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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARV</td>
<td>Anti-Retroviral (drugs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNPCAN</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPA</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>DanChurchAid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KADP</td>
<td>Karamoja Agro-Pastoral Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRGI</td>
<td>Minority Rights Group International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLWHA</td>
<td>People Living With HIV and AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRGA</td>
<td>Participatory Gender and Rights Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT 1</td>
<td>Political Space Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT 4</td>
<td>HIV and AIDS Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UJCC</td>
<td>Uganda Joint Christian Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>Uganda Land Alliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

A Participatory Gender and Rights Audit (PRGA) was carried out from 1 – 20 November for DanChurchAid (DCA) Kampala office by a team of six: two staff members of the DCA Kampala office, two staff members of DCA Headquarters, one staff member of the DCA Ethiopia office, and an external team leader. A PRGA is a self assessment methodology aiming to improve the performance of an organisation, its policies and programmes within the context in which it operates. The PGRA also aims at individual and organisational learning through the involvement of the staff and other key stakeholders in the assessment process.

The main question the PGRA wanted to answer is “to what extent are DanChurchAid’s gender equality policy and rights-based commitment policy mainstreamed in DCA Kampala office”. The audit looked into the internal affairs of the Office – such as staff competence, its systems, decision making, culture - and into two of its programmes: the Political Space Programme (PT1) and the HIV and AIDS Programme (PT4). Since the programmes are implemented by partner organisations, special attention was paid to the choice of partners and the relationship between DCA Kampala office and the partners.

The audit team developed a checklist with key elements and guiding questions to direct its information collection and to systematise its findings. It used three main methods of information collection: document review of key documents produced by and used in DCA Kampala office; semi-structured interviews of key informants; workshops for staff of DCA Kampala office, staff of partner organisations included in PT1 and PT4 and rights-holders of both Programmes.

The audit team formulated nineteen recommendations to put DCA’s Gender Equality and Rights-based Commitment policies more effectively into practice in DCA Kampala Office’s work and its workplace (see chapter III.1). The debriefing session at the end of the audit was a first step for DCA Kampala staff towards translating relevant recommendations into an action plan. The staff prioritised the audit team's recommendations and suggested concrete actions (see chapter III.2).

The most critical findings/ conclusions were:

- DCA Kampala office has some focus on rights and gender and wish to strengthen this which was evidenced by the commitment to carry out a gender and rights audit.

- DCA Kampala staff has more emphasis on rights based commitment than on ensuring the integration of gender equality within its rights-based work. Gender equality issues are felt to be more difficult and HQ guidelines felt to be less developed on gender equality.

- Staff considers addressing gender issues as an ‘add-on’ and that the problem for the staff in using a gender lens in their work is rather the “how to do it” than a matter of knowledge and commitment. DCA Kampala Office’s culture of mutual respect, sharing of information and resources, and participation is an excellent start for strengthening its gender and right-based profile and addressing gender inequality in its programmes.

- DCA Kampala office’s contacts with relevant gender and human rights networks and government institutions at the national level leaves much to be desired. DanChurchAid appears not to be well-known among organisations and institutions outside its partner base,
• Both Programme strategies have taken steps to be in line with the Rights-Based Commitment policy.

• There was a problem with targeting of right holders in both programmes. PT 1 programme did not distinguish between men and women among the right holders and both programmes only to a limited extent identified the most vulnerable among the group of rights holders chosen.

• Partners in both programmes mainly address gender issues as women’s rights and not broader issues of gender inequality. Partners have very few activities that involve men in actively promoting gender equality.

• Contrary to the Gender Equality policy the Office has not included in its partner portfolio an organisation working on gender equality issues at the national level.

• The PT 1 programme strategy appears to be gender blind, both in relation to the group of right holders, objectives and indicators. However looking at the implementation level, partners are ahead of the Uganda Political space Strategy when it terms of integrating gender aspects. However, there still appear to be weaknesses in addressing gender-based violations that only affect men or only affect women within the group chosen.

• The PT 4 programme strategy has some focus on gender but not very systematically. The composition of the HIV and AIDS partner portfolio is highly skewed towards partners who address access to basic health services through service delivery.

• There is a number of good and relevant capacity development activities for partners under the Programmes related to rights-based commitment and gender equality. However, capacity building of partners to date has largely been event-based training workshops for individuals within partner organisations which prevent a good trickle down into the whole organisation.

The most critical recommendations were:
• Programmes should reflect a gender perspective in their rights-based strategies, addressing power relationship between men and women and including men in activities that promote gender equality

• DCA Kampala office should include in the Terms of Reference for the upcoming review of the Political Space Programme and in the ongoing review of the HIV and AIDS programme the manner in which gender equality issues, including the specific rights violations faced by men and women, can be strengthened in a possible revised Programme strategy

• DCA Kampala office should give more priority to networking with relevant national gender and human rights organisations. Broader contacts may contribute to knowledge and information sharing greater visibility and perhaps joint actions

• DCA Kampala office should reconsider the geographical balance of its HIV and AIDS Programme between Rakai and Teso/Karamojo. New partners could be identified that work in the Teso/Karamojo region

• DCA Kampala office should only take on new partners under the HIV and AIDS Programme with strong capacities on gender equality and rights-based strategies.
• Partner dialogue includes discussions not only on rights-based issues but also gender equality.

• DCA Kampala Office should develop a coherent competence development plan to ensure that capacities are built on 1) how to apply a gender perspective in rights-based development, 2) how to address gender inequality through specific actions at national level, and 3) how to mainstream gender and rights in the way of working of the Office (which includes systems, procedures, tools).

• DCA Kampala office should give one staff member on a rotational basis the specific task to look from a gender and rights perspective at each issue on the agenda of decision making meetings, to ensure more effective mainstreaming of gender equality and rights-based commitment.

• DCA Kampala office should develop a mechanism to ensure consistent, systematic and conscious learning on gender and rights issues within the Office, building on the existing practices such as access to/participation of all staff in training, the joint discussions in the Project Committee, end-of-the year reviews, retreat, and the like.

• DCA Kampala office should review job descriptions to ensure that tasks include attention to mainstreaming to right-based and gender equality and all future advertisements for staff positions include commitment to gender equality and rights-based development.

• All DCA Headquarters’ policies on working conditions and facilities (including the grievance mechanism) are introduced to and discussed within the DCA Kampala office and put into practice with action plans where needed.

• DCA Kampala office includes in all TORs for consultancies, reviews and evaluations both rights and gender equality perspectives in relation to competences needed, issues to be addressed, and the like.

The main report gives the background and further details about the PGRA in the introductory chapter I. The second chapter presents the main findings and conclusions of the audit team which form the basis of the recommendations in chapter III. This last chapter also includes the recommendations which according to the staff of the DCA Kampala office should get priority for action.
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I. Introduction

1. Background

As stated in its 2006-2010 organisational plan, DanChurchAid will ensure that in all its activities it works from a rights-based perspective and for equality between men and women. For DanChurchAid, gender and rights-based strategies, methods and tools are complementary to each other. Recently, DanChurchAid has moved from a project approach to a programme approach. Partner support within particular sectors is now placed in an overall strategic framework with various partners and cross-cutting interventions contributing to the same overall development objective. The programmes are developed based on context analyses, which to a greater or lesser extent have examined the relevant rights and gender issues at play.

DanChurchAid wished to explore to what extent its programmes work from a rights-based and gender perspective. To answer this question DCA opted to use a self assessment methodology, the so-called participatory gender and rights audit (PRGA). In this type of self-assessment a number of stakeholders are invited to express their views on the performance of the organisation, its policies and programmes within the context in which the organisation operates. They could be staff of the organisation concerned, from support to management staff, partner organisations, rights-holders and duty-bearers. The core of the audit takes place in stakeholder workshops. Participatory methods used in these workshops help the participants to critically assess what they are doing, how it is done, why it is done in that particular way, what the results are, how they relate what they are doing to what others are doing and how and where they can improve. This critical reflection does not only lead to suggestions for improvement, but also to individual and organisational learning. Such learning promotes a more effective dealing with all kinds of challenges in the organisation’s environment. The self-assessment is based on the principle that adults learn best when the learning is based on concrete experiences in their personal and professional lives. Through reflection and exchange they are able to translate these experiences into more abstract and generalised conclusions, which can then be translated into proposals for change through experimentation.

The adult learning cycle (experiential learning cycle):

```
1. Direct experience
2. Exchange/reflection
3. Generalisation/Conceptualisation
4. Application
```
The following outcomes of a PRGA can be expected:

- Recommendations on how to improve the organisation’s and programme performance. The translation of the recommendations into an action plan is the responsibility of the leadership of the organisation concerned in close consultation with and with support from staff of DCA Headquarters.
- A common understanding and a shared basis for improvements among staff.
- Increased staff’s enthusiasm for working on gender equality and rights-based development.
- A more gender and rights responsive organisational culture.

A team composed of staff of the organisation concerned and external members (amongst others the team leader) carry out a PGRA. Such a team helps to bring in external views while building on internal knowledge and experiences. Apart from the outcomes already mentioned, the staff members of the audit team will have increased their capacity to carry out gender and rights audits, or at least, to use methods promoting reflection, analysis of experiences and learning for change in other settings.

2. The Participatory Gender and Rights Audit in Uganda

The DanChurchAid Kampala office indicated interest in being part of the Participatory Gender and Rights Audit in order to be able to strengthen their rights and gender work within two of their programmes in Uganda: the Political Space Programme (PT1) and the HIV and AIDS Programme (PT4). It did not include Humanitarian Work and the Regional Strategy. The PT1 and PT4 programmes have been developed based on a context analysis and are in the first phases of their implementation. The Political Space Programme is currently focused on the Karimojong for a) strengthening their influence on legislation and policies and b) increasing their access to resources. The HIV and AIDS Programme focus on young people in particular young women’s vulnerability with a geographic focus on Kagera-Rakai and Teso-Karamoja regions.

The Participatory Gender and Rights Audit was carried out from 1 – 20 November in Uganda by a team of six: two staff members of the DanChurchAid Kampala office, Vincent Abura and Edwin Kayuki, two staff members of DanChurchAid Headquarters, Elsebeth Gravgaard and Carol Rask, one staff member of the DanChurchAid Ethiopia office, Senait Ayalew, and an external team leader, Verona Groverman, Verona Groverman Consultancy. Annex 2 gives the time schedule and programme of the audit.

Summarising the above, the Participatory Gender and Rights Audit in Uganda had four purposes.

- Firstly, it should strengthen awareness and skills within the DanChurchAid Uganda office for supporting gender and rights-based work within its organisation and two programmes (PT1 and PT4).
- Secondly, it should contribute to increased capacity of five DanChurchAid staff to carry out gender and rights audits.
- Thirdly, it had to help DanChurchAid to more systematically identify and address gaps in its policies, programmes and practices.
- Fourthly, the audit was meant to test the applicability and relevance of the methodology for DanChurchAid as a whole. To that end the methodology and different tools used have been critically assessed during the audit process.

In annex 1 the Terms of Reference of the audit can be found.
3. Assessment framework of the Participatory Gender and Rights Audit

The main question the PGR-Audit wanted to answer is “to what extent are DanChurchAid’s gender equality policy and rights-based commitment policy mainstreamed in DanChurchAid Kampala office – both its organisation and its programmes”. It concerns issues such as:

- equality of access and control over resources between marginalised/discriminated male and female rights-holders
- equal participation of marginalised/discriminated female and male rights-holders in decision-making
- political influence of marginalised women
- active involvement of men in promoting gender equality
- elimination of systemic gender-based discrimination
- rights claiming by marginalised/discriminated male and female rights-holders
- laws, policies and attitudes and practices at the level of the duty-bearers
- access to justice by discriminated male and female rights-holders
- gender and rights sensitivity of the DanChurchAid Kampala office’s systems & procedures, practices, information management, decision making and culture.

The focus of the audit was the DanChurchAid (DCA) Kampala office. The team was particularly interested in the extent to which this office deals with gender and rights issues in the context in which it operates. The audit therefore looked both into the internal affairs of the Office – such as its systems, decision making, culture - and into its two programmes PT1 and PT4. Since the programmes are implemented by partner organisations, special attention was paid to the choice of partners and the relationship between DCA Kampala office and the partners. This framework of assessment is visualised below.

In line with this framework the audit team developed a checklist with key elements and guiding questions to direct its information collection and to systematise its findings (see also annex 3):

1 DanChurchAid. Programme Policies
A. Analysis of gender and rights issues, gender and rights debate in the context in which the programmes are executed
B. Mainstreaming rights–based commitment and gender equality into Policy and Strategies (Policies, Programmes, and Projects)
C. Mainstreaming rights-based commitment and gender equality in partner choice
D. Mainstreaming rights-based commitment and gender equality in partner relationship
E. Gender/ rights competence, capacity development and staff’s commitment
F. Information and knowledge management for supporting rights-based commitment and gender equality
G. Systems, procedures and tools in use for supporting rights-based commitment and gender equality
H. Decision making in the organisation
I. Organisational culture
J. Perception of achievement

4. Approach of the Participatory Gender and Rights Audit in Uganda

The PGRA methodology is based on the Manual for Participatory Gender Audit developed by Hettie Walters (1999). Elsebeth Gravgaard and Carol Rask with inputs from Hettie Walters adjusted this manual to include rights issues. The draft Manual for Participatory Gender and Rights Audit was to be tested and refined during the audit in Uganda by the two DCA Headquarters staff and the team leader.

The audit team collected information about the key elements using three main methods:
- Document review of key documents produced by and used in DanChurchAid Kampala office to get an impression of what the Office is doing, how it is doing it and to what effect. It also served to cross-check the qualitative self-assessment findings. A document analysis sheet was prepared to guide the review.
  The Kampala Office staff members in the audit team collected the following documents: annual plans and reports; programme documents, including log-frames; minutes of relevant Partner Platform Meetings; job descriptions; project/partner documents; project evaluations; staff manual and staff policies. In annex 4 a list of documents reviewed is provided.
- Semi-structured interviews of key informants to gain information about the context in which DanChurchAid Kampala office operates. See annex 2 for the organisations that have been visited.
- Workshops for staff of DanChurchAid Kampala office, staff of partner organisations included in the PT1 Programme and the PT 4 Programme and rights-holders of the PT1 and the PT4. The audit team prepared a detailed training design for each of the workshops with assignments and handouts for the participants. The team selected methods from the twelve methods described in the draft Manual to collect the perceptions and views of the participants. Annex 5 gives the methods selected for each workshop.

The audit took a total of twenty days. It included the preparation of all activities mentioned above and the training of the audit team by the team leader in the design of the workshops and the use of the methods where required. Each method selected was adjusted to fit the programmes of DanChurchAid Kampala office as well as the participants of the workshop concerned.

In the next chapters of this report the team presents the findings and conclusions of the audit. The last chapter contains recommendations and the reactions of the staff of the DCA Kampala office that were given during the debriefing session on the last day of the audit.
II. Findings and Conclusions of the Participatory Gender and Rights Audit

In this chapter the audit team presents its findings and conclusions for each of the key elements of the checklist of the assessment framework. In the next chapter the recommendations are given. The findings are based on the views and opinions of a number of people with whom the audit team interacted: staff of DCA Kampala office and of its partners, rights-holders and key informants. Based on these qualitative findings the audit team has drawn conclusions which have been discussed with the DCA staff during a debriefing session. Their comments have been worked into the text.

A: Analysis of gender and rights issues, gender and rights debate in the context in which the programmes are executed

Projects and programmes are executed in a national or regional context. It is in this context that the organisation aims to contribute to gender equality and further the enjoyment of rights for marginalised/discriminated groups. To correctly assess the organisation’s contribution, it is necessary to look within the particular context at what the organisation is actually doing and proposing and to the extent its programmes reflect relevant gender and rights issues, build upon opportunities and address constraints. The audit team interviewed various people in Uganda to better understand the context and DCA’s niche of operation. It also reviewed two key documents concerning the programmes executed in Uganda: the Political Space Programme 2006 -2008 “DCA Integrated Community Development and Advocacy Programme” and the HIV and AIDS Programme “HIV/AIDS Competence for Prevention, Care& Mitigation of Effects”.

A: Main Findings

1. The Political Space Programme and the HIV and AIDS Programme are based on rights-based context analyses as per the DanChurchAid rights-based context guidelines. Both programmes include an analysis of the legal and policy environment and a reasonable assessment of the relevant duty-bearers. Both programmes refer to the Ugandan Constitution and national policies. However, the programme analyses do not indicate where there may be gaps in Uganda’s implementation of its human rights obligations under international and regional human rights instruments.

2. The analysis in the HIV and AIDS Programme document specifies the manner in which HIV and AIDS affects male and female groups differently and the different groups of men and women that are most affected. Interviewees stated that women in Uganda were the most affected group, particularly women in fishing communities and women in conflict areas due to the prevailing gender relations. A particularly discriminated group in Uganda are homosexuals, as revealed in stakeholder interviews and ongoing debates in the Ugandan media. This latter group has not been included in the HIV and AIDS programme analysis.

3. The HIV and AIDS Programme focuses on Kagera/Rakai and Teso-Karamojo. Interviews with stakeholders stated that the HIV and AIDS response in Teso-Karamojo was still limited and much needed. External stakeholders questioned a heavy concentration of activities in Rakai where there is allegedly a saturation of NGOs working with HIV and AIDS. DCA’s partners work in remoter parts of Rakai where less NGOs operate. One partner works with women within fishing communities in the Lake Victoria region in Kagera-Rakai but it does not use strategies specifically addressing gender inequality.

4. The Political Space Programme is based on a rights-based analysis which has identified the Karimojong as a particularly discriminated group in Uganda and Northern and North-
East Uganda as the poorest regions. Gender inequality in the Karamoja region is mentioned but the analysis does not systematically assess the different needs and interests of men and women within this group, specific gender-based violations nor the prevailing gender roles and power relationships. According to the interviews with external stakeholders, Northern and North-East Uganda belong to the poorest regions and the Karimojong’s livelihood strategies were not recognised in the prevailing development discourse in Uganda. They also pointed to specific gender-based right violations, particularly in relation to women’s rights, in this region e.g. female genital mutilation, domestic violence/rape, bride price which does not appear to be addressed in the Uganda Political Space strategy.

5. Interviews by the audit team revealed that DanChurchAid was not known by those organisations/insitutions that were not DCA partners e.g. National Aids Commission and the Uganda Human Rights Commission. Discussions with staff of DCA Kampala office confirmed that the Office had limited contacts with relevant networks and institutions beyond its partner base. Contacts with and knowledge of gender organisations and networks were particularly weak.

6. During the partner workshop many of the Political Space partners appeared to have contact with each other but also with other organisations and coalitions. This included networking with leading gender coalitions such as UWONENT. Many Political Space partners said they were in dialogue with government institutions but they also said that the flow of information was one-way i.e. towards the government institution. Two partners spoke of a two-way flow with government institutions i.e. UJCC with the Parliament and ULA with the Ministry of Land. Dialogue with and access to information from the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Affairs was a challenge for most Political Space partners.

7. The partner workshop revealed that partners in the HIV and AIDS Programme are networking primarily at the district/local level. Contacts with government seemed mostly to be related to co-ordination and monitoring of activities. Only One organisation was networking with local government institutions for advocacy purposes (CIPA). None of the partners seemed to prioritise networking with national organisations nor contacted relevant national government actors. A potential new partner ANNPCAN had regular contacts with the police and courts of law on rights-protection issues. One partner said it had strategic relationships with gender and rights capacity-building organisations.

A: Main conclusions - Looking at the way the PT1 and PT4 Programmes analyses reflect critical gender and rights issues and the broader gender and rights debate in Uganda the team concludes the following.

1. The Political Space Programme does appear to address the main rights deficits that affect the Karimojong as a minority group. While the analysis is strong on assessing the structural causes for this marginalisation, it has a more limited analysis of the causes and impact of marginalisation on different groups within the Karimojong. The legal and policy environment and relevant duty-bearers in this regard are not adequately assessed nor are Uganda’s specific human rights obligations reflected on in this regard. The Programme has not fully analysed whether there are specific rights violations that only affect men or only affect women within this group, such as rape/domestic violence and female genital mutilation.

2. The HIV and AIDS Programme has analysed the most affected groups of men and women and their respective situation with regard to HIV and AIDS. Concerning its target groups, women in conflict situations are not clearly targeted in the Programme strategy, while women within fishing communities are planned to be included. Both groups of women are considered to be particularly vulnerable in the Ugandan national context.
3. The DanChurchAid Kampala office’s contacts with relevant gender and human rights networks and government institutions at the national level leaves much to be desired. DanChurchAid appears not to know and not to be known by relevant organisations and institutions outside its partner base. Staff members of the Kampala Office confirmed this low visibility. Broader contacts may contribute to knowledge and information sharing, perhaps joint actions and moreover to greater visibility. Partners though, more especially various Political Space partners, seem well-connected to national gender, human rights, and advocacy networks and address Parliament and relevant Ministries, while HIV and AIDS partners are primarily networking at the district level.

B: Mainstreaming rights-based development and gender equality into Policy and Strategies (Policies, Programmes, and Projects)

One of the key questions the audit wished to answer was to what extent gender equality and rights-based commitment are mainstreamed in the Political Space Programme and HIV and AIDS Programme. In the previous section (A) the question was addressed to what extent the context analyses on which both programme strategies are based reflect critical gender and rights issues in Uganda, more particularly in the areas in which the programmes are executed. This section B focuses on the programmes’ objectives and related indicators, rights-holders and duty-bearers to which the efforts are targeted, and the allocated budgets in order to assess the degree of mainstreaming of relevant gender and rights issues into strategies and projects.

B: Main Findings

1. The Political Space Programme addresses critical rights issues of a group who are facing continuous systemic discrimination and rights violations, the Karimojong. Objectives address access to productive resources, including land, increasing rights claiming of the Karimojong, and mobilising legal and moral duty-bearers.

2. The Political Space Programme so far has not integrated a gender perspective into its rights-based strategy i.e. it can be considered gender blind. Its objectives are very general and do not address the gender problems as they are identified in the analysis. Neither objectives nor indicators are gender-specific, i.e. referring to men’s and women’s situation within the socio-cultural context.

3. The HIV and AIDS Programme is working mainly with long term partners who engage in HIV and AIDS service provision, in line with the first objective of the Programme. The other three objectives that would make the programme more rights-based and add a stronger gender perspective are covered by few activities. The Programme to a very limited extent includes issues of access to and control over resources. Rights and gender issues are not addressed in a very focused and strategic manner.

4. When looking at the implementation level of the Programmes, most partners carry out some form of context analysis. Differences between partners were observed in the thoroughness of gender analyses and the analysis of rights issues, the policy and legal environment, and the relevant duty-bearers. Partners incorporating gender (e.g. KADP) seem stronger on gender analyses, particularly at the community level, but are weaker than policy and human rights partners in the rights analysis. The latter organisations in turn, seem weaker on gender analyses (e.g. MRGI). For some national advocacy and human rights organisations weaknesses are also seen in relation to their analysis of the impact of poverty and marginalisation on different groups (UDN, ULA). It appeared furthermore, that Political Space partners do not adequately analyse the different interests of different groups, including gender and other identities. Although these partners feel they have a focus on women’s empowerment (economic, legal and political), it is not clear the degree to which women from marginalised groups are also included. Indicators to measure change within rights-holders groups are not developed.
Partners feel that the lack of properly specifying rights-holders and gender in the objectives and indicators could be one of the reasons why gender and diversity issues tend to disappear during project design.

5. The projects of the *HIV and AIDS Programme* mainly focus on women as rights-holders although this is not always a conscious choice. Gender inequalities are not systematically addressed and mainly concern women specific activities, such as affirmative action towards widows to ensure land and protect them against property grabbing. The programme has some focus on children’s rights, rights of PLWHA and on young women as the most vulnerable to the epidemic. The *Political Space partners* often use a gender perspective in the projects, although gender-based rights violations affecting men and women seem to get lesser attention.

6. With regard to the influence of rights-holders in project design and implementation, some Political Space partners indicated at the partner workshop that they use a bottom-up approach, but this may not be a general practice. For example, Political Space partners felt that lack of rights-holders’ willingness to engage in projects was a hindering factor to success.

**B: Main conclusions - Looking at the extent to which DCA’s gender equality and rights-based commitment policies have been mainstreamed the team concludes the following.**

1. Both the *Political Space Programme* and *HIV and AIDS Programme* strategies have taken steps to be in line with the Rights-Based Commitment policy. With regard to a gender perspective, their objectives and related indicators do not sufficiently refer to the specific situation of men and women. They also lack attention to the other diversities within the groups targeted. Partner projects show the same deficiency of analysing and addressing different interests of different groups, including gender.

2. The Programmes do not include specific activities addressing gender equality at national policy level, which the Gender Equality policy recommends: “at least one such activity should be developed for a focus country programme”.

3. In relation to gender, partners appear to be ahead of the DCA Ugandan Political Space strategy. However, gender issues are mainly taken up as women’s rights. There are very few activities that involve men in actively promoting gender equality.

4. The *HIV and AIDS Programme* faces a big challenge in moving away from a service delivery/needs based approach into working fully from a rights-based and gender equality perspective.

**C. Mainstreaming rights-based development and gender equality in partner choice**

To put its policies and strategies into practice DanChurchAid as a partner-based organisation is very dependent on partners’ commitment and capacity in addressing rights and gender issues. The choice of partners is critical when it comes to mainstreaming gender equality and rights-based commitment. This section C addresses the selection criteria and the partner composition in relation to gender equality and rights-based development and the partners’ capacity in addressing these issues.

**C: Main findings**

1. At the time that DanChurchAid moved to a programme approach partner choice was primarily influenced by historical relations and partnerships. Prior to the establishment of the DCA Kampala office and the development of the current HIV and AIDS and Political Space programmes, DanChurchAid supported a number of partners often selected
among church-based organisations and networks. This was also based on a previous DCA HIV and AIDS policy that had not mainstreamed a rights and gender equality perspective.

2. During the audit DCA Kampala staff brought forward that since the introduction of the programme approach efforts have primarily focused on promoting rights-based development. Discussions with partners concentrated on strengthening advocacy work and incorporating rights protection strategies, while issues of gender equality and gender discrimination received less attention. Some partner representatives, particularly gender focal points, stated during workshops that DCA should be more proactive and put more focus on gender in order to support their tasks of mainstreaming gender in the organisation. They felt that an important hindrance to work with gender equality and rights-based development was the lack of support of top management.

3. The Political Space programme shows a balance between partners working at the national and local level (Karimojong). The partners focus particularly on policy/advocacy issues and empowerment. However, the bulk of funding is directed to empowerment activities with a very small percentage of funding allocated to national organisations that are strong on advocacy and networking. The focus on access to justice issues for the targeted rights-holders is limited. Moreover, few organisations address gender-specific rights violations. As mentioned under B, the HIV and AIDS Programme includes mainly organisations that are working on service-delivery with few partners working on advocacy. This Programme does not comprise partners working on structural issues at the national level as yet but it envisages a partnership with an organisation strong on rights and gender issues.

4. The need for partner capacity development on rights-based development and gender has been identified as priorities under the cross-cutting activities of both DCA Kampala programmes and as such, were planned for under the two Programmes. Training for partners on gender has not yet been organised by DCA Kampala office. To date, HIV and AIDS partners have received training on child rights legislation with combined attention to rights and gender issues. Capacity building of PT4 partners mainly took place at partner platform level. The partners expressed a clear need for more training to happen at the level of the organisations so all staff could benefit. Both HIV and AIDS and Political Space partners have received training on advocacy. Some partner representatives have attended rights-based training in Ethiopia and Malawi.

5. At the audit workshop for partners in the Political Space Programme the participants showed a good understanding of gender and rights issues and a willingness to take up these issues. The audit team could not confirm whether this was representative of their organisation. However, the participants did admit to a certain sloth in translating gender into practical actions which they attributed to “not knowing how”. They also thought it as a real challenge to work with gender issues among the Karimojong.

6. The audit workshop for partners in the HIV and AIDS Programme revealed that the partners still have considerable challenges in integrating rights-based and gender equality issues in their work. While one or two new partners have a stronger focus on advocacy and legal protection, the understanding among older partnerships on targeting the most marginalised, on empowerment, on engaging with legal duty-bearers, and on gender discrimination and equality issues was very weak. With regard to gender, hindrances seem to go beyond capacity issues. Some partners expressed a certain uneasiness about engaging with both rights-based development and gender. Particularly in relation to gender, some partners felt they were going against their culture or spoiling people.
C: Main conclusions - Looking at the extent to which DCA Kampala Office's partner composition contributes to putting DCA's Gender Equality and Rights-based Commitment into practice, the audit team concludes the following.

1. In view of DanChurchAid Kampala’s inheritance of partners with limited capacities in rights-based development and gender equality and, particularly in the HIV and AIDS Programme, who predominantly work on service-delivery it is not surprising that many of these partners are struggling to internalise and apply a right based and gender equality perspective. The level of understanding varies: among Political Space partners the audit team observed a good understanding of rights issues and most of them of gender issues; HIV and AIDS partners, except for some potential/new partners, showed weaknesses in understanding rights and gender issues and some resistance to take on board rights and in particular gender equality issues.

2. In view of the above, DanChurchAid Kampala Office has had to make and has made some conscious – though not systematic - efforts over the last three years to strengthen the rights-based orientation of its work, including dialoguing with partners to this effect. This is particularly reflected in its Political Space programme where partner composition shows a prioritization of organisations working on rights and policy issues without necessarily a strong gender orientation in this work. Contrary to the Gender equality policy the Office has not included in its partner portfolio an organisation working on gender equality issues at the national level.

3. The composition of the HIV and AIDS partner portfolio is highly skewed towards partners who address access to basic health services with only one new and one potential partner (CIPA, ANNPCAN respectively) addressing advocacy and legal protection.

4. There is a number of good and relevant capacity development activities for partners under the Programmes related to rights-based commitment and gender equality. However, capacity building of partners to date has largely been event-based, focusing on periodic training workshops for individuals within partner organisations. Since partners are invited to many workshops a limited number of their staff members has benefited from these trainings, thereby preventing a good trickle down into the whole organisation. The training workshops have not been accompanied by individual organisational competence development plans at the partner level. This approach apparently did not create organisational commitment nor adequate capacities among partners to develop more rights-based and gender equality perspectives within their organisations and projects.

D. Mainstreaming rights-based development and gender equality in partner relationship

DCA as a partner-based organisation sees equal partnership as a core value. It is important therefore to assess how partners perceive the nature of the relationship and the way the relationship is given shape. How much space do partners feel they have to influence and ‘own’ the programmes and projects? How much scope is available to create partnership mechanisms which are meaningful for both the partners and DCA Kampala?

D: Main findings

1. Most partner organisations indicated that they were aware of the DanChurchAid Kampala’s rights-based focus. Some partners felt that gender is less explicitly mentioned. Partners in the Political Space Programme indicated that they considered DCA to be both a gender and rights-based organisation. Only one partner thought DCA focused primarily on gender (KADP), which may be due to the fact that this project deals more with gender issues. It appeared that the Office shared parts of the rights-based policy with some partners but the gender equality policy has not been shared to date.
2. The partner workshops revealed that partners perceive the partnership between DCA Kampala and themselves to be primarily based on funding, sharing of information and capacity building.

3. Partner platforms have been formed under both the Political Space and HIV and AIDS Programme as mechanisms for dialoguing with partners. According to DCA Kampala’s programme officers, the Terms of Reference for these Programme platforms have been developed by the Kampala Office and shared with partners. However, partners appeared to perceive the platforms as a meeting arranged by DCA Kampala office rather than their own forum for discussing partnership issues with the Office.

4. The Political Space Programme platform has met only once. Many Political Space partners have a multitude of donors and are active in networking and advocacy with a number of organisations/institutions. DanChurchAid is often a small donor for many of the national advocacy organisations. Although most partner representatives at the Political Space partner workshop had never attended a platform meeting, they claimed that the platform could be useful for sharing, capacity-building, feeling as “one” before the donor, and for bringing up common issues of concern with the donor. It was not possible to assess the degree to which partners felt that they had contributed to the Programme’s strategy development, as partner representatives present had not attended the platform meeting.

5. The HIV and AIDS Programme platform has met three times. It has discussed rights and gender issues and has prioritised rights-based development and gender for capacity-building. The Programme has tried to increase partner ownership by suggesting that a partner is the chair of the platform and that the chairmanship is rotating. At the HIV and AIDS partner workshop there still appeared to be limited knowledge of the DCA Kampala HIV and AIDS programme. As with the Political Space platform it was not clear to what extent the individual partner had contributed or felt it had influenced the Programme strategy.

**D: Main Conclusions – Looking at partnership mechanism which contribute to dialogue on gender and rights-based policies and practices, the audit team concludes the following.**

1. In the Political Space programme there seems to be space to strengthen the platform since partners expressed that it could be useful for sharing, capacity-building, feeling as “one” before the donor and for bringing up common issues of concern with the donor. Since DCA is a relatively small donor for most of the partners in this Programme the challenge in this Programme is to find a niche where partners can receive valuable inputs for their work which they would not receive through other fora.

2. Partner platforms in both Programmes still have room for development especially in terms of creating a joint ownership of the programmes and greater knowledge of programme issues.

**E. Gender/rights competence, capacity development and staff’s commitment**

Central to any organisation are the men and women who undertake coordinated activities to run the organisation and its programmes effectively and efficiently. These activities are guided by policies and strategies set by the organisation. The audit tries to find out to what extent the two policies on gender and rights-based commitment as developed at DanChurchAid Headquarters (with inputs from other DCA levels) guide DCA Kampala Office. The audit wishes to assess how this Office builds sufficient staff’s knowledge and skills and creates staff commitment to implement the policies concerned.
E: Main findings

1. The discussions about gender and rights concepts in the DCA staff workshop showed that the staff has a good understanding about both concepts. They do not, however, link the two concepts to each other, i.e. consider rights issues from a gender perspective and vice versa. They feel that it is easier to address rights issues than gender issues and they are more confident in working on rights-based development. Each staff member indicated that he/she is committed towards attending to both gender and rights issues. Gender, they admit, disappears during the process of working. Some reasons given are that ‘gender’ is too complicated to deal with, that their workload is already high, and that rights issues are given priority over gender.

2. As mentioned under the sections A and B, the staff’s analysis of the living situation of the rights-holders from a gender perspective leaves much to be desired, while the rights perspective is strong but lacks a gender differentiation. Kampala Office’s networking for information sharing, capacity building or, perhaps, lobbying or identifying partners, focuses on right-based organisations, not on organisations with gender equality expertise/mandate.

3. DCA Kampala office organised several events to build the capacities of its staff on rights issues and to a much lesser extent on gender issues. The Office developed a training plan (2006 – 2008) consisting of topics which apparently relate to the different working areas/work of staff members. It is not clear to what extent the inter-linkages between the topics are discussed (for instance how to make gender and rights issues visible in PME) and to what extent initiatives are followed-up.

4. The staff feels that the expatriate staff made deliberate effort to share their work experience with less exposed staff e.g. in humanitarian work, fundraising, programme administration and in using the web-based management systems. It is said that there is always support readily available from the more experienced. Support to each other is common practice. Some tasks are also shared to balance competencies.

5. A coherent competence development plan to build and strengthen staff’s understanding and skills related to both issues could not be traced. The audit team also did not find a mechanism in place which ensures systematic, consistent and conscious learning among the staff which goes beyond the discussions during an end-of-the year session and retreat (see also section F, G).

E: Main conclusions - Looking at the extent to which DCA Kampala Office builds staff’s competence and commitment to promote the implementation of DCA’s Gender Equality and Rights-based Commitment policies, the audit team concludes the following.

1. The audit team concludes that staff considers addressing gender issues as an ‘add-on’. One of the reasons could be that over the past years a lot of emphasis is put on rights-based development, through discussions and training encouraged by DanChurchAid Headquarters. The past three years gender equality has been on the agenda at DCA Headquarters but it is yet to trickle down to the DCA Kampala office. It is evident that consistent efforts are needed to ensure that staff focuses on gender issues and brings in gender equality in all its activities. This must include a conscious effort to integrate a gender perspective in the rights-based work.

2. The problem for the staff in using a gender lens in their work is rather the “how to do it” than a matter of knowledge and commitment – the latter are certainly present. It is about how to analyse the living situation of the rights-holders, how to network with other organisations than partners and how to identify strategic partners, how to support partners, and the like. Mechanisms to promote conscious and collective learning as well
as to develop staff competence, as mentioned under the main findings above, would certainly help to strengthen staff’s understanding and skills on how to apply a rights perspective in a gender sensitive way in project and programme work, at the workplace and to build their confidence in this area.

F. Information and knowledge management for supporting rights-based development and gender equality
Organisations need systems and procedures for collecting, storing, distributing, and sharing information internally and externally to optimally use the experiences, good and bad practices in making a step forward in the work. The audit is interested to find out how DCA Kampala office manages the information and how knowledge is built up and shared for supporting rights-based development and gender equality.

F: Main Findings
1. All staff at DCA Kampala office has access to information which is shared on a common drive. The staff indicated that sharing of information between the DCA Headquarter and DCA Kampala is problematic and therefore ineffective due to the low speed of the intranet.

2. It appeared that The Rights-based Commitment and Gender Equality policy documents are distributed among staff but not adequately discussed nor optimally used.

3. Staff indicated that space exists for information sharing and learning within DCA Kampala office. The focus is rather on rights-based development than on gender equality. Examples are discussions on assessment and approval of proposed project strategies in the Project Committee.

4. Information sharing between staff of DCA Kampala office and partners takes place during partner platforms meetings and during training events or events they individually organise. The agenda of the HIV and AIDS programme platform meetings include a specific item on sharing innovations and best practices. Attention may be paid to rights-based development but not to gender issues. Partners are asked to report on rights-based development in their progress reports and not on gender equality issues.

F: Main conclusions – Looking at the extent to which DCA Kampala Office manages the information and builds knowledge for supporting rights-based development and gender equality, the audit team concludes the following.
1. In the DCA Kampala office information is available to everybody. The Office lacks however a system to ensure that information and knowledge is shared and used within the Office and, also between staff and partners, for conscious, collective learning to know, understand, improve and develop the work and programmes.

2. Within DCA Kampala office information on rights-based development is better shared among staff than on gender equality issues. This conclusion may explain observations described in previous sections.

G: Systems, procedure and tools in use
Organisations develop systems to make sure that activities are coordinated, data are being processed, that grievances can be addressed, information is disseminated to the right people, that recruitment and performance appraisal is transparent, effective partnership and network relationships can be established, that promote accountability, and so on. Procedures are put in place to ensure that the right steps are followed, for example, concerning administrative matters, project proposals, budget allocation, recruitment of staff, and the use
of facilities. The audit addresses the question to what extent the systems, procedures and tools facilitate mainstreaming of gender and rights principles as described in the Gender Equality and Rights-based Commitment policies.

G: Main Findings
1. The current systems and procedures in relation to staff management are based on the DCA Headquarters’ guidelines and policies. These have gender and rights considerations and are fair to staff. For instance, the salary scales are based on qualification, experience and position.

2. DCA Kampala office employs females and males originating from different parts of the country and world. Currently the staff composition is 5 women against 5 men, which is well-balanced compared to last year (7 women against 3 men). The expatriate staff is all women. Staff expressed that relations are good and discrimination does not exist. Staff is free to speak their local languages/Danish. According to the staff, recruitment is based on professional competence and gender balance is considered in the selection process for interviews.

3. The DCA Kampala Staff Manual is based on rights principles. Gender considerations come out in the provision of both maternity and paternity leave. The manual uses rights language and respect for the Law. An overriding goal is to manage staff in a fair and equitable way so all are treated equally and fairly. Gender equality or respect for diversity is not explicitly mentioned.

4. The DCA Kampala Staff Manual gives some indication on how to solve grievances. The Manual is unclear about the person to approach in case Headquarters level needs to be contacted. It appeared that the grievance mechanism for staff, who feel that they are unfairly treated which DCA Headquarters recently developed, has not been shared with staff yet. The Kampala Staff Manual is not specific about who has access to what assets and facilities, such as vehicles, computers, and mobiles. In practice, staff freely shares computers and space in the Office.

5. The HIV and AIDS Staff Policy and the Policy on Prevention of Sexual Exploitation, both developed at DCA Headquarters, are said to have been briefly discussed in the 2007 staff retreat, but the policies have not been put into action. It has not been discussed how to mainstream gender internally as described in the Gender Equality Policy, i.e. making systems & procedures, practices, information management gender sensitive. The guidance on how to solve grievances has not been discussed at the office.

6. DCA Kampala staff feels that DCA Programme Context Analysis guidelines are clear about a rights-based perspective but do not facilitate or highlight the importance of analysing gender discrimination and gender inequality issues. This constraints proper gender analyses within the rights-based analysis.

7. A DCA Kampala programme officer has been assigned to act as gender focal point. Without a clear task description or mandate the focal point has not taken any action yet. The Office feels that guidelines should be provided by DCA Headquarters.

8. The Terms of reference for reviews, evaluations and other consultancies reviewed by the audit team show more focus on rights competences than on gender.
**G: Main conclusions - Looking at the extent to which DCA Kampala Office’s systems, procedures and tools facilitate mainstreaming of gender and rights principles the audit team concludes the following.**

1. Both job descriptions and advertisements for new staff lack sufficient attention to gender and rights sensitivity to ensure that Gender Equality and Rights-based Commitment policies are put into practice.

2. The sharing of DCA Headquarters’ policies on working conditions and facilities with DCA Kampala staff has been insufficient while their implementation is pending.

3. There is a strong perception among some staff that the existent PME tools do not adequately allow for the operationalisation of gender equality into programme strategies and project support. It is also felt that DCA Headquarters issues new guidelines and instructions too quickly, thus not allowing for consolidation at the local Office. Some staff are directly opposed to introduction of any new tools.

4. DCA Kampala office made an effort to assign a gender focal point but pending decisions about the mandate, time and resources required for the task the focal point has not taken actions.

---

**H. Decision making in the organisation**

*Adequate and timely decision making is the key to efficient and effective running of an organisation, including its programmes. The audit team looked at decision making from a rights and gender perspective in three ways: a) Are gender and rights issues part of the agenda for decision making and are follow-up actions taken on decisions made; b) Is equal participation of male and female staff irrespective their identity or personal characteristics ensured in discussions and in the taking of decisions; and c) Are decisions which concern discrimination or violations of rights put into practice (sexual harassment, grievances, etc).*

**H: Main findings**

1. The workshop with the DCA Kampala staff showed that staff had difficulty to identify concrete decisions which concern gender issues and rights-based development. DCA Headquarters apparently played a dominant role in setting priorities (e.g. requirements that are put forward), the agenda of decision making (e.g. policies, instructions) and the way the work is carried out (e.g. guidelines, procedures to follow). The staff felt that they are rather reactive towards issues brought forward by Headquarters than pro-active.

2. Each staff member has its own area of responsibility and related decision making power. Joint discussions in the Project Committee ensure that everybody is informed about what happens at programme level and beyond.

3. The overall budget allocations do not specify activities related to gender equality and rights-based commitment as stipulated in the policy.

4. The audit team was informed that the decision making process is very participatory: all staff - RR, programme officers, programme funding officers and humanitarian work staff - are involved in the discussions and can bring their views forward irrespective of their being male or female or having other diversities.

5. The audit team could not elaborate on decisions which concern discrimination or violations of rights because systems that are put in place (sexual harassment, grievances, etc) do not seem to be active in the Office (see G).
H: Main conclusions – Looking at the extent to which DCA Kampala’s agenda setting and its decision making process facilitate mainstreaming gender equality and rights-based development the audit team concludes the following.

1. DCA Kampala Office has very close relations with DCA Headquarters, closer than any other local or other organisation. The Office has to relate to Headquarters systems and policy priorities and can draw on the support provided by Headquarters. The question is whether sufficient space is available for DCA Kampala to build its own office with its own way of working and its own agenda setting within Headquarters’ organisational priorities. Some DCA staff felt that more space has to be provided so that the Office can set its own agenda and dialogue with others presenting its own point of view. This also requires strong local leadership.

2. Decision making at DCA Kampala office does not consistently take gender issues into consideration. The focus is more on rights-based development. Space exists for individual staff members to give shape to their work. At the same time, there is ample scope for sharing and discussing at different meetings (e.g. the project committee) in which all staff participate. In such a situation, a strong emphasis from management on gender and rights as cross-cutting DCA priorities is needed to ensure consistent gender and rights mainstreaming in the work and the work place.

I. Organisational Culture

The audit pays attention to the organisational culture because norms and values of an organisation are reflected in all of its actions and the way it presents itself to the world. They produce its image. Its policies, the focus and strategies of its programmes, its procedures, the way decisions are taken, the partnership relations, and so on, are based on the organisation’s norms, values and principles. The audit team did not explore thoroughly DCA Kampala office’s culture but wants to present a few findings.

I: Main findings

1. DCA Kampala office places high value on rights-based commitment which is reflected amongst others in its programmes, its recruitment policy and staff composition as outlined in previous sections. To the outside world DCA Kampala is seen as an organisation addressing rights issues although some partners felt that it works on gender issues.

2. Gender equality is said to be valued but it is less visible in its external practices. The request to carry out a PGRA for the Office is a clear example of the value attached to gender equality. Its internal practices reflect attention to the family life of the staff member. Examples are staff procedures such as flexible working hours for parents to allow them to care for their children and maternity and paternity leave which are longer than other similar organisation in Uganda. Yearly a family day is organised bringing together staff, their spouses and children. At the Office both male and female staff shares domestic tasks such as washing up and lunch time pick up of the used plates. Moreover, female partner staff with babies is allowed to bring baby sitters to workshops. The programme budgets have included such expenses in their budget.

3. DCA Kampala office highly value equal access and participation of staff which is reflected in the inclusive way topics are discussed and decisions are taken and the participation in training. Staff feels that discussions are open, even about critical issues. In the staff workshop all participants freely expressed their area of weakness in terms of rights and gender issues.

4. DCA Kampala office appreciates good and personal working relationships. The relationships between male and female staff are based on mutual respect. Staff takes
lunch together and there is a central place to collect coffee and tea. The relationship between the staff seems supportive and open; they know each other well. It is said that the RR gives space to each staff member and that no staff member dominates others. Gossiping about minorities is not accepted.

5. A good relationship with DCA Headquarters is felt very important to the Kampala office. It follows the policies, systems and procedures of DCA Headquarters, at times making adjustments.

I: Main conclusions – Looking at the extent to which DCA Kampala Office’s norms, values and principles facilitate mainstreaming gender equality and rights-based development the audit team concludes the following.

1. To an outsider DCA Kampala office seems rather inward looking but that is not surprising because it is still building-up and finding its shape. An example is the limited number of frequent contacts with Ugandan organisations (other than partners) which could feed DCA Kampala with fresh ideas about rights-based development and more particularly on gender equality issues. It has long standing relations with various partners and it is slowly building up its partner portfolio.

2. DCA Kampala Office’s culture of mutual respect, sharing of information and even resources, and participation is an excellent start for strengthening its gender and right-based profile and addressing gender inequality in its programmes.

J. Perception of change
All those involved in programmes and projects of DCA Kampala office and its partner organisations have ideas about the relative success and outcome of their work. Based on the inputs from staff of the Office and partners, rights-holders and duty-bearers the audit made an attempt to qualify the results from a gender and rights perspective in terms of changes resulting from the work done at programme, partner and organisation level.

J: Main findings
1. Most partners in both Programmes appeared to have difficulty in monitoring change and measuring outcome. Some partners use participatory PME systems but lack a proper understanding of outcome monitoring.

2. With regard to the HIV and AIDS Programme the participants of the partner workshop predominantly reported changes concerning access to resources and services, which they mainly attributed to their own service delivery activities. They did not mention changes in terms of delivery by government providers, except for one organisation that suggested increased linkages between the communities they worked with and health departments. They distinguished changes in terms of specifically vulnerable groups: orphans, AIDS affected households, PLWHA’s.

3. The partners observed some changes with regard to access to justice/ protection issues. They noticed some limited changes among moral duty-bearers: some religious leaders were now speaking out on condom use. They did not mention changes at the level of policies but noticed limited changes in the practices of legal duty-bearers.

4. Changes were recorded in terms of reduced stigma: PLWHA’s were giving live testimonies. Partners reported changes in relation to stigma in their areas which they attributed to increased access to ARV and productive resources.

5. In terms of specific rights issues within the HIV/AIDS programme, there were some promising but limited changes related to the reporting of child abuse and access to land
by widows. Communities visited by the audit team showed limited awareness on rights issues and about holding government actors to account. Only one community spoke of increased knowledge on children rights issues.

6. Discussions with rights-holders in the *HIV and AIDS Programme* revealed that there were very few changes in gender relations and men’s involvement in promoting gender equality. Men are still considered superior, women live at their mercy, widows are expected to have sex with men, women without a man are despised, men do not share the burden of child care, men are more reluctant to disclose their HIV status than women.

7. In the *Political Space Programme*, the partner representatives in the partner workshop reported changes on equal access and control of income and resources, particularly in relation to credit. The partners pointed to a number of changes in relation to women’s participation, amongst others increased participation of Karimojong women in political decision making bodies. It was however difficult to identify which groups of women were benefiting because the participants did not disaggregate their data.

8. With regard to duty-bearers changes recorded on laws, policies, attitudes and practices were few although most of the DCA Political Space partners are active in lobby and advocacy. Only one partner mentioned in the workshop that as a result of its lobby a Parliamentary Committee was established to explore disarmament issues. Changes were said to take place in terms of levels of awareness-raising and contributions to policies. It appeared that men’s involvement in gender equality work was very limited.

9. During the *DCA staff* workshop the staff identified changes primarily related to access to capacity building both for staff and the partners. They also mentioned some limited changes in the focus of programmes i.e. the identification of advocacy partners and the inclusion of more activities on access to rights. They indicated few changes in relation to gender equality in their programmes. They did not identify changes at the rights-holder or duty-bearer level.

### J. Main conclusions related to perceptions of change

1. The *HIV and AIDS programme* apparently resulted in changes at the level of rights-holders, mostly related to access to resources and services and to a lesser extent to access to justice/protection issues and reduction of stigma. Interestingly, despite partners’ apparent lack of clarity on targeting strategies (see section B) they reported changes at distinguished target groups (orphans, PLWHA, etc.). However, a systematic assessment of the impact of their work on different groups and between men and women is lacking which may relate to the observed lack of outcome monitoring based on disaggregated data.

2. The *Political Space Programme* appeared to lead to changes concerning women’s participation in decision-making, including management structures of church organisations (PDR) and in claiming their rights. Partners lack adequate analysis of the interests of different groups and therefore it is not clear whether women’s participation also includes women from marginalised groups.

3. *Political Space* partners address legal duty-bearers but presented few changes in relation to laws, policies, attitudes and practices of these duty-bearers at the DCA Political Space partner workshop. The limited changes were said to be partially attributable to unfavourable government policies and to a one-way flow of information between themselves and government institutions. However, additional information presented to the audit team suggested that partners’ advocacy efforts had considerable impact on certain policies and procedures (e.g. land use policy, PEAP, debt cancellation).
4. During the *DCA staff* workshop the staff felt it difficult to identify five changes in relation to rights and gender. This could suggest that the identified changes at programme and partner level were not always based on conscious decisions and planning by the DCA Kampala office to strengthen rights-based commitment and gender equality in their work. The issues mentioned as changes at the level of the DCA Kampala office such as paternity and maternity leave did not always seem to be based on new decisions or decisions taken by the Kampala office itself.
III. Recommendations

In this last chapter the audit team presents recommendations to put DCA’s Gender Equality and Rights-based Commitment policies more effectively into practice in DCA Kampala Office’s work and its work place. The recommendations give suggestions on how to mainstream gender and rights issues in the Office’s programmes, its relationships with other organisations including its partners and in its internal arrangements. The audit team repeated some of its conclusions to facilitate the understanding of the recommendations made.

The translation of the recommendations into an action plan is the responsibility of the management of the Kampala office in close consultation with and with support from staff of DCA Headquarters. The recommendations have been discussed in the debriefing session with DCA Kampala Office staff. The staff’s priorities for action brought forward in this session are included.

1. Recommendations on mainstreaming a gender and rights perspective

**Mainstreaming a gender and rights perspective in DCA Kampala’s Programme Strategies and Projects**

The Audit team recommends that

1. Programmes reflect a gender perspective in their rights-based strategies, addressing power relationship between men and women and including men in activities that promote gender equality.

2. DCA Kampala office includes in the Terms of Reference for the upcoming review of the Political Space Programme the manner in which gender equality issues, including the specific rights violations faced by men and women, can be strengthened in a possible revised Programme strategy. The Terms of Reference should include the task of identifying potential partners which address gender equality issues at the national level.

3. The ongoing HIV and AIDS Programme review also provides recommendations for strengthening the gender equality and rights-based perspective in the Programme and in the choice of partners. It should include proposals for strengthening social and economic empowerment, legal protection, and advocacy towards both moral and legal duty-bearers.

4. In both Programme reviews attention is paid to the degree to which objectives and indicators refer to specific gender and diversity categories/groups. The review should also assess the extent to which the objectives reflect critical gender and rights issues in the specific context. Their recommendations should help to improve monitoring of the impact on different groups.

5. The Programme Officers concerned pay specific attention to the degree to which partners have included the specific rights-holders to be targeted either in the objectives or in the indicators under the objectives when reviewing partner log-frames.

6. Partner dialogue includes discussions not only on rights-based issues but also gender equality.

The Audit team’s recommendations are based on various conclusions, amongst others that the Political Space Programme analysed the main rights violations affecting the Karimojong as a minority group, but not fully whether there are specific rights violations that only affect men or only affect women within this group. The HIV and AIDS Programme has analysed the most affected groups of men and women and their respective situation with regard to HIV and AIDS. Both Programme strategies have taken steps to be in line with the Rights-Based Commitment policy. With regard to a gender perspective their objectives and related indicators do not sufficiently refer to the specific situation of men and women and lack attention to the other diversities within the groups targeted. Partner projects show the same deficiency of analysing and addressing different interests of different groups, including
gender. It was also concluded that in relation to gender, partners appear to be ahead of the DCA Uganda Political Space Strategy. However gender issues are mainly taken up as women’s rights. They have very few activities that involve men in actively promoting gender equality. Contrary to the Gender equality policy the Office has not included in its partner portfolio an organisation working on gender equality issues at the national level.

**Mainstreaming a gender and rights perspective in DCA Kampala’s Networking efforts**

The Audit team recommends that

7. DCA Kampala office gives more priority to networking with relevant national gender and human rights organisations. Broader contacts may contribute to knowledge and information sharing, to greater visibility and to perhaps joint actions. Time should be made available for Programme Officers to participate in these networks and to be more in touch with the developments in relevant government institutions.

This recommendation is based on the team’s conclusion that DCA Kampala office’s contacts with relevant gender and human rights networks and government institutions at the national level leaves much to be desired. DanChurchAid appears not to know and not to be known by relevant organisations and institutions outside its partner base, which staff members of the Office confirmed.

**Mainstreaming a gender and rights perspective in DCA Kampala’s partner composition**

The Audit team recommends that

8. DCA Kampala office reconsiders the geographical balance of its HIV and AIDS Programme between Rakai and Teso/Karamojo. New partners could be identified that work in the Teso/Karamojo region. DCA Kampala office may wish to consider the degree to which its partners and programme is adequately addressing the gender-based rights violations affecting men and women in conflict (Teso-Karamojo) and men and women within fishing communities (Rakai-Kagera).

9. DCA Kampala office only takes on new partners under the HIV and AIDS Programme with strong capacities on gender equality and rights-based strategies.

10. DCA Uganda office reviews the manner in which it is providing capacity-building for partner organisations on rights-based development and for gender equality. DCA Kampala should support partners in developing competence development plans on these issues for their own organisations. It could consider Training of Trainers workshops in order to create a pool of trainers with capacity on rights-based development and gender equality. DCA Kampala may consider asking partners to commit themselves by funding a percentage of the training and to request applications from potential trainees. Focus should be on strengthening analyses, formulation of objectives, targeting, outcome monitoring and how to promote change.

The Audit team based its recommendations on the conclusions that the composition of the HIV and AIDS partner portfolio is highly skewed towards partners in Rakai which as external stakeholder interviews suggested was currently better serviced than other areas e.g. Teso-Karamojo. Furthermore, the team concluded that in view of DCA Kampala’s inheritance of partners with limited capacities in rights-based development and gender equality it is not surprising that many of these partners are struggling to internalise and apply a right-based and gender equality perspective. There is a number of good and relevant capacity development activities for partners under the Programmes related to rights-based commitment and gender equality. However, capacity building of partners to date has largely been event-based, focusing on periodic training workshops for individuals within partner organisations. Since partners are invited to many workshops a limited number of their staff members has benefited from these trainings thereby preventing a good trickle down into the whole organisation. The training workshops have not been accompanied by individual
organisational competence development plans at the partner level. This approach apparently did not create organisational commitment nor adequate capacities among partners to develop more rights-based and gender equality perspectives within their organisations and projects.

**Mainstreaming a gender and rights perspective in DCA Kampala’s Relationship with the Partners**

The Audit Team recommends that

11. The Terms of Reference of both the HIV and AIDS platform and the Political Space platform are reviewed together with partners in order to develop or renew a commitment to the platform and arrive at an agreement on mandate, issues to be addressed, membership and frequency of meetings.

This recommendation is based on the team's conclusion that partner platforms in both Programmes still have room for development especially in terms of creating a joint ownership of the programmes and greater knowledge of programme issues.

**Mainstreaming a gender and rights perspective in DCA Kampala’s internal organisation**

On **Staff Capacities** the Audit Team recommends that

12. DCA Kampala Office assesses the needs of staff on how to put the Gender Equality Policy into practice in their work - in the analysis and programme design; in the appraisal of project proposals, in supporting partners during implementation; in the choice of partners; and the like. Based on these needs the Office should develop a coherent competence development plan to ensure that capacities are built on 1) how to apply a gender perspective in rights-based development, 2) how to address gender inequality through specific actions at national level, and 3) how to mainstream gender and rights in the way of working of the Office (which includes systems, procedures, tools).

13. DCA Kampala office develops a mechanism to ensure consistent, systematic and conscious learning on gender and rights issues within the Office, building on the existing practices such as access to/participation of all staff in training, the joint discussions in the Project Committee, end-of-the year reviews, retreat, and the like.

These recommendations are based on the Audit team’s conclusion that staff consider addressing gender issues as an ‘add-on’ and that the problem for the staff in using a gender lens in their work is rather the “how to do it” than a matter of knowledge and commitment – both are certainly there. It was also concluded that DCA Kampala Office’s culture of mutual respect, sharing of information and even resources, and participation is an excellent start for strengthening its gender and right-based profile and addressing gender inequality in its programmes. At the same time the Office appeared to lack a system to ensure that information and knowledge is shared and used within the Office and, also between staff and partners, for conscious, collective learning to know, understand, improve and develop the work and programmes

On **Systems, Procedures and Guidelines** the Audit team recommends that

14. DCA Kampala office uses the gender and rights assessment tools recently developed by DCA Headquarters to facilitate that both aspects are integrated in the projects.

15. DCA Kampala office reviews job descriptions to ensure that tasks include attention to the mainstreaming of right-based development and gender equality.

16. All future advertisements for staff positions include commitment to gender equality and rights-based development.

17. All DCA Headquarters’ policies on working conditions and facilities (including the grievance mechanism) are introduced to and discussed within the DCA Kampala office and put into practice with action plans where needed.
18. DCA Kampala office includes in all TORs for consultancies, reviews and evaluations both rights and gender equality perspectives in relation to competences needed, issues addressed, and the like.

The Audit team’s recommendations are based on the conclusion that both job descriptions and advertisements for new staff lack sufficient attention to gender and rights sensitivity to ensure that Gender Equality and Rights-based Commitment policies are put into practice. Moreover, the sharing of DCA Headquarters’ policies on working conditions and facilities with DCA Kampala staff has been insufficient while their implementation is pending. The Audit team observed that terms of reference for reviews, evaluations and other consultancies reviewed by the team show more focus on rights competences than on gender.

On Decision making the Audit team recommends that
19. DCA Kampala office gives one staff member on a rotational basis the specific task to look from a gender and rights perspective at each issue on the agenda of decision making meetings, to ensure more effective mainstreaming of gender equality and rights-based commitment.

The Audit team recommended the above to improve DCA Kampala’s agenda setting and its decision making process towards gender and rights mainstreaming. It is based on the team’s conclusions that decision making at DCA Kampala office does not consistently take gender issues into consideration. The focus is more on rights-based development which is seen as not including or not prioritising gender issues. Space exists for individual staff members to give shape to their work, while there is ample scope for sharing and discussing at different meetings in which all staff participate. The team further observed during the DCA staff workshop that the staff felt it difficult to identify five changes in relation to rights and gender. This could suggest that the identified changes at programme and partner level were not always based on conscious decisions and planning by the DCA Kampala office to strengthen rights-based commitment and gender equality in their work.

The Audit team added special recommendations for the DCA Headquarters:
1. DCA Headquarters needs to revisit the current PME tools including programme development guidelines, context analysis guidelines and the steps 1-5 to see where the gender issue could easily “evaporate”. It should be ensured that wherever possible the two cross cutting aspects are integrated.
2. The gender and right based advisors could on request assist in the development of programme strategies to help mainstream gender equality and rights-based commitment.

The Audit team concluded that there is a strong perception among some staff that the existent PME tools do not adequately allow for the operationalisation of gender equality into programme strategies and project support. A few staff also felt that DCA Headquarters issues new guidelines and instructions too quickly, thus not allowing for consolidation at the local Office. Some staff are directly opposed to introduction of any new tools.
2. Priorities set by the staff of DCA Kampala office

It is the task of an audit team to guide the different stakeholders through the process of assessment and learning and to formulate recommendations based on the views and opinions expressed. The DCA Kampala office should translate relevant recommendations into an action plan and arrange the follow-up. The debriefing session was a first step towards such an action plan. The audit team requested the staff of DCA Kampala office to comment on the recommendations and to set priorities for action.

Summarising the comments:

- Some staff felt that recommendation 15 should include all policies and not only make reference to the gender equality and rights-based commitment policies.
- The staff did not see the relevance of assigning a gender focal point (see conclusion G4). Therefore the audit team deleted a recommendation which suggested the Office to reconsider its usefulness.
- Some staff feared that the first recommendation for DCA Headquarters might result in more paper work.

On mainstreaming a gender and rights perspective in DCA Kampala’s Programme Strategies and Projects the Office staff prioritised that:

- **DCA Kampala office should include in the Terms of Reference for the upcoming review of the Political Space Programme the manner in which gender equality issues, including the specific rights violations faced by men and women, can be strengthened in a possible revised Programme strategy. The Terms of Reference should include the task of identifying potential partners which address gender equality issues at the national level. (Audit team’s recommendation 2)**
- **The ongoing HIV and AIDS Programme review should also provide recommendations for strengthening the gender equality and rights-based perspective in the Programme and in the choice of partners. It should include proposals for strengthening social and economic empowerment, legal protection, and advocacy towards both moral and legal duty-bearers. (Audit team’s recommendation 3)**

**Proposed action on recommendation 3:** RR reminds the two people who are currently reviewing the Programme to include it in the work - **When:** 20 November 2007

The DCA staff prioritised **Audit team’s Recommendation 7** on mainstreaming a gender and rights perspective in DCA Kampala’s networking efforts:

- **DCA Kampala office should give more priority to networking with relevant national gender and human rights organisations. Broader contacts may contribute to knowledge and information sharing, perhaps joint actions and moreover to greater visibility. Time should be made available for Programme Officers to participate in these networks and to be more in touch with the developments in relevant government institutions.**

**Proposed actions on recommendation 7:**
- Recruit another programme officer (PO).
- Review tasks and restructure administrative tasks.
- Each PO to identify a network that he/she would like to explore and eventually become a member of.

**When/Deadline:** Group meeting January 2008
On mainstreaming a gender and rights perspective in DCA Kampala’s partner composition, the staff prioritised that:

- **DCA Kampala office may wish to consider the degree to which its partners and PT4 programme is adequately addressing the gender-based rights violations affecting men and women in conflict (Teso-Karamojo) and men and women within fishing communities (Rakai-Kagera).**

The staff did not fully agree with the first part of the **Audit team’s Recommendation 8:** DCA Kampala office should reconsider the geographical balance of its HIV and AIDS Programme between Rakai and Teso/Karamojo. New partners could be identified that work in the Teso/Karamojo region.

With regard to its partners, the staff prioritised **Audit team’s recommendation 10:**

- **DCA Kampala office should review the manner in which it is providing capacity-building for partner organisations on rights-based development and for gender equality. DCA Kampala should support partners in developing competence development plans on these issues for their own organisations. It could consider Training of Trainers workshops in order to create a pool of trainers with capacity on rights-based development and gender equality. DCA Kampala may consider to ask partners to commit themselves by funding a percentage of the training and to request applications from potential trainees. Focus should be on strengthening analyses, formulation of objectives, targeting, outcome monitoring and how to promote change.**

**Proposed action on recommendation 10:** To be put on the agenda of the DCA Kampala retreat/planning meeting for 2008: how to operationalise this in 2008

**When/Deadline:** Retreat/planning meeting 2008

The DCA Kampala staff prioritised two recommendations which concerned the mainstreaming of a gender and rights perspective in DCA Kampala’s internal organisation.

- **DCA Kampala Office should develop a coherent competence development plan to ensure that capacities are built on 1) how to apply a gender perspective in rights-based development, 2) how to address gender inequality through specific actions at national level, and 3) how to mainstream gender and rights in the way of working of the Office (which includes systems, procedures, tools).**

The staff did not agree with the first part of the **Audit team’s recommendation 12** that DCA Kampala Office should assess the needs of staff on how to put the Gender Equality Policy into practice in their work - in the analysis and programme design; in the appraisal of project proposals, in supporting partners during implementation; in the choice of partners; and the like.

- **DCA Kampala office should give one staff member on a rotational basis the specific task to look from a gender and rights perspective at each issue on the agenda of decision making meetings, to ensure more effective mainstreaming of gender equality and rights-based commitment. (Audit team’s recommendation 19)**

**Proposed action on (revised) recommendation 12:** To identify a consultant

**When/Deadline:** not indicated

**Proposed action on recommendation 19:** Inform the chairperson of the project committee meeting one week in advance that Fred has been suggested to put on rights-based commitment and gender equality lenses

**When/Deadline:** Each project committee meeting.
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Annex 1: Terms of Reference Participatory Gender and Rights Audit (PGRA) DanChurchAid organisation and programmes in Uganda

1. INTRODUCTION
In its 2006-2010 organisational plan, DanChurchAid has stated that it will ensure that in all its activities it works from a rights-based perspective and for equality between men and women. 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 intentions into practices and only since the 2006 plan that gender was explicitly included.

Concurrently, DCA has moved from a project approach to a programme approach in which partner support within particular sectors (called programme types) is now placed in an overall strategic framework with various partners and cross-cutting interventions contributing to the same overall development objective. 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. DanChurchAid sees gender and rights-based strategies, methods and tools as complementary and therefore seeks in its training, its strategies and its tool development to ensure that both aspects are better reflected and integrated.

DanChurchAid is interested in testing a participatory gender and rights audit in one of its programme countries, Uganda. The audit is seen as a learning exercise for the organization and in this case the DCA Uganda office, in the operational consequences of intensifying and systematizing rights and gender strategies in its support to development work. DanChurchAid is also interested in this audit in order to more systematically identify and address gaps in its policies, programmes and practices.

The DanChurchAid Uganda office has indicated interest in being part of this audit in order to be able to strengthen their rights and gender work within their two programmes in Uganda: the Political Space Programme and the HIV/AIDS Programme. Both programmes have been developed based on a context analysis and are in the first phases of their implementation. The Political Space programme is currently focused on the Karimojong for a) strengthening their influence on legislation and policies and b) increasing their access to resources. The HIV/AIDS Programme focuses on young people in particular young women’s vulnerability with a geographic focus on Kagera-Rakai and Teso-Karamoja regions.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE PARTICIPATORY GENDER AND RIGHTS AUDIT (PGRA) IN UGANDA
The overall objectives for this DanChurchAid PGRA will be twofold as follows:
• Strengthened awareness and skills within the DCA Uganda programme for supporting gender and rights-based work within their organisation and two programmes
• Increased capacity of 6 DCA staff to carry out gender and rights audits

The immediate objectives of the participatory gender and rights audit will be the following: a) Participants have learned about
• what they are doing concerning gender equality and rights-based development policy in their work,
• how they do it, how they have organised themselves, how the organisation has been geared towards policy implementation, how this is being done in cooperation with partners
• what the results of their work are
• how they relate what they are doing to what others are doing in the country
• how they can improve what they are doing and place it in the context in which they work.
b) 6 DCA staff are trained

- To be facilitators of the PGRA
- Have facilitated this PGRA in Uganda under the guidance of the lead facilitator,
- Are confident in utilising the methodology within DCA and other country programmes.

c) the Uganda programme has been audited

The assumption is that the learning from the audit will lead to proposals for change that can translate the learning into action. This translation of recommendations into an action plan is the responsibility of the country programme leadership in close consultation with and with support from DCA Copenhagen staff.

d) A Gender and Rights Manual has been developed and tested for DCA future use

3. METHODOLOGY

The participatory gender and rights audit is a methodology for self-assessment of policy implementation by development programmes and organisations in terms of their rights-based and gender intentions and practices.

Participatory gender and rights audits differ from an ‘ordinary’ gender or rights-based development impact evaluation in that the focus is on self-assessment and not on external evaluation. The people who are employed in an organisation or are associated to it as partner organisations or donors are considered as empirical experts, able and motivated to assess themselves and their organisation or their partner organisations in order to improve the organisation’s performance on rights-based development, gender equality and women’s empowerment. Another important difference with traditional impact assessments is that the PGRA focuses its attention on the organisation and its cooperation with partner organisations and not so much on the assessment of impact at the beneficiary level. The impact level is touched upon only briefly in two of the exercises/methods used in the PGRA: the Perception of Achievement and the Classification of Programmes and Projects.

Engaging in a PGRA therefore means that DanChurch Aid will participate in and own a process in which through a guided self-assessment DCA Uganda and DCA Copenhagen will learn about the way in which DCA has given form to its intention of contributing to gender equality including women’s empowerment and reducing inequalities in access and enjoyment of rights for specifically marginalized groups within Ugandan society. This will involve participation of staff of the organisation in Uganda and representatives of its partner organisations. This is important as the PGRA aims at promoting an organisation-wide learning process and not just programme-based learning.

As DCA implements its programme in very close cooperation with a number of partner organisations, these partners will also be invited to participate in the PGRA and to engage themselves in a guided self-assessment of how they are contributing to gender equality and rights-based development.

The third level of organisation that can be involved in the PGRA is the level of the beneficiaries for example by inviting a group of beneficiaries of one or two of the partner organisations in the PGRA.

4. EXPECTED OUTPUT

The following output is expected from this co-operation

- A Gender and Rights Audit Report of the Uganda Country Office and Programme to be submitted latest 2 weeks after finishing the audit
- An Action Plan for Strengthening the Rights and Gender orientation of the Uganda Country Office and Programme to be submitted latest 2 weeks after finishing the audit
- A Gender and Rights Manual adapted to DCA’s way of working to be submitted latest one month after finishing the audit
- Trained DCA Gender and Rights Audit Facilitators
5. **ACTIVITY PLAN AND TIME SCHEDULE**

The time frame is between the period September 2007 to December 2007. The work in Uganda is scheduled to take place within the period 31 October and 21 November.

All facilitators have to be free and fully available for the entire 21 day period as an audit facilitation team is a highly intensive occupation that does not allow for many other activities and might interfere with household responsibilities on some evenings.
## Annex 2: Time schedule of the audit  1-21 November 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS/INTERVIEWEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 November</td>
<td>Audit Team Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 November</td>
<td>Audit Team Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 November</td>
<td>Audit Team Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 November</td>
<td>Documentation Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 November</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>ANPPCAN Mr. D. Yiga 12.00 FHRI who?? 15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 November</td>
<td>Prepare for Office Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 November</td>
<td>Prepare for Office Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 November</td>
<td>DCA Office Workshop, 9.00 -17.00 Hotel International</td>
<td>Inger Kjeldsen Annette Ringgaard Vincent Abura Edwin Kayuki Charlotte Gulyetonda Frederick Luzze Albert Okolong Fred Kayiira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 November</td>
<td>DCA Office Workshop, 9.00 -17.00 Hotel International</td>
<td>Inger Kjeldsen Annette Ringgaard Vincent Abura Edwin Kayuki Rikke … Charlotte Gulyetonda Frederick Luzze Albert Okolong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 November</td>
<td>Prepare for Partner Audit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 November</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November</td>
<td>Morning: Prepare for Partner Workshop</td>
<td>UAC Ms. R. Nalwadda 8.00 UHRC Mr. ? 14.00 UNASO Mr. H. Swahuka, S.Alejo 15.00 MRGI – Ms. J. Nakato 16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon: Team VCV: Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team SEE: Leave for Rakai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 November</td>
<td>Team VCV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morning: Rights-holder Workshop, Kampala 9.30-14.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Participants: Change Agents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon (after 14.00) Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team SEE: Focus group discussion with rights-holders, Rakai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 November</td>
<td>Partner Workshops PT1-Muyenga Club (9 participants) PT4- Serifa Hotel</td>
<td>For participants see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11 participants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 November</td>
<td>Morning: Partner Workshops</td>
<td>For participants see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PT1-Muyenga Club (8 participants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PT4- Serifa Hotel (11 participants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both teams arrive at Ranch on the Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 November</td>
<td>Synthesis Workshop/Report Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 November</td>
<td>Synthesis Workshop/Report Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 November</td>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td>Back from Ranch on the Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 November</td>
<td>Interview with Inger Kjeldsen</td>
<td>Report Writing and Prepare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Debriefing

20 November
Morning: Debriefing Session (7 participants)
Afternoon: last team meeting
Inger Kjeldsen
Annette Ringgaard
Vincent Abura
Edwin Kayuki
Albert Okolong
Fred Kayiira
Rikke …

21 November
Departure audit team to Copenhagen, Amsterdam and Addis Abeba

List of Participants at PT 1 Workshop Muyenga Club Kampala 14th to 15th November

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rachael Aanyu</td>
<td>UJCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Martha ?</td>
<td>UDN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mary Sakesa</td>
<td>COU/PDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Roberts Nyeko</td>
<td>ULA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Doreen Kyarimpa</td>
<td>CDRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Juliet Nakato</td>
<td>MGRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Anjellina Nawal</td>
<td>KADP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Douglas …</td>
<td>AFLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rita …</td>
<td>ULA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of Participants at PT 4 Workshop Kyotera 14th to 15th November 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ssenkima Stephen</td>
<td>RACOBAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Titus Kamwamwa</td>
<td>KZACP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Charles Bukenya</td>
<td>CIPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Namukasa Josephine</td>
<td>ANPPCAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sr. Peninnah Kaimukirwa</td>
<td>KZACP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ignatius Nuwoha</td>
<td>ANPPCAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Doreen Namugambe</td>
<td>RACOBAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fred Kasozi</td>
<td>RACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ssalongo Frank</td>
<td>CIPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Anna Patrick</td>
<td>KZACP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mary Nagaddya</td>
<td>RACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Haq Makumbi</td>
<td>RACOBAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jude Tebandeke</td>
<td>RACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Angella Nakiyimba</td>
<td>CIPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Marxy Nanziri</td>
<td>CIPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Key elements for assessment with guiding questions

A: Analysis of gender and rights issues, gender and rights debate in the context in which the programme is executed

Project and programmes are executed in a national or regional context. It is in this context that the organisation aims to contribute to gender equality and further the enjoyment of rights for marginalised/discriminated groups. To correctly evaluate the organisation’s contribution, it is necessary to look within the particular context at what the organisation is actually doing and proposing. The potential for effecting change is linked not only to an organisation’s own capacity, competence, and organisational priorities, but also to the opportunities and constraints in the particular context of support/implementation.

Guiding questions to assess the above:

- Has a contextual rights-based and gender analysis been carried out?
- How has this been done and who have been involved?
- How well is the organisation informed of the main human rights issues/debates in the country relevant for their areas of support?
- How well is the organisation informed of the main gender issues/debates in the country relevant for their areas of support?
- Is the organisation aware of how relevant human rights treaties are implemented in the national context and of recommendations from human rights treaty bodies?
- Is the organisation aware of the manner in which the relevant Conventions and international agreements relevant for women’s rights are implemented in the national context (e.g. 1995 Beijing Women’s Conference and CEDAW)?
- Does the organisation have contacts or does it network with relevant human rights organisations, organisations of discriminated groups, and policy research organisations for informing its contextual analysis?
- Does the organisation have contacts or does it network with relevant women’s organisations and organisations focusing on gender and women’s rights?

B: Mainstreaming Rights-based development and Gender equality into Policy and Strategies (Policies, Programmes, and Projects)

It is necessary to assess how the organisation has mainstreamed gender equality and rights-based development in its policy documents and translated them into practice in its programmes and projects.

Guiding questions:

- Are the organisation’s policies and strategies rights-based and have they incorporated a gender equality perspective? More specifically, do they
  a) Address issues of discrimination and rights abuse/violations?
  b) Address issues of gender-based discrimination and inequality?
  c) Address the immediate and structural causes (practical needs and strategic interests) of impoverishment and rights abuse/violations?
  d) Have strategies for addressing the interests and rights of the most discriminated group?
  e) Have strategies for addressing the different interests of women and men within these groups?
  f) Have strategies for addressing the duty-bearers to tackle structural causes and barriers?
  g) Have strategies for empowering women and men within discriminated groups to access rights and resources?
  h) Have strategies that address access to justice issues for both women and men within most discriminated groups?
  i) Work in accountable, participatory and rights-sensitive ways towards partners and rights-holders?
Are the objectives geared to 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, and elimination of systemic gender-based discrimination?

Are the objectives geared to increasing rights claiming, strengthening institutional actors and frameworks, increasing access to justice, increasing opportunities and access to resources and services?

Has a gender analysis, rights analysis and/or stakeholder context analysis informed the foci of the policies/programmes/projects?

How is gender equality included in the project or programme: through specific activities addressing gender inequalities, women’s specific activities, men’s specific activities, mainstreaming for gender equality?

How is rights-based development included in the project or programme: through empowerment/capacity-building activities, policy and advocacy activities, human rights activities, access to justice issues?

Are indicators rights-based and gender-specific?

Do budgets reflect rights and gender equality priorities?

C: Mainstreaming rights-based development and gender equality in partner choice

DCA is a partner-based organisation so policies and strategies are very dependent on partners’ commitment and capacity in relation to rights-based development and gender equality. Therefore the choice of partner is extremely critical. This section addresses the selection criteria and the partner composition in relation to gender equality and rights-based development.

Guiding questions:

- Is the choice of partner organisations influenced by the rights-based policy, gender equality policy and the relevant programme strategy?
- Do partners adhere to rights-based principles and gender equality?
- What is the partner balance in relation to the focus of their work: advocacy, access to justice, empowerment/capacity building, service delivery, and research/analysis on rights and gender issues?
- Is a partner included that works specifically on promotion of gender equality?
- Have partner organisations been selected based on their capacity/perspective/commitment on gender equality?
- Have partner organisations been selected based on their capacity/perspective/commitment on rights-based development?
- Why have other organisations with these capacities not been selected as partners?
- What is the effect of the choice of partners for mainstreaming gender equality and women’s empowerment?
- What is the effect of the choice of partners on effectively supporting rights-based development?

D: Mainstreaming rights-based development and gender equality in partner relationship

DCA as a partner based organisation sees equal partnership as a core value. It is important to see how DCA policies are discussed with partners and how partners perceive the gender equality and rights-based commitment issues.

It is also important to assess how DCA is working to support the capacity development and internal mainstreaming of gender equality and rights-based development within the partner organisation.

Guiding questions:

- Have partner organisations been informed of the organisation’s gender policy, and if so, how?
- Have partner organisations been informed of the organisation’s rights-based policy, and if so, how?
- How do partner organisations perceive gender issues, and specifically the organisation’s gender equality policy?
How do partner organisations perceive rights issues, and specifically the organisation’s rights-based policy?

Has the organisation supported partner organisations’ capacity development on gender equality and rights-based development?

How has the organisation strengthened the dialogue with partner organisations on policy and programme development? Have systematic consultation procedures been implemented?

How do the partner organisations perceive their influence on the organisation’s policies and strategies?

Do partners have a feeling of shared ownership of the programme platform and do they feel that they influence its agenda?

**E: Gender/rights competence, capacity development and staff’s commitment**

Guiding questions:

- Are there specific posts/focal points for gender or rights specialists/advisory staff?
- What are the levels of expertise in terms of knowledge and skills on gender equality and rights-based development?
- How is this expertise dispersed/available in the organisation?
- What initiatives have been taken by the organisation to promote capacity development of staff on gender and rights-based development?
- Who has access to capacity development? Who is excluded? Is this based on formal or informal criteria?
- How is learning in the workplace promoted, for example, through intra-programme learning, feedback from colleagues/supervisors, discussion with outsiders, and the like?
- What is the level of commitment and motivation of staff members to address gender and rights issues in the workplace and the work with partners?
- How much space do staff have to do their job, for example, in relation to expressing ideas, trying out innovations, and work relations? Are they encouraged to document failures and use them as stepping stones towards success?

**F: Information and knowledge management for supporting rights-based development and gender equality**

Guiding questions:

- Is information collected, adapted, disseminated, and used in a structured manner? Is someone assigned for this task?
- Is access to internet and intranet available, and if so, to whom? Who does not have access?
- Are policy documents on gender/rights available and actively disseminated to staff and to partner organisations?
- Are experiences in programmes/projects on gender and rights issues shared within the organisation?
- How is learning collected, documented and shared within the organisation? Who is included and who not?
- How are partner organisations involved in the sharing of experiences and learning? Who is included and who not?

**G: Systems, procedures and tools in use for supporting rights-based development and gender equality**

Organisations develop systems to make sure that information is disseminated to the right people, that activities are coordinated, that data are being processed, that grievances can be addressed, that recruitment and performance appraisal is transparent, that effective partnership and network relationships can be established, that promote accountability and so on. Procedures are put in place to ensure that the right steps are followed, for example, concerning administrative matters, project proposals, budget allocation, recruitment of staff, and the use of facilities.
Guiding questions:
- Are the systems and procedures in the organisation gender sensitive and based on a respect for rights and rights principles?
- Are there systems/mechanisms in place to deal with discrimination, sexual harassment, grievances? Do all staff have equitable access to these systems? Is there a person appointed to handle confidential issues?
- Are these systems/mechanisms in the previous item based on organisational policies?
- Is the PME system gender and rights-sensitive in terms of data collection, analysis and process?
- Are instruments available and effective, such as checklists, guidelines, and the like, that help staff to work from a gender and rights perspective?
- How is the gender and diversity (age, ethnicity, regional, religion, sexual identity, national/international) balance of personnel promoted/maintained: positive discrimination, extra conditions, selection methods?
- Do the systems ensure equitable access for all staff members to opportunities for development and advancement?
- How do different groups work together in the organisation (men, women, class, caste, religion, ethnicity, people living with AIDS)?
- Are mechanism developed for increased accountability to partners and rights-holders?
- Are systems in place which promote the inputs of external expertise concerning gender and rights related issues?

H: Decision making in the organisation

Guiding questions:
- Who is always included in the decision taking about major issues such as policies, programme strategies, budget allocations? Is this selection related to functions or to other factors?
- Who is excluded? Is this related to function or to other factors?
- Are all staff timely informed about decision making and the decisions taken?
- Are gender equality and rights-based development taken into consideration in decision making?
- Are budgets allocated to activities in line with the gender equality and rights-based development policy?
- Who exerts most influence in the organisation about whether gender issues/rights issues are seriously taken up or neglected?
- Is there a mechanism for facilitating the participation and influence of partner organisations in policy and programme strategy?
- Is there a mechanism for facilitating the participation and influence of rights holders in programme strategy?

I: Organisational culture

Guiding questions:
- What is the image of the organisation among stakeholders in terms of gender equality: is the organisation women friendly; does it see gender issues only as window dressing; is it seriously involved in promoting women’s/men’s empowerment and in changing cultural norms in society; is there critique from outsiders, from insiders?
- What is the image of the organisation among stakeholders in terms of rights-based development? Is the organisation perceived by outsiders as rights-sensitive and non-discriminating? Is it seen as accountable to its staff, constituency, partners and targeted rights-holders? Is it seen as an advocate for the rights of marginalised groups? Is there critique from outsiders or from insiders?
- What is the organisation’s reputation as an employer of women and of men, of minorities and discriminated groups?
What would be the ideal staff profile in terms of qualities, capacities, commitment to work? Is this profile equally attainable for men and women, other diversities?

Does the organisation explicitly disagree with gossiping and joking about gender roles and minorities?

Does the organisation give a high priority to gender equality and rights-based development in the organisation and in the programmes/projects?

How open is the organisation to public display of its strengths and weaknesses?

How is cooperation with feminist/women’s organisations, organisations of discriminated groups, human rights organisations, secular organisations or religious organisations valued?

Does the organisation believe in teamwork to address gender and rights issues?

Does the organisation attach importance to learning and sharing about gender equality and rights-based development?

**J: Perception of achievement**

All those involved in programmes and projects of the organisation and the partner organisations have ideas about the relative success and outcome of their work. An attempt will be made to qualify the results from a gender and rights perspective in terms of:

- changes resulting from the work done
- their relative importance
- their relation to the objectives of the organisation
- the objectives of the programme/project/partner platform, and specific action plans/activities
- changes in relationship between DCA Headquarter and DCA local office, between the DCA local office and partners, and between partners.
Annex 4: List of documents reviewed

- Regional Strategy 2005-2012 for the Great Lakes Region
- Report of the a mid-term review of Karamoja Agro-Pastoral Development Programme (KADP) August 2005
- Rakai Community Integrated Aids Project 2006-2008
- Uganda Debt Network
- ELCT Kagera Zone Aids Control Project
- HIV/AIDS Bi-annual Programme Report
- Minutes of PT4 Platform Meeting Date?
- PT1 Cross-cutting
- TOR PT1 Programme Advisory Committee
- PT4 Programme Advisory Committee 2006
- PT4 Minutes 2007
- PT1 Minutes 2007
- PT4 Cross-cutting Project
- KADP DCA Internal Project Appraisal
- KADP Programme Document 2006-2008
- KADP logframe with objectives and outputs
- KADP Annual report 2006
- PT 1 policy document: DCA Uganda Integrated community and Advocacy programme
- PT 4 policy document: DCA HIV/AIDS Competence for Prevention, Care & Mitigation of Effects
- Staff Manual for DCA Great Lakes Office
- Documenting and Enhancing Best Practice, by The Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda 2007
Annex 5: DOCUMENT ANALYSIS SHEET - DANCHURCHAID GENDER AND RIGHTS-BASED AUDIT - UGANDA
NOVEMBER 2007  Please note that this sheet is used for testing and needs revision if to be used in future

Please note that men may to refer to men and boys and women to women and girls

Overall assessment based on observations about what is included and not included in the document(s)

<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>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Explanatory Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A: Analysis of gender and rights issues, gender and rights debate in the context in which the programme is executed | Has the analysis in the document incorporated a gender and rights-based perspective:  
  • identified those most affected/discriminated against  
  • identified the different needs and interests of women/girls and men/boys within these groups  
  • identified which rights are violated in relation to the men/boys and women/girls within these groups  
  • identified the underlying causes and barriers of rights abuses and violations  
  • drawn on national legislation, policies, human rights instruments  
  • analysed relevant state and non-state actors with responsibilities and power to make needed changes |     |    |               |         |                |                      |
**B: Mainstreaming Rights–based development and Gender equality into Policy and Strategies (Policies, Programmes, and Projects)**

*In the documents on policies, programmes and projects is the following explicitly stated:*

- Have rights-based **policies** of DCA incorporated a gender equality perspective?
- Do the **objectives** address the interests and rights of the most discriminated and deprived groups?
- Do the objectives address the different interests and rights of women and men within these groups?
- Do the overall objectives address gender equality at a structural level?
- 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, 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?
- Are **indicators** rights-based and gender specific?
- Are the **project activities** specifically geared towards gender equality and women’s empowerment?
- Are the project activities geared to combating specific forms of discrimination and rights denials and violations?
- Is attention paid to gender equality in the project or programme in the following way:
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | - 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  
|   | - Is attention paid to rights-based development in the project or programme in the following way:  
|   | - empowerment/ capacity-building activities for rights-holders  
|   | - policy and advocacy activities  
|   | - capacity-building of duty-bearers  
|   | - human rights activities  
|   | - access to justice activities  
|   | - Do budgets reflect rights-based priorities?  
|   | - Do budgets reflect gender equality priorities?  
| J. Perception of Achievement | - Are changes resulting from work reported according to specific discriminated groups and gender disaggregated?  
|   | - Are changes reported in terms of gender equality (see objectives under B)  
|   | - Are changes reported in terms of rights-based development (see objectives under B)  
| C. Mainstreaming rights-based development and gender equality in partner choice | Type of documents: Programme policy documents, annual plans, programme reports, programme strategies, programme review reports, Vision and plan  
|   | - Are gender and rights-based commitment and competences prioritised in partner selection  
| D: Mainstreaming rights-based development and | Type of document: minutes of programme platform and other partner meetings, training or workshop reports, programme reports, TOR from the partner platform.  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender equality in partner relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Have partner organisations been informed about DCA Gender equality policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have partner organisations been informed about DCA Rights-based commitment policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has DCA supported the partners’ capacity development on gender equality and rights-based development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is there evidence that partners have influenced DCA policies and strategies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is there evidence that partners feel shared ownership of the programme platform and that they influence the agenda?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E: Gender/ rights competence, capacity development and staff’s commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of document: training reports, job descriptions, organogram, planning papers, competence development plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the capacity building include attention to gender and rights issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is the capacity building also geared towards increasing knowledge and skills to address gender and rights issues and to motivate staff members to address such issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do all staff members take part in relevant training irrespective of their responsibility and position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is every staff member supposed to address gender equality and rights-based development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the organisation plan and regularly organise capacity development for the staff?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is there evidence (for example in assessment forms), that staff bring into practise and prioritise their knowledge about gender and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F: Information and knowledge management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G: Systems, procedures and tools in use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H: Decision making in the organisation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Are gender and diversity interests of staff taken into consideration?
- Is the language used gender sensitive and non-discriminatory?
- Is it indicated that all staff can make use of grievance mechanism irrespective of their gender and other identities?
- Is access to assets and facilities based on entitlements and function opposite to individual privileges?
- Are gender and diversity explicitly taken into consideration in staff recruitment and performance appraisal?
- Do data systems, checklists and guidelines differentiate according to gender and rights-holders?
- Do data systems, checklists and guidelines include gender and rights-based issues?
- Do TORs specifically ask for gender and rights expertise and addressing gender and rights issues?

- 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?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I: Organisational culture</th>
<th>Type of document: vision and plan papers, brochures, notice board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Do core values reflect gender and rights principles?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do core values appreciate learning, sharing and team work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is high priority given to gender equality and rights-based development in the organisation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Are the decisions taken to promote gender equality and rights-based development related to programmes and partner relations put into action?
- 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?
- Are budgets allocated to activities in line with the gender equality and rights-based development policy?
- Are decisions and actions taken disseminated to all staff in the organisation?
- 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?
Annex 6: Methods selected for the workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>DCA staff workshop</th>
<th>DCA partner workshop</th>
<th>Rights holders workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Awareness Quiz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>PT4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate</td>
<td></td>
<td>PT1</td>
<td>PT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality test</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of projects/programmes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>PT1 PT4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venn diagram</td>
<td></td>
<td>PT1 PT4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onion of Hofstede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind-mapping</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of achievement/change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>PT1 PT4</td>
<td>PT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about learning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>PT1 PT4</td>
<td>PT1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>