.noedhjaelp.dk
General Fundraising and presentation material - please refer to www.noedhjaelp.dk
Selected campaigns and information material - please refer to www.noedhjaelp.dk
Annex 2: Best Practice Case Studies

Details of best practice both within DCA and external have been included as part of the main report. A list of the different case studies and web links to where more information can be found are provided below.

DCA Case Studies

- Zambia Office In-House Communications
- One Body Campaign
- DCA Diversity Policy
- DCA Staff Policy on HIV/AIDS
- Give a Goat
  [http://www.danchurchaid.org/where_we_work/asia/india/read_more/giving_goats_in_india](http://www.danchurchaid.org/where_we_work/asia/india/read_more/giving_goats_in_india)
  and
- DCA Ethical Guidelines for Business Partnerships and UN Global Compact
  [http://www.unglobalcompact.org/AboutTheGC/TheTenPrinciples/index.html](http://www.unglobalcompact.org/AboutTheGC/TheTenPrinciples/index.html)

DCA Partner Case Studies

- ACT International Gender Policy
- APRODEV Joint Position Paper on Rights-Based Development from a Faith-Based Perspective

External Case Studies

Mission and Mandate

- Oxfam Strategic Plan 2007-12
- ActionAid International Strategy 2005-10

Diversity

- UK Foreign Office Diversity Report 2008
- DFID’s Diversity Strategy can be found at
Partnerships
Ensuring greater partner participation and accountability

- ACTIONAID ALPS
  [www.actionaid.org/assets/pdf/ALPSENGLISH2006FINAL_14FEB06.pdf]

Communications and Advocacy

- Gender and Media Advocacy Toolkit developed by World Association for Christian Communication

- UNESCO RBA training manual for Viet Namese journalists - would need to be modified to be relevant to different local settings.
  [http://www2.unescobkk.org/elib/publications/228/HRBA-Journalism.pdf]

- CARE international training manual ‘An introduction to Human Rights Issues’, which utilises communication tools (letters and articles) through which a RBA is analysed.

- CARE International - concrete examples to share its RB approach to poverty, but also to highlight the issues around poverty and How it affects women and men.

- Amnesty International, Building Ireland’s Future

Knowledge Networks and Communities of Practice

- Primer on UNDP Networks, including success factors and tips:
  [http://www.km4dev.org/forum/topics/undps-How-to-launch-a-network]

- Tips, advice and further links on setting up and running Communities of Practice:
  [http://www.knowledgeboard.com/cgi-bin/item.cgi?id=378]
Annex 3: Tools

Questionnaire
(Questions that were not well answered and could be omitted in future are highlighted in red)

Danish Church Aid Participatory Gender and Rights Audit: Self-Assessment Questionnaire

**Background:** You may be aware that Social Development Direct is currently undertaking a gender and rights audit for Danish Church Aid. The purpose of this audit is to:

- Understand the degree to which Danish Church Aid has put gender and human rights perspectives at the centre of its work and activities.
- Recommend areas for improvement and possible tools to remedy gaps identified in terms of mainstreaming gender and rights-based perspectives internally within the organisation.

As part of the audit we have developed a staff Questionnaire to collect information on staff attitudes, perceptions and behaviour relating to gender equality and rights. We would be grateful if you could fill in the questionnaire below. There is a general set of questions for all staff to answer plus additional questions for senior management and regional office staff to complete.

**Name:**
**Sex:**
**Nationality:**
**Position in DCA:**
**Briefly describe your roles and responsibilities:**

**A. General Questions for All Staff**

*Your knowledge of gender equality and right-based approaches within DCA*

1. What do you understand by a gender equality and rights-based approach?

2. Are gender equality and rights-based development a core component of your work?

3. What are the main gender and rights issues relating to your work?

4. What is your understanding of DCA policies on gender equality and rights-based development?

5. Do you feel that the organisation is sensitive and respectful to all employees?

*Incentives and resources to address gender equality issues*

6. Do you think gender equality and rights-based development is seen as a priority in DCA’s work?

7. What motivation is there for you to address gender equality and rights issues in your work?

8. What resources and support do you need to help you include gender and rights in your work?
9. Does DCA provide adequate resources and support to enable you to include gender equality and rights in your work?

10. Does anyone within DCA have responsibility for ensuring gender equality and rights issues are adequately addressed?

11. Where does information on gender equality and rights in DCA come from?

12. Are there any obstacles to monitoring and evaluating the impact of DCA’s programmes/policies on gender equality and rights-based development?

**Working with others to promote gender equality and rights-based commitment?**

13. Do you think DCA is known as an organisation which promotes gender equality and rights based approaches through its development and humanitarian work?

14. Do you feel confident explaining DCA’s gender equality and rights based commitments clearly to the partners you work with?

15. What support have you provided to partners to implement these commitments?

16. What obstacles exist when working with partners to implement these commitments?

**Gender equality and rights in the workplace**

17. Does DCA promote equality for all in the workplace and ensure that there is no discrimination on the basis of gender, race/ethnicity, sexuality, HIV/AIDS status?

18. Please provide an example of any policy or practice that you think improves equality within DCA’s office.

**B. Additional Questions**

**Senior Management**

1. To what extent do you consider gender and rights issues when making decisions on strategies, policies and budgets?

2. To what extent are gender equality and rights issues taken into account regarding recruitment, retention and promotion of staff?

3. How do you ensure that there is transparency in the organisation’s decision-making, including use of financial resources?

4. How do you ensure adequate staff participation in decision-making?

5. How are decisions taken to promote gender equality and rights based development put into action?

**Staff in Regional Offices**

1. What are the key gender and rights issues in your region?

2. Which organisations are most active in promoting equality between women and men and
for promoting the rights of minority groups within your region?
  a) Donors:
  b) Government departments:
  c) Civil society organisations:

3. To what extent do you feel consulted regarding key decision made in DCA?

4. Is DCA working on any activities to promote gender equality and rights at a national level?

5. Are partner organisations able to influence decision making at DCA and How?
# Annex 3: Tools

## Framework for Document Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core elements</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>To Some Extent</th>
<th>No info</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Explanatory Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A: Mission and Mandate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do mandate and mission documents indicate a commitment to gender equality and rights-based development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do principles to which DCA adheres have a commitment to gender equality and rights-based development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there direct or indirect references to human rights documents and human rights principles in mission documents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B: Organisational Plans and Budgets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do Vision and Plan objectives and activities reflect rights-based and gender equality priorities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the current budget reflect gender equality and rights-based priorities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is there a specific budget line for projects targeting women/ men/ minority groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the 2012 strategy reflect gender equality and rights-based priorities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are there specific fundraising goals for gender equality and rights-based development within the 2012 Strategy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C: International Work (Development, Humanitarian Assistance, Humanitarian Mine Assistance)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Policy and Programme Analysis</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have DCA policies incorporated a gender equality and rights perspective?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have policy and programmes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o identified those most affected/discriminated against</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o identified the different needs and interests of women/girls and men/boys within these groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o identified which rights are violated in relation to the men/boys and women/girls within these groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o identified the underlying causes and barriers of rights abuses and violations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o drawn on national legislation, policies, human rights instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o analysed relevant state and non-state actors with responsibilities and power to make needed changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Policy and Programme Objectives</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do objectives address the interests and rights of the most discriminated and deprived groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the objectives address the different interests and rights of women and men within these groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the overall objectives address gender equality at a structural level?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the other objectives address equality of access and control over resources, equal participation in decision making and women’s political influence, active involvement of men in promoting gender equality,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
systemic gender-based discrimination?
Do the overall objectives address increased enjoyment of rights?
Do the other objectives address increasing rights claiming, strengthening institutional actors and frameworks, increasing access to justice, increasing opportunities and access to resources and services?

**Policy and Programme Activities**
Is attention paid to gender equality and rights-based development in the following way:
- specific activities addressing gender inequalities at structural level
- women’s specific activities
- men’s specific activities
- mainstreaming for gender equality
- activities addressing practical gender needs
- activities addressing strategic gender interests
- empowerment/capacity-building activities for rights-holders
- policy and advocacy activities
- capacity-building of duty-bearers
- human rights activities
- access to justice activities

**Monitoring and Evaluation**
Are indicators rights-based and gender specific?
Is data systematically disaggregated by gender/ethnicity/minority groups?
- Are changes resulting from work reported according to specific discriminated groups and gender disaggregated?
- Is there a specific mechanism through which research can be conducted on gender equality and rights-based issues on a regular basis?
### D: Staff Competencies and Commitment to Rights-Based Development and Gender Equality

**Key Documents:** Personnel list, Staff CVs, Job Adverts, HR recruitment policy, Diversity Policy (*Mangfoldighedspolitik*), Guidelines on Capacity Building

- To what degree is the principle of non-discrimination respected in employment and recruitment procedures, advancement, and access to training, remuneration and benefits (based on objective criteria)?
- Does DCA have an Equal Opportunities Policy?
- Is competence on rights-based development and gender equality taken into consideration and given priority in staff recruitment?
- Is competence and commitment on rights-based development and gender equality ensured within the organisation at the relevant level in keeping with the functions of different staff?
- Is every staff member supposed to address gender equality and rights-based development?
- Is there evidence (for example in assessment forms), that staff bring into practise and prioritise their knowledge about gender and rights issues?
- Does the organisation plan and regularly organise capacity development for the staff on gender and rights issues irrespective of their responsibility and position?
- Is capacity building geared towards increasing knowledge and skills to address gender and rights issues and to motivate staff members to address such issues?
### E: Personnel and Work Place Policies, Procedures and Practices

**Key Documents:** Job Descriptions, Staff Welfare Policy, Prevention of Sexual Violence Policy, Staff Complaint Mechanism, Staff manuals, HIV/AIDS staff policy, Intranet, Management documents, Board minutes, *Trivelsesplan* (well-being plan), *Trivelsesundersøgelse* (staff satisfaction survey), Performance Review Forms, Learning and Quality Assurance doc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Issues</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Does staff experience barriers to equal opportunities?</td>
<td>- Are gender and diversity interests of staff taken into consideration?</td>
<td>- Is access to assets and facilities based on entitlements and function opposite to individual privileges?</td>
<td>- To what extent are work conditions just and favourable for attracting a diverse workforce (working hours, overtime, vacation etc)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grievances</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- To what extent does the organisation protect its employees from physical, verbal, sexual, or psychological harassment, abuse, or threats in the workplace?</td>
<td>- Does the organisation have mechanisms for resolving grievances of all staff members in a non-discriminatory way?</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Can staff make use of grievance mechanism irrespective of their gender and other identities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- To what extent is there transparency in the organisation's decision-making, including use of financial resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• To what extent does the organisation ensure adequate staff participation in decision-making? WHO is excluded? Is this related to functions, objective criteria or to other factors? Are gender and rights issues put on the agenda of meetings? Are decisions taken to promote gender equality and rights based development related to programmes and partner relations put into action? Are decisions taken to promote gender equality and rights based development related to programmes and partner relations? Are decisions taken at partner platforms considered in the decision making meetings at DCA? Are the opinions and views of rights-holders put on the agenda and discussed in decision making meetings of DCA? Are decisions taken to promote equal opportunities for all staff irrespective of gender and other identities? Are the decisions taken to promote equal opportunities for all staff irrespective of gender and identities put into action?

F: Information, Advocacy and Fundraising Strategies and Materials


• Are procedures in place to ensure the consideration of rights-based development and gender equality perspectives when prioritising and developing advocacy issues and campaigns? 
• Are rights-based development and gender equality issues reflected in advocacy, communication, and international and national fundraising strategies?
• Does the organisation ensure that gender equality and rights-based development is reflected in its advocacy, information and fund raising materials and activities?
• Are there barriers in mainstreaming gender equality and rights-based perspectives in advocacy, communication and fundraising strategies?

**Internal Information Sharing**
Are decisions and actions taken disseminated to all staff in the organisation?
• To what extent does the organisation ensure access to relevant information for all staff?
Is the language used in internal DCA information material gender sensitive and non-discriminatory?

**G: External Communication and Stakeholder Relations**

**Key Documents:** Contractual documents, Partnership policy, Anti-corruption policy and reports

• Are there procedures and guidelines in place to ensure that DCA does not work with suppliers and donors whose policies and practices violate human rights and are discriminatory?
• Does the organisation work to ensure a bribery and corruption-free practice?
• Are there mechanisms to ensure competence on gender equality and rights based commitment among DCA’s partner base?
• Have partner organisations been informed about the DCA gender equality and rights-based commitment policy?
• Are there mechanisms and procedures for addressing grievances from partners, other external stakeholders and rights-holders?
<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Has DCA supported partners’ capacity development on gender equality and rights-based development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is there evidence that partners have influenced DCA policies and strategies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Is there evidence that partners feel shared ownership of the programme platform and that they influence the agenda?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Are there mechanisms in place for facilitating the participation and influence of partner organisations in decisions taken as part of programme strategy development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Are there mechanisms in place for facilitating the participation and influence of rights-holders in the development of programme and project strategies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Are gender and rights-based commitment and competences prioritised in partner selection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Do TORs specifically ask for gender and rights expertise and addressing gender and rights issues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Are there mechanisms in place to ensure priority is given to working with women’s organisations and minority groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Are there mechanisms to ensure that rights-holders participate in needs assessments, project implementation and M&amp;E procedures?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Are there mechanisms to ensure that partners are involved in the development of DCA policies and strategies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Are there mechanisms in place to ensure that DCA reports back to rights-holders on initiatives taken?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H: Organisational Culture
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Documents: Questionnaire, Notice board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Does DCA staff experience the culture of the organisation to be sensitive and respectful to all employees?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do core values reflect gender and rights principles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do core values appreciate learning, sharing and team work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is high priority given to gender equality and rights-based development in the organisation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4: Questionnaire Analysis

Questionnaire Analysis
A total of 38 response out of 47 questionnaire sent out were received (81%). Responses received from all departments except for local consultants. Including three country offices:
1. Zambia (Africa, country office, relatively old)
2. Cambodia (Asia, country office, old office)
3. Kyrgyzstan (Central Asia, regional office, new office)

There was an impressive 100% response from the country offices.

Table 3 below shows a breakdown of staff that replied to the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>M – 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F - 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish – 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambian – 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian/ Zambian -1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American -1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian – 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian – 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Board - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Office – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Department – 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy &amp; Communications – 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Hand SHQp – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretariat - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Board – 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Management – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Management – 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fundraiser – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement Officer - $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme Officer – 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance Officer – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global Funding Officer – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme Assistant – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head 2nd Hand shop – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Representative - 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Findings:
- Country office staff seemed to find questions relating to GE and RB issues easier to explain, more relevant to their work, and were better able to provide concreted examples. In contrast, administrative, shop, fundraising and Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) staff found questions harder to answer or not applicable to their particular role.
- Generally the RBA appears to have been better understood and internalised than GE.
• The Prog Development Unit (PDU) is largely seen as having specific responsibility for mainstreaming GE and RBA within DCA, although many also said that all staff have a responsibility.

• Obstacles to monitoring and evaluating the impact of progs/policies on GE and RBA development included poor staff capacity, weak M&E tools, problems with partners.

• 2/3 of those that responded thought DCA was known for having GE and RBA, whilst 1/3 did not.

• 2/3 of those that responded were confident of communicating GE and RBA to partners, 8 were not.

Findings by Question:

A: General Questions for All Staff

Knowledge of gender equality and right-based approaches within DCA

1. Understanding of GE and RB approaches
All except one person attempted to answer this question. Most respondents were able to answer this question in their own words, though there were some who sounded as though they were repeating something directly from DCA’s policies. In general, country office and senior staff were able more in depth answers than other staff and to provide specific examples. Most common answers on GE included: equal opportunities for men and women; one human right among many; and about not discriminating by gender. Most common answers on RBA include: discussion of relationship between rights-holders and duty-bearers; reference to specific human rights instruments; being about entitlements rather than recipients and as an alternative approach to handouts. One respondent referred to the RBA being the corner stone of our programme work.

2. GE and RB development as core components of respondents’ work.
8 staff members (21%) did not see GE and RB development as a core component of their work. This included staff from HMA, Fundraising, Procurement and the Second Hand Shop. In 2 cases this was related not to rights but specifically to gender (Kyrgyzstan and Communications).

3. How do you integrate GE and R issues in work? Use an example to explain
Table 4 below shows examples of the ways in which DCA integrate GE and R’s issues into their work.

Table4 : Examples of ways in which DCA staff integrate GE and R’s issues into their work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/ Country</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Zambia:             | Gender Equality:  
|                     | PT1 partner Zambian National Women’s Lobby – getting more women into leadership positions – 50/50 campaign at elections.  
|                     | Positive discrimination in recruitment  
|                     | PT4 – HIV/AIDS programme focuses on prevention of mother to child transmission virus  
|                     | Rights:  
|                     | PT4 - HIV/AIDS programme partner Churches Health Association has integrated rights approach into community awareness work – produced advocacy strategy at national level to claim better use of funds for health sector. |
| Cambodia:           | Gender Equality:  
<p>|                     | Analysing gaps to address gender and rights issues. Awareness raising, training, advocacy, training curriculum and tools from short term consultant |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Rights:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>Involve beneficiaries in project design and processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All partner projects under ABS prog include assessment of needs/ claims of RH and identification of DB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Main Gender and Rights issues relating to work**

Most gave some examples. 1 said there were no issues (administration), 1 said N/A (board) and 1 did not understand the question. Country offices were better able to provide concrete examples.

**Zambia**
- Gender: women little voice and access to economic, political power. Gender discrimination widespread in rural areas.

**Cambodia**
- Gender: Lack understanding in Cambodia re difference gender and sex
- Rights: Land rights

**Kyrgyzstan**
Traditional attitudes, patriarchal society, soviet inheritance

**International Dept**
Unequal access. Culture, tradition, legal issues, issues relating to vulnerable groups

**ProLog**
Ensure equal opportunities for all and that meet their requests for commodities

5. **Understanding of DCA policies on GE and RB development**

All except 2 staff knew of the policies. 1 said didn’t know about them which was due to own fault (admin), the other did not understand the question. 1 said it was not helpful to have a lot of policies and 2 referred to DCA policies being too long. 1 said they worked within larger international frameworks, not necessarily focussed on DCA policies.
Incentives and resources to address gender equality issues

6. GE and RB priority?
Only 1 person thought that GE and RBA were not priorities on their own but part of DCA’s general perspective (shop). 20 thought that GE and RBA were seen as DCA priorities, 2 thought so strongly. 4 thought they were to a certain extent, but that there were either challenges of putting them into practice particularly with regard partner projects or that there were competing agendas at a policy level. Some said that they were seen as priorities in some countries, progs and projects, though not in other areas not key priority. Some staff referred to gender imbalances in DCA staffing, eg lack of female staff at top management level and lack of male staff in service group in HQ.

7. Motivation
The majority of staff were motivated to address GE and R issues in work due to their personal conviction that these are important in development and because they saw it as part of being a good professional. Only three people were not motivated to address these issues in their work (shop, fundraising) Additional reasons for staff motivation included that women are often the best promoters of development and can become significant drivers of change and that as gender inequality is one of the most substantial hindrances to long term development, through using a GE approach results can be produced. Others also commented that DCA needed to distance itself from the perception of ‘doing good’ and rather to address issues as part of a large picture of global injustice. Some staff mentioned that there is less motivation for promoting GE, whilst there is a strong motivation for using a RBA.

8. and 9. Resources and support used
The majority of staff said that they used technical support and tools from PDU. Only 1 staff member said had not used any of these resources (shop) and 1 staff member did not know what resources were available (HMA). Carol and Elsebeth were specifically mentioned as providing support. Other support was found from:
- Policy documents
- Training
- Project approval procedures steps 0,1,2
- External advice
- Gendernet
- Prog approval committee
- Aprodev - Gender and Food security group and Karin Ulmer from Aprodev Secretariat
- International Standards (HAP)

Limitations to support included:
- Lack of capacity building and using HQ gender resource
- Lack of training at management level
- HR Unit provide support, but G&R focus seems less profound
- Limited PDU resources

10. Who has responsibility for ensuring GE and RBA addressed
Many said that responsibility lay with all staff, though over half of respondents thought that responsibility lay with PDU through policy making, support and quality. Responsibility was also thought to belong to:
- Unofficially programme officers for the Cambodian GBV prog
- HR dept at HQ
- RR
- Management – as is CC concern
11. Information on GE and R in DCA?

12. Obstacles to monitoring and evaluating the impact of DCA’s programmes on GE and RB development

Partners

Obstacles given included:
- Working through partners - Limitations in partners understanding and competencies
- DCA funds progs jointly with other donors and may be difficult to trace impact back to DCA specifically. Might be cultural resistance from other partner orgs
- Some partner countries restrictive (Ethiopia, DRC)
- Difficulties in identifying duty-bearers directly responsible
- M&E tools - Lack of systematic tools to collect gender info. No tools to monitor gender at prog level
- Lack of concrete examples
- Wish PTAs had more time in regions
- Weak staff capacity - tools more developed than Human resources work with
- Typically linked to other issues – food security, humanitarian response etc – so cannot be measured and evaluate independently
- Change happens over time
- Lack of Funds

Working with others to promote gender equality and a rights-based approach

13. DCA known for work on GE and RBA?
The majority of staff said that DCA was known for its work on GE and RBA, though primarily with partners, back donors and the ACT community. Several people said that DCA was not known for its work beyond these groups and was known more for its RBA than GE.

14. Able to communicate DCA’s commitments to GE and RB with partners?
8 respondents said that they would not be able to communicate DCA’s commitments to partners. Whilst other staff members said that they would be able to communicate DCA’s commitment to partners, several, including senior management, said that their knowledge could be improved.

15. Support to partners
6 staff members did not think that much support had been provided to partners on GE or RBA or that this question was not applicable to them. These included those working on HMA and Fundraising. Of those that had provided support to partners these included:
- Ongoing dialogue
- Tailored capacity building
- Training
- Funding
- Programme platforms
- Advocacy
- Contact to other partners and actors
- Cooperation agreements
- Consultations

16. Obstacles with partners
A number of different answers were provided to this question. The most common was ‘cultural issues/ fear of violating customs/ traditions’. Other answers included:
• Some partners may not be aware of gender equality or not internalised them sufficiently in their work. Changes don’t come about quickly.
• Partners with a traditionally working with service delivery have difficulties in moving towards more RB approach or moving into advocacy work.
• Lack of competencies in strategic planning and advocacy.
• Partners have poor M&E frameworks and skills
• Partners have limited understanding of GE and find it easier to embrace RBA concept
• Partners have a different understanding of RBA to DCA

Gender equality and Rights in the workplace

17. Sensitive and respectful to all employees
All respondents thought that DCA was sensitive and respectful to all employees. Senior staff say that they try to promote culture of openness and participation. 1 staff member referred to possible discrimination against women due to staff policy regarding the medical insurance scheme:

_Sometimes our office introduces administrative procedures that unintentionally reinforce structural gender discrimination against women staff. For example, in Zambia, the child’s father is the only one legally allowed to obtain a birth certificate for a child and yet the newly introduced DCA staff requirement for eligibility to a DCA funded medical scheme is that all employees should submit birth certificates for their children. Though on face value this requirement could promote greater accountability and transparency, it also reinforces gender discrimination because female employees could be discriminated against simply because their spouses or partners are not interested in getting birth certificates for their children._

18. Promote equality in workplace?
All respondents thought that DCA promotes equality in the workplace, though 3 thought that whilst this was generally true it could be improved or that there might be ‘subconscious’ discrimination. There were 2 comments regarding lack of transparency regarding salaries. Ways in which equality is promoted included:
• Policies available to all staff, occasions to reiterate policies and implications.
• Women encouraged to apply - progressive maternity/ paternity benefits.
• Making conscious effort to recruit female staff in important positions in ROs and have positive policy about HIV status
• Not in so many words directly, more implicitly

Possible issues of inequality:
• _In Cph, just all white folks....except for the cleaning ladies - DCA is still a very provincial organisation_
• _Possible discrimination at subconscious level – DCA is Christian org and people might hesitate to apply for jobs if are non-Christians/ muslims_

19. Example of policy/ practice that improves equality
Policy/ practice already in DCA:
• Staff manual
• Recruitment Policy
• HR policies
• Implementation of DCA procurement manuals in all ROs
• Positive discrimination in country office regarding recruitment of women

Ideas for future initiatives:
• Need to Develop female leaders eg flexible working hours, self-assertion training, welcome women with a lot of initiative
• A few ‘non-all-white-Danes’ in management positions

Findings of Questions for Specific Staff

Senior Management

Gender and R issues used when making decisions?
On the whole senior management said that they did consider G and R issues in decision making and that Gender and RBA included and budgeted through annual V&P process. They also thought that the Comms Strategy strong on RBA

GE and R issues taken into account in recruitment, retention and promotion of staff?
In general management said that they will recruit best qualified person, but attempt a balance of genders

Transparency in decision making
Ways in which transparency was achieved in decision making included:
• Decisions circulated in organisation
• Accessible minutes of board meeting
• Staff rep on board.
• Transparent accounting system.
• Open approach to media.
• HAP certification
• Complaint mechanism
• Anti-corruption policy

Ensuring adequate staff participation in decision making
• Leading staff participate in board meetings along with ‘other relevant staff’
• From board member:
• 2 elected staff reps, one serves on board. Both have full voting rights
• Through depts. staff involved in process of consultation and decision making
• Staff represented on board and council. Monthly meeting in work council.
• Practice of dialogue based management
• Participatory processes

How decisions put into action?
No-one answered this question. Either didn’t understand or left blank

Advocacy, Media and Fundraising Staff

• Regional staff say ‘unfortunately do not deal with communication. This is dealt with by HQ’
• Comms strategy does not deal with GE and R issues adequately
• Regional offices asked for input, not included in decision making.

Staff in Regional Offices

Key gender and rights issues in region
Strong understanding from Cambodia on gender due to the GBV programme
*Men are gold and women are cloth*
Zambia:
Gender:
- Traditional practices affect women’s access to land/property.
- Infringe reproductive rights
- Low representation of women in parliament
- Poor implementation of laws on gender

Rights:
- Social, economic and cultural rights not part of bill at right in Zambia.
- Basic needs not adequately addressed, particularly rural.
- Large distance between population and formal decision-makers
- Relationship between trad and stat. Governance unclear.

Knowledge of other partners working on GE and R issues.
Programme officer staff provided a range of comprehensive answers to this questions

Working on activities to address gender at national policy level
Yes -2

Feel included in key decision making
About 50% of staff felt included in decision making and 50% did not. Some mentioned lack of consultation by head office or the Country Representative

Partner platforms
Many said that platforms were not formal DCA decision-making bodies. However, if a partner takes initiative, this is welcomed eg advocacy strategy on OVCs. Other answers included: Difficult to engage platforms in influencing broader DCA policy decision in influencing broader DCA policy decision and People who attend platforms do not represent management of partner orgs.
### Annex 5: List of Staff Interviewed

#### Copenhagen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Dep</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit Team + DCA team</td>
<td>28.9.</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>PBL - office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrik Stubkjær, General Secretary</td>
<td>29.9.</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>Henrik’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaus Løkkegaard, Dir., Development</td>
<td>29.9.</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>PBL-office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten Lund Larsen, Chair, DCA Board</td>
<td>30.9.</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>PBL-office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mads Klæstrup Kristensen, Dir., Advocacy &amp; Comm.</td>
<td>29.9.</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>PBL-office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Dep., Focus Group Discussion</td>
<td>30.9.</td>
<td>9-10:30</td>
<td>PBL-office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Coordinators, Focus Group Discussion</td>
<td>30.9.</td>
<td>10:30-12</td>
<td>PBL-office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hum Mine Action+Hum Response Focus Group Discussion</td>
<td>30.9.</td>
<td>14-15:30</td>
<td>PBL-office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progr Finance Unit, Focus Group Discussion</td>
<td>1.10.</td>
<td>10:30-11:30</td>
<td>PBL-office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medie&amp;Advocacy + National Fundraising, Miniworkshop</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>11:30-13</td>
<td>PBL-office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Duelund Jensen, Head, Global Funding Unit</td>
<td>1.10.</td>
<td>14-15:30</td>
<td>PBL-office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Dev Unit, Focus Group Discussion</td>
<td>2.10.</td>
<td>9-10:30</td>
<td>PBL-office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prolog meeting</td>
<td>2.10.</td>
<td>10:30-11:30</td>
<td>PBL-office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Workshop, DCA HQ</td>
<td>2.10.</td>
<td>13-14:30</td>
<td>Tutu meeting-room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-briefing, whole Team</td>
<td>2.10.</td>
<td>14:30-15:30</td>
<td>PBL-office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SKYPE INTERVIEWS

**Senior Management**

Peter Bo Larsen, Director, Secretariat
Christian Friis Bach, Director, International Department

**Kyrgyzstan**

Tatiana Kotova, RR
Pia Dyrhagen, Programme Officer
Aikanash, Finance Officer

**Cambodia**

Carsten Trier Høj, RR
Ly Sunlina, Programme Officer
Chiv YouMeng, Programme Officer

Zambia
Uffe Gjerding, RR
Valerie Chanda Chibuye, Programme Officer
Anna Murru, Programme Officer

India
Nina Ellinger, South Asia RR
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**Human Resources Documents**
Rekrutteringspolitik, Oktober 2007
Mangfoldigheds politik (Diversity Policy)
Staff Manual for DCA Regional Offices – Guidelines
Annexes for Staff Manual:
   i) DCA Staff Welfare Policy
   ii) International Code of Conduct for Humanitarian Aid
   iii) DCA Staff Policy to Prevent Sexual Exploitation
   iv) DCA HIV/AIDS Staff Policy
   v) Security Guidelines
   vi) Complaint Mechanism
   vii) Principle of Salary Scale
   viii) DCA Recruitment Policy
Staff Manual for DCA main office – on DCA intranet
Trivselsmål og handlingsplan 2008-2010 (Staff well-being objectives and action plan 2008-2010)
Overview of Local Competence Development Plans 2008 (and 2009) – Needs involving HQ
Overview of Local Competence Development Plans 2008 (and 2009) – Needs involving HQ
TOR Competency Committee
DCA Structure and Organograms
TOR Competency Committee
Midterm report on DCA’s Complaints Handling Systems (October 2009)

**Job Descriptions**
Development Director
Humanitarian Response Director
International Director
Director of Secretariat
Head of Fundraising and Networks
Head of Popular and Church Networks
Regional Representative for Cambodia
Regional Representative for The Great Lakes
International Administrator
PT1 Zambia

**Job Advertisements**
NGO Forum Coordinator
RR for Sudan
Web Administrator

**Partnership Documents**
Partnership Cooperation Agreement from Valerie Zambia
Partnership Policy for International Cooperation
Anti-Corruption Policy
Anti-Corruption Report
HAP
COWI, 2009, *DCA Partnership – any added value?*
APRODEV, Rights Based Development from a Faith Based Perspective, 2008
Fundraising Documents
Global Funding Unit
GFU check list system 2009
GFU definitions – planning
GFU Global Funding action plan – Latin America 2006
GFU Global Funding overview Malawi 2008
GFU HRU roles and responsibilities
GFU project planning

Communication and Media

English Documents
- Visions for the Advocacy team 2007-2008
- Corporate unit description
- Organogram (online)
- DCA English Website
- Articles online:
- 22.07.2009: Rebuilding Life after the cyclones
- 20.07.2009: Culture and development in Zambia
- 26.06.2009: From Battlefield to Cornfield
- 11.06.2009: Into the prison
- 11.06.2009: Even paper is not allowed
- 11.06.2009: A Lifeline of Tunnels
- 11.06.2009: An Absurd Solution
- 04.06.2009: Rebuilding Lives and HQpe after Tsunami
- 29.05.2009: ACT Alliance: Giant global humanitarian body to be created
- 28.05.2009: Time to wake up and smell the climate change
- 28.05.2009: Empowering widows and single women in Rajasthan
- 20.05.2009: Report on armed violence in Burundi
- 15.05.2009: Youth and Agriculture can change Africa
- 20.05.2009: Economic Empowerment of Women Conference
- 15.05.2009: Struggle for land of the Saharia tribe in Southern Rajasthan
- 05.05.2009: The Worst Place on Earth
- 01.05.2009: ACT International to unify with development network
- 08.04.2009: 4 years since the worst accident in DCA history happened
- 09.03.2009: GDR analysis: Denmark’s role in a climate constrained world
- 04.03.2009: Families fight to get their land back
- 02.03.2009: More people helped the poor
- 14.01.2009: The Strong State
- (As well as a selection of articles on the issue specific pages)
- Annual Report 2008
- DCA Good Practices – Emails, Meetings, Deadlines
- Advocacy – V+P Activities Goals and Activities 2009
- Corporate - V+P Activities Goals and Activities 2009
- Web orientering
- DCA Added Value – COWI evaluation
- DCA Newsletter – 30 September, 2009
- Fighting Aids/HIV worldwide
- Fighting Poverty Worldwide
- Zambia code of conduct
- DCA Vision and Plan 2008 Part II
- Travel Plan for Uganda 0309 hungerclimate
Supplier registration form
- Summary of the Thematic Review of Danish Church Aid “Organizational Decentralization and HIV/AIDS”
- Participatory Gender and Rights Audit Manual
- Gender self assessment tool
- Quality Standards and checklist
- Standard ToR Programme Evaluation

Danish Documents
- Communication Strategy
- Nielsen imageanalyse FKN 2009
- Corporate policy
- Opdrag til DKM.BJC 24.06.06
- Samarbejdsaftale – DKs kirkelige Mediecenter
- NØD –March 2009
- Communication Plan Roskilde Festival
- Handlingsplan
- Mediestrategi

Management Documents
Board minutes 4 February 2008
Board Minutes 25 April 2008
Board minutes 25 June 2008
Management minutes 28 March
Management forum meeting 160909
Management forum meeting 230609
Management forum meeting 300609
Management forum meeting 180909
TOR Management Forum March 2008

International Seminars
International Seminar minutes 2008
International Seminar 2009 agenda
International Seminar June 2009

Strategy papers
Vision and Plan 2007-2010 –part 1
Vision and Plan 2007-2010 –part 2

Policies
DCA Policy on HIV and AIDS
DCA Policy on Humanitarian Assistance
DCA Policy on Political Space
DCA Policy on Right to Food
DCA Policy on Partnership
DCA Policy on Rights-Based Commitment
DCA Policy on Gender Equality
Humanitarian Mine Action Policy

Monitoring and Evaluation
Annual Report 2007-8
Global Annual Prog Report 2008
Evaluation guidelines
Evaluation policy
2012 Report May-Sept 2009
English ESCR Interior Round1 – Courts and the legal enforcement of economic, social and cultural rights

**Audit Reports**
Kampala Gender Audit
HAP Audit Report

**Programme Docs**
Prog Doc Malawi Food Security Programme Strategy
Prog Doc Palestine gender programme 2008
Prog Doc PT1 Political Space Burma May 2009
Prog Doc Cambodia HIV/AIDS
Prog Doc Zambia political space

**Specific Gender and Rights tools**
Gender and Rights – Outline Equality and non-discrimination – workshop sessions
Gender and Rights – checklist for rights and gender projects
Gender and Rights – Rights and Gender self assessment with five questions
Gender and Rights – Targetting session exercises – workshops
Gender and Rights Audit Manual

2008 anti-corruption report
Anti-corruption policy
Humanitarian Accountability Framework 2008
## Annex 7: Bonuses 2008-9

### Tillægsforhandlinger 2008-09

#### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Antal ansatte på AC-vilkår (2007)</th>
<th>%-vis fordeling, mænd/kvinder i FKN</th>
<th>Antal Ansøgninger</th>
<th>Ansøgninger i % af kvinder/mænd ansat</th>
<th>i % af samlede antal ansøgninger</th>
<th>Antal personer der får tillæg</th>
<th>Beløb i DKK</th>
<th>i %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kvinder</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>150,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mænd</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I alt</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Oversigten viser at genderbalancen er rimelig, bortset fra en - vigtig - detalje. Mænd er mere flittige til at søge.

#### Type af tillæg:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Antal</th>
<th>Beløb i DKK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engangs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varigt</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>213,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I alt</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>285,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engangstillæg: 8 stk. tillæg af 9.000 DKK
Varige tillæg: 9 stk. tillæg af 15.600 + 2 stk. tillæg af 21.600 + 1 stk. tillæg af 30.000