

**[A](#_bookmark1)**

[**B**](#_bookmark15)

**ANNEXES**

[Glossary](#_bookmark45)

[References](#_bookmark46)

TOOLS



[**TOOL 1**](#_bookmark34)

[**First-order boundary**](#_bookmark34)

[**analysis**](#_bookmark34)

117



[**TOOL 2**](#_bookmark35)

[**Stakeholder analysis**](#_bookmark35)

119



[**TOOL 3**](#_bookmark36)

[**Second-order boundary**](#_bookmark36)

[**analysis**](#_bookmark36)

121



[**TOOL 4**](#_bookmark37)

[**Vulnerability assessment**](#_bookmark37)

122



[**TOOL 5**](#_bookmark38)

[**GEMs evaluability**](#_bookmark38)

[**assessment**](#_bookmark38)

123



[**TOOL 6**](#_bookmark39)

[**ISE4GEMs planning tool**](#_bookmark39)

124



[**TOOL 7**](#_bookmark40)

[**Transdisciplinary methods**](#_bookmark40)

[**and tools**](#_bookmark40)

125



[**TOOL 8**](#_bookmark41)

[**Facilitators’ field guide**](#_bookmark41)

[**meeting planner**](#_bookmark41)

129



[**TOOL 9**](#_bookmark42)

[**GEMs data analysis**](#_bookmark42)

130



[**TOOL 10**](#_bookmark43)

[**GEMs integration tool**](#_bookmark43)

132



[**TOOL 11**](#_bookmark44)

[**Final reflections**](#_bookmark44)

133

**[A](#_bookmark1)** [**B**](#_bookmark15)ISE4GEMS TOOL 1: **First-order boundary analysis (1/2)**



**Suggested document sources:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project name:** | | | |
| **Questions to guide your first-order analysis** | **Information** | **Record any changes** (for- mal or informal), including when, how or why these changes were completed | **Source** (e.g. monitoring report, staff interview) |
| What is the problem the intervention is trying to address? |  |  |  |
| How was the problem identified and described? By whom? |  |  |  |
| What prompted the decision to intervene to address the problem? Who was in- volved? |  |  |  |
| How does the intervention expect to address the problem? |  |  |  |
| What are its goals, objectives and rationale? Who was involved in developing them? What was considered? Who made the final decision? |  |  |  |
| Was a stakeholder analysis conducted to inform the design of the intervention? How was it conducted and by whom? |  |  |  |
| Was a ToC developed? If yes, please describe it? If not, can it be constructed? |  |  |  |
| Was there a monitoring system in place? How was data collected and at what inter- vals? Is there baseline data that is suitable for later comparative analysis? |  |  |  |
| What are the expected results (outputs, outcomes or impacts)? How were these decided? Who was involved in the decision-making? What factors were considered? |  |  |  |
| What are the strategies or activities selected to deliver results? Why were these selected? By whom? What factors were considered? |  |  |  |
| What was the time frame allotted for achieving results? |  |  |  |
| What was the overall financial budget allocated for the intervention? |  |  |  |
| Who was targeted by the intervention for inclusion? Any specific populations? Any vulnerable groups included? (Note: A more detailed stakeholder analysis will be conducted through Tool 2) |  |  |  |

organizational mission statements, strategic plans, programme/project documents, proposals and grants, ToC, baseline studies, monitoring data/reports, progress and donor reports, reviews or evaluations, etc.

[**A**](#_bookmark1)[**B**](#_bookmark15)ISE4GEMS TOOL 1: **First-order boundary analysis (2/2)**



**Suggested document sources:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions to guide your first-order analysis** | **Information** | **Record any changes** (for- mal or informal), including when, how or why these changes were completed | **Source** (e.g. monitoring report, staff interview) |
| Who is involved in the implementation of the intervention? What are the roles and responsibilities? How were these decided? |  |  |  |
| How was implementation monitored? What indicators or methods were selected and by whom? Why were these selected? Who was responsible? |  |  |  |
| Did the intervention pay attention to or address gender equality issues? How were these identified? What actions were taken? |  |  |  |
| Did the intervention pay attention to marginalized or vulnerable groups? Was a vulnerability assessment conducted? If not, how were these groups identified? What actions were taken? |  |  |  |
| Did the intervention identify and address any relevant socioenvironmental issues (e.g., natural resources, places or assets important in terms of habitability of biodiver- sity)? How were these identified? By whom? What actions were taken? |  |  |  |
| Did the intervention identify any interconnections in terms of two or more of the GEMs dimensions (gender equality, environments and marginalized voices)? How were these identified? By whom? What actions were taken? |  |  |  |
| Were any uneven power dynamics identified? How were these considered and addressed by the intervention? If stakeholders had conflicting ideas, were these differences addressed and how?  For example, what is the relationship between donors and other end-user stakehold- ers in the evaluation? |  |  |  |

organizational mission statements, strategic plans, programme/project documents, proposals and grants, ToC, baseline studies, monitoring data/reports, progress and donor reports, reviews or evaluations, etc.



[**A**](#_bookmark1)
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ISE4GEMS TOOL 2: **Stakeholder analysis (1/2)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions to guide your analysis** | **Information/description** (e.g., what was each individual or group’s role?) | **Source** (e.g., monitoring report, staff interview) | **Include or exclude in the evaluation and why** |
| List the groups of stakeholders that were explicitly identified at the start of the interven- tion—especially those that represent GEMs stakeholders (e.g., donors, programme staff, gate- keepers, government agencies, community organizations, households, individuals, schools/ac- ademia, NGOs, multilateral organizations, private sector agencies). What was each individual or group’s role? |  |  |  |
| Which stakeholders had decision-making power regarding the design of the programme? Which were consulted for feedback? |  |  |  |
| Name any additional stakeholders who were identified during the implementation process of the intervention. What prompted their identification? |  |  |  |
| Have the stakeholders been disaggregated by gender identity? Were categories beyond male and female included? |  |  |  |
| Identify any stakeholders also classified as marginalized or vulnerable. |  |  |  |
| Name stakeholders who could be classified as rights holders and/or duty bearers. |  |  |  |
| Who are the intended data sources for this information? |  |  |  |
| What were/are the relationships, and how do they vary by level of power? To what extent did the relationships change over the course of the intervention and what influenced those changes (e.g., social and economic empowerment, legal and social protection laws)? |  |  |  |
| How has gender been defined? Are relevant gender identities or perspectives represented? Is a more inclusive definition of gender required? |  |  |  |
| How will gender play a primary consideration in the planning, staffing, field locations, meth- ods and participation throughout the evaluation’s conduct? |  |  |  |
| Describe the particular marginalized sectors or groups. Can they be included in the evalua- tion? Who is making those decisions? |  |  |  |
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ISE4GEMS TOOL 2: **Stakeholder analysis (2/2)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions to guide your analysis** | **Information/description** (e.g., what was each individual or group’s role?) | **Source** (e.g., monitoring report, staff interview) | **Include or exclude in the evaluation and why** |
| What special adaptations need to be put into place for people to safely participate (e.g., home visits, focus groups, use of technologies for anonymity and inclusion)? |  |  |  |
| How can all affected people, communities and organizations be involved in the planning and design of the evaluation? |  |  |  |
| If they were not a central focus, how will other marginalized groups be included as stakehold- ers? |  |  |  |
| Which people with local and/or scientific expertise or organizations can provide knowledge and representation of the socioecological landscapes of importance?  Can agencies be included that are tasked with monitoring and supporting social change for human and environmental well-being (e.g., Medicines Sans Frontiers, the International Union Conservation of Nature)? |  |  |  |
| How will structural and relational power dynamics that acted as barriers or enablers of partic- ipation for gendered and marginalized groups be identified and mitigated? |  |  |  |
| What possible opportunities could inclusion provide to empower, build capacity, reduce mar- ginalization or positively influence power dynamics? |  |  |  |
| How will different perspectives and potential conflicts between stakeholders/groups be man- aged? What does this level of complexity mean for the evaluation? |  |  |  |
| What are the barriers to inclusion related to feasibility, accessibility, harm and power dynam- ics? Can these barriers be mitigated ethically and efficiently with safeguards (e.g., home visits, focus groups, use of technologies for anonymity and inclusion)? |  |  |  |
| How will structural and relational power dynamics that acted as barriers or enablers of partic- ipation for gendered and marginalized groups be identified and mitigated? |  |  |  |
| What consideration about vulnerability assessment do they suggest? Do the stakeholders suggest questions to ask of the evaluation? |  |  |  |
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ISE4GEMS TOOL 3: **Second-order boundary analysis**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions to guide your analysis** | **Information** | **Ideal actions to be taken** | **Source** (e.g., monitoring report, staff interview) |
| What was missing from the Boundary Story that could be included in the evaluation boundary (e.g., vulnerability assessments, gender analysis, human rights analysis, socioenvironmental analysis)? |  |  |  |
| Who are the agents of interpersonal power dynamics and structures within the Boundary Story? How were these agents identi- fied? Who or what agencies should be included in the evaluation? |  |  |  |
| How does the intervention interact with its context? Is the intervention nested or intersecting with other systems? What types of networks have formed among these systems? How do they affect or change each other? |  |  |  |
| **GENDER EQUALITY** | | | |
| Can the evaluation increase the accountability and learning of how the intervention has affected or could better support gender equality (e.g., for women, men and/or transgendered people as defined and identified by the people involved/affected by the intervention)? |  |  |  |
| Is there evidence of planned or unplanned results (positive or negative) related to gender equality? |  |  |  |
| How will the evaluation be used to improve intervention design to promote gender equality? |  |  |  |
| **ENVIRONMENTS** | | | |
| How can the evaluation increase the accountability of, and learning about, the habitability of environments and socioecological landscapes for humans and flora and fauna (as defined and identified by the people involved/affected by the intervention)? |  |  |  |
| Is there evidence of planned or unplanned results (positive or negative) related to the habitability, sustainability or managed resource use of ecological systems? |  |  |  |
| How will the evaluation be used to improve intervention design to promote environmental sustainability? |  |  |  |
| **MARGINALIZED VOICES** | | | |
| How can the evaluation increase the accountability and learning of changes in the status, needs and quality of life of people, and reduce marginalization (as defined and identified by the people involved/affected by the intervention)? |  |  |  |
| Is there evidence of planned or unplanned results (positive or negative) related to reductions in marginalization? |  |  |  |
| How will the evaluation be used to improve intervention design to reduce marginalization in all its forms for social and environ- mental justice? |  |  |  |

**[A](#_bookmark1)** [**B**](#_bookmark15)ISE4GEMS TOOL 4: **Vulnerability assessment**



**Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEMs dimensions** | **Indicators of vulnerability at the intervention location(s)** | **Potential vulnerability within the evaluation process** | **Level at which vulnerability may be experienced (e.g., community, household, intra- household)** | **Proposed mitigation actions to reduce vulnerability within the evaluation process (e.g., special efforts to encourage participation, ethical safeguards, empowerment)** |
| **Gender equality**  *(example)* | *Dominant cultural norms or religious beliefs are not accepting of homosexual relations and gender fluidity* | *LGBTQI individuals— discrimination or targeting based on sexual identity or orientation* | *Community, intra-household, household* | *Take special measures to allow individuals to confidentially express their interest in participating in the evaluation; protect confidentiality throughout the process* |
| **Environments**  *(example)* | *Drought conditions* | *Community members may not have time to engage with the evaluation process given the lack of availability/accessibility of natural resources and impact on livelihoods (e.g., water, food)*  *Women, children, the elderly and those already living below the poverty line may be more affected* | *Community, intra-household and household* | *Data collection efforts may not be ethical if engagement affects participants’ ability to access life- sustaining resources;*  *special efforts can be made to offset or reduce harm* |
| **Marginalized voices**  *(example)* | *Dominant perception that persons with disabilities do not have the capacity to actively participate in community initiatives* | *People living with disabilities— discrimination, not included due to disability* | *Community and household* | *Special effort to engage with people living with disabilities in the*  *evaluation process and highlight their contributions and perspectives* |

Organization). 2009. The Livelihood

Assessment Toolkit.

Frankenberger, T.R., K. Luther, J. Becht, and M.K. McCaston. 2002. Household Livelihood Security Assessments A Toolkit for Practitioners. Atlanta, GA: CARE USA.

Moret, W. 2014. Vulnerability Assessment Methodologies: A Review of the Literature. Washington, DC: USAID.

Oxfam Australia and Australian Government (AusAID). 2012. Integrated Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Participatory Capacity Vulnerability Analysis

(PVCA) Toolkit.

Regional Hunger and Vulnerability Programme (RHVP), Save the Children UK (SC UK) and the Food Economy Group (FEG). 2015. The Practitioner’s Guide to the Household Economy Approach.

Regmi, B. et al. 2010. Participatory Tools and Techniques for Assessing Climate Change Impacts and Exploring Adaptation Options.

London: UKAID.
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ISE4GEMS TOOL 5: **GEMs evaluability assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions to guide your analysis** | **Information** | **What action should be taken?** | **Record of changes in thinking or emergence of new material** | **Source (e.g., monitoring report, staff interview)** |
| What should be assessed to provide robust analysis of the GEMs dimensions? |  |  |  |  |
| What level of data is available or can feasibly and ethically be collected against the GEMs dimensions (e.g., on environmental landscapes)? |  |  |  |  |
| Do the systems have discreet and knowable ecological landscapes (e.g., natural resources, places or asset)? How were these described in the intervention (quantified, measured or described in narratives)? |  |  |  |  |
| Are there ongoing issues of contestation concerning ecological landscapes and sustainable development? |  |  |  |  |
| What is the context within which the evaluation is being undertaken?  What are the policy and sectoral boundaries (e.g., local, state, international)? What policy settings and sectors of the community did the intervention work with and within or seek to affect?  How was the social impact measured? |  |  |  |  |
| Is there an explicit ToC? Were monitoring indicators established to review change |  |  |  |  |
| How is cultural sensitivity and awareness addressed? What language(s) are spoken? What is the ethnic composi- tion of the population? What are the religious practices and observations? What are the beliefs and practices that must be understood and regarded with cultural sensitivity?  How were the intervention’s staff, volunteers, partners, etc., cognizant of cultural sensitivities and did they act with cultural competence? |  |  |  |  |
| Were the intervention’s staff, volunteers, partners, etc. cognizant of intersectional divisions that may have com- pounded individuals’ or groups’ experience of marginalization? |  |  |  |  |
| What evidence is there of critical reflection on the initial boundaries of the problem and agreement sought from local participants/stakeholders that the intervention is warranted, ethical, and likely to produce an outcome that makes an improvement? |  |  |  |  |
| What level of authentic stakeholder participation is possible and what are the parameters around co-evaluation/ co-facilitation (e.g., availability or interest/capacity of stakeholders, independence safeguards)? |  |  |  |  |
| Will the evaluation results support learning on transformational change and open up opportunities, or find limita- tions to build local capacities? |  |  |  |  |
| What resources exist to evaluate the intervention? |  |  |  |  |
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ISE4GEMS TOOL 6: **ISE4GEMs planning tool**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **EVALUATION TITLE:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Evaluator/Co-evaluators:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** |
| **Evaluation purpose, objectives and use** | **Evaluation criteria** | **Evaluation key questions** | **Evaluation indicators** | **Data collection methods** | **Alternative options** | **Data source(s), stakeholders and data management plan** | **Identified ethical risks and safeguards** | **Data analysis and interpretation methods for systemic triangulation** | **Capacity development and knowledge sharing** | **Timeline and resources** |
| ***Chapter 5, Step 3***  *These are indicative questions to support the development of your plan. Please see for a more comprehensive discussion and set of suggestive questions for each column.* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Why is this evaluation being undertaken?  What need will it serve? Who will be interested or able to use it and how?  Are there divergent views as to the objectives and use of the evaluation?  Which GEMs dimensions (and their inter-relationships) are relevant to include in the objectives? | Are GEMs deemed relevant incorporated into the evaluation criteria? | Are GEMs deemed rel- evant incor- porated into the evaluation questions based on their relevant?  Was the selection of questions an inclusive process?  Are second or- der questions included? | Select indicators to be able to collect evidence of intervention  effectiveness, the relevant GEMs  dimensions and to track changes in behaviour and attitudes. | Do interdisciplinary mixed methods integrate different data sets to:  Gather sufficient and appropriate data  Examine the causes of marginalization, gender inequality and damage to environments  Produce locally defined, beneficial improvements and social change  Address how data and associated materials will be managed, stored, documented and secured. | | | Have ethical protocols been reviewed and safeguard strategies been developed?  How will decisions be made on when to exclude a stakeholder due to ethical concerns? | Do analysis methods allow you to establish findings according to the GEMs themes and emergent outcomes?  What methods can be deployed for an inclusive interpretation processes?  Who will be engaged in the final boundary analysis within which to interpret the findings? | What are the knowledge sharing and capacity development opportunities during the evaluation process?  At the end of the process? What methods will be used? | What are the resources and time frames available?  Do these take into account possible need for additional cycles of data collection? |
| Will the evaluation process and findings be used to develop capacity of stakeholders? |  |  |  |  | | |  |  |  |  |

**[A](#_bookmark1)** [**B**](#_bookmark15)ISE4GEMS TOOL 7: **Transdisciplinary methods and tools (1/4)**



**Key for ISE4GEMs relevance:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Framework, approach or methodology** | **Basic description** | **Sources for implementation of method** | **ISE4GEMs**  **relevance** |
| **Participatory statistics** | Local people can generate their own numbers, and the statistics that result are powerful for themselves and can influence policy. Statistics are being generat- ed in the design, monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment of development interventions.  *Who Counts?* provides impetus for a step change in the adoption and mainstreaming of participatory statistics within international development practice. | Holland, J. 2013. *Who Counts? The Power of Participatory Statistics.* Rugby, UK: Practical Action Publishing. Available at: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/publication/> who-counts-the-power-of-participatory-statistics | Systemic  Marginalized voices |
| **Individual**  **semi-structured interviews** | Semi-structured interviews are particularly useful for collecting information on people’s ideas, opin- ions or experiences. They are often used during needs assessment, programme design or evalu- ation. Semi-structured interviews should not be used to collect numerical information and require informed consent. | Tools4dev. 2014. “How to do Semi-structured Interviews”. Available online at: <http://www.tools4dev.org/wp-content/uploads/how-to-do-semi-struc-> tured-interviews.pdf  Harrell, M.C. and M.A. Bradley. 2009. *Data Collection Methods: Semi-Structured Interviews and*  *Focus Groups.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp. Available at: http://www.rand. org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical\_reports/2009/RAND\_TR718.pdf  Evaluation Toolbox. 2010. “Semi-structured Interview”. Available at: http:// evaluationtoolbox.net.au/index.php?option=com\_content&view=arti- cle&id=31&Itemid=137 | Marginalized voices |
| **Outcome harvesting** | It does not measure progress towards predeter- mined outcomes, but rather collects (harvests) evi- dence of what has changed (outcomes), and works backwards to determine whether and how the project or intervention contributed to the outcome, with particular attention to behavioural change. | Wilson-Grau, R. and H. Britt. 2012. *Outcome Harvesting.* Cairo, Egypt: Ford Foundation. Available at: <http://www.outcomemapping.ca/resource/out-> come-harvesting | Systemic |
| **Developmental evaluation** | An evaluation approach that can assist social innovators in developing social change initiatives in complex or uncertain environments by facili- tating real-time, or close to real-time, feedback to programme staff, thus facilitating a continuous development loop. The approach is highly respon- sive to context and suited for radical uncertainty  and complexity, and not intended as the solution to every situation. | Spark Policy Institute. 2014. “Development Evaluation Toolkit”. Available at: <http://sparkpolicy.com/tools/developmental-evaluation/>  Gamble, J.A. 2008. *A Developmental Evaluation Primer.* Canada: The JW McCo- nnell Family Foundation. Available at:  [http://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/A 20Developmen-](http://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/A20Developmen-) tal 20Evaluation 20Primer 20- 20EN.pdf  NECTAC (National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center). 2008. *De- velopmental Screening and Assessment Instruments.* Chapel Hill, NC: NECTAC. Available at:  <http://www.nectac.org/~pdfs/pubs/screening.pdf> | Systemic |

**Gender** = Developed to respond to gender equity and

empowerment

**Environments** = Developed to promote environmental

analysis

**Marginalized voices** = Developed to highlight the voices of marginalized groups

**Systemic** = Developed to promote systemic thinking

[**A**](#_bookmark1)[**B**](#_bookmark15)ISE4GEMS TOOL 7: **Transdisciplinary methods and tools (2/4)**



**Key for ISE4GEMs relevance:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Framework, approach or methodology** | **Basic description** | **Sources for implementation of method** | **ISE4GEMs**  **relevance** |
|  |  | Sadler, J. et al. 2013. “Cognitive Mapping: Using Local Knowledge for Planning Health Research”. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 13:96. Available at: |  |
| **Cognitive mapping** | A participatory research methodology that uses local knowledge to document, in visual form, a construct of the local environment in which people live and work. | <http://bmcmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com/arti-> cles/10.1186/1471-2288-13-96  MGray, S.A. et al. 2012. *Mental Modeler: A Fuzzy-Logic Cognitive Mapping Modeling Tool for Adaptive Environmental Management.* Washington, DC: IEEE Computer Society. Available at:  [http://www.mentalmodeler.org/articles/Gray 20et 20al 20Mental 20](http://www.mentalmodeler.org/articles/Gray20et20al20Mental20) Modeler 202013.pdf | Environments Systemic |
|  |  | Brightman, J. 2003. “Mapping methods for qualitative data structuring (QDS)”. Presented at IOE Conference, London UK, 8-9 May 2003. Available at: <http://www.banxia.com/pdf/de/Map_for_qual_data_struct.pdf> |  |
| **Harvard Analytical (Gender Roles) Framework** | A simple method for mapping the work and resources of men and women in a community and highlighting the main differences. Collects and analyses data at the community and household level. | UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East). 2011. UNRWA Gender Analysis Manual. Jordan: UNRWA. Available at: <http://www.unrwa.es/EBDHsevilla2015/wp-content/up-> loads/2015/11/Gender-Analysis\_UNRWA.pdf | Gender |
| **Gender Planning Framework** | Takes the view that gender planning, unlike other mainstream planning, is “both technical and polit- ical in nature.” It involves transformative processes and characterizes planning as a “debate.” There are six tools in the framework that can be used for planning at all levels from project to regional planning. | Moser, C. 2012. *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice and Train- ing.* London: Routledge. Available at: <http://www.polsci.chula.ac.th/pitch/> urbansea12/moser1993.pdf | Gender |
| **Gender analysis frameworks** | Gender analysis frameworks help to determine the different impacts of development interventions on women and men. They can be used for planning, making changes during a project, and monitoring and evaluation. Gender analysis frameworks are of- ten implemented through a participatory process. | “Gender Analysis Matrix”. In: Parker, R. *Another Point of View: A Manual on Gender Analysis Training for Grassroots Workers.* UNIFEM. Available at: http:// [www.gdrc.org/gender/framework/matrix.html](http://www.gdrc.org/gender/framework/matrix.html)  “The WHO Gender Analysis Matrix”. In: WHO (World Health Organization). 2010. *Gender Mainstreaming for Health Managers: A Practical Approach.*  Geneva: WHO. Available at: <http://www.who.int/gender/mainstreaming/> GMH\_Participant\_GenderAnalysisMatrix.pdf  Rao, A., J. Sandler, D. Kelleher, and C. Miller. 2015. *Gender at Work: Theory and Practice for 21st Century Organizations*. London: Routledge.  Charmes, J. and S. Wieringa. 2010. “Measuring Women’s Empowerment: An Assessment of the Gender-related Development Index and the Gender Empowerment Measure”. *Journal of Human Development, 4*(3), 419-435. doi:10.1080/1464988032000125773  The European Institute for Gender Equality. 2017. *Gender Impact Assess- ment: A Tool for Public Institutions.* Available at: <http://eige.europa.eu/gen-> der-mainstreaming/toolkits/gender-impact-assessment | Gender |

**Gender** = Developed to respond to gender equity and

empowerment

**Environments** = Developed to promote environmental

analysis

**Marginalized voices** = Developed to highlight the voices of marginalized groups

**Systemic** = Developed to promote systemic thinking

[**A**](#_bookmark1)[**B**](#_bookmark15)ISE4GEMS TOOL 7: **Transdisciplinary methods and tools (3/4)**



**Key for ISE4GEMs relevance:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Framework, approach or methodology** | **Basic description** | **Sources for implementation of method** | **ISE4GEMs**  **relevance** |
| **Women’s empowerment framework** | Assists planners to question what women’s equal- ity and empowerment means in practice and to what extent a development intervention supports empowerment. | Longwe, S. 1991. “Gender Awareness: The Missing Element in the Third World Development Project”. Available at: h[ttps://w](http://www.popline.org/node/335992)ww[.popline](http://www.popline.org/node/335992).org/[node/335992](http://www.popline.org/node/335992)  Longwe, S. 1995. “Women’s Empowerment Framework.” Available at: http:// awidme.pbworks.com/w/page/36322701/Women 27s 20Empowerment 20 Framework  ILO (International Labour Organization). 1998. “ILO/SEAPAT’s OnLine Gender Learning & Information Module”. Available at: <http://www.ilo.org/public/> english/region/asro/mdtmanila/training/unit1/empowfw.htm | Gender |
| **The Institute of Develop- ment Studies**  **Social Relations Framework** | A socialist feminist approach that focuses on the social relations of gender and the role of institu- tions in shaping gender relations by analysing the social relations of gender in terms of rules, people, resources, activities and power in macro and micro levels of analysis. | Reeves, H. and S. Baden. 2000. *Gender and Development: Concepts and Defi- nitions.* Brighton, UK: University of Sussex Institute of Development Studies. Available at: <http://www.bridge.ids.ac.uk/sites/bridge.ids.ac.uk/files/reports/> re55.pdf  Kabeer, N. and R. Subrahmanian.1996. *Institutions, Relations and Outcomes: Framework and Tools for Gender-Aware Planning.* Brighton, UK: University of Sussex Institute of Development Studies. Available at: https://www.ids. ac.uk/files/Dp357.pdf | Gender Systemic |
|  |  | Oxfam. 2018. “Women’s Economic Empowerment in Agriculture: Vulnerability and Risk Assessment (VRA”). Available at: <http://growsellthrive.org/page/> vulnerability-and-risk-assessment-vra |  |
| **Vulnerability assessment** | A participatory, perception based approach that identifies and assesses the shifting vulnerabilities of different communities in relation to disaster management, environmental hazards, as well as sociopolitical and socioeconomic issues. | UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2009. “Community-based Adaptation Project: A Guide to the Vulnerability Reduction Assessment”.  Available at: <http://slideplayer.com/slide/8428002/>  UNICEF (United Nations Children’s Fund). 2010. *Guidance Note: Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments.* Kenya: UNICEF. Available at: http://www.unicefine- mergencies.com/downloads/eresource/docs/1.8 20Gender 20equality 20 in 20humanitarian 20action/2010-02-01 20- 20UNICEF 20Kenya 20- 20 Guide 20to 20using 20existing 20VCA 20tools 20& 20methodology.pdf | Marginalized voices  Systemic |
|  |  |  | Gender |
| **Gender-sen- sitive Climate Vulnerability and Capacity Analysis** | A framework for analysing vulnerability and capacity to adapt to climate change and build re- silience to disasters at the community level, with a particular focus on social and, in particular, gender dynamics | CARE International. 2014. *Gender-sensitive Climate Vulnerability and Capacity*  *Analysis*  *(GCVCA).* Mozambique: CARE International. Available at: [http://careclimat-](http://careclimat-/) echange.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/GCVCA\_Practitioners-Guide-FI- NAL-July-2014.pdf | Environments  Marginalized voices |

**Gender** = Developed to respond to gender equity and

empowerment

**Environments** = Developed to promote environmental

analysis

**Marginalized voices** = Developed to highlight the voices of marginalized groups

**Systemic** = Developed to promote systemic thinking

[**A**](#_bookmark1)[**B**](#_bookmark15)ISE4GEMS TOOL 7: **Transdisciplinary methods and tools (4/4)**



**Key for ISE4GEMs relevance:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Framework, approach or methodology** | **Basic description** | **Sources for implementation of method** | **ISE4GEMs**  **relevance** |
| **Environmental risk assessment** | Provides a systematic procedure for predicting the potential risk to human health or the environment cause by particular env*ironmental* stressors (e.g., chemicals, land change, disease, invasive species and climate change). | Manuilova, A. 2003. *Methods and Tools for Assessment of Environmental Risk*. Available at: h[ttps://w](http://www.scribd.com/document/307290125/An-Overview-)ww[.scribd.c](http://www.scribd.com/document/307290125/An-Overview-)om/[documen](http://www.scribd.com/document/307290125/An-Overview-)t/[307290125/An-Overview-](http://www.scribd.com/document/307290125/An-Overview-) of-ERA-Methods-and-Tools  EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). 2016. “Ecological Risk Assessment”. Available at: h[ttps://w](http://www.epa.gov/risk/ecological-risk-assessment)ww[.epa.go](http://www.epa.gov/risk/ecological-risk-assessment)v/[risk](http://www.epa.gov/risk/ecological-risk-assessment)/ec[ological-risk-assessment](http://www.epa.gov/risk/ecological-risk-assessment)  UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). No date. “Training Module on Environmental Risk Assessment (EnRA)”. Available at: http://www.unep. or.jp/ietc/publications/techpublications/techpub-14/2-EnRA1.asp | Environments |
| **Sustainability science, coupled human and natural sys- tems; ecology; environmental geography** | Interdisciplinary fields of research that focus on the integrated nature of human and environmental systems. | BetterEvaluation. “Search Results for ‘Environment’”. Available at: http:// [www.betterevaluation.org/en/search/site/environmental](http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/search/site/environmental)  PNAS (Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences). 2018. “Sustainabili- ty Science”. Available at:  <http://sustainability.pnas.org/> | Environments |
| **Social ecological model** | A theory-based framework for understanding the multifaceted and interactive effects of person-  al and environmental factors that determine behaviours, and for identifying behavioural and organizational leverage points and intermediaries for health promotion within organizations. | CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). No date. “The Social-Eco- logical Model: A Framework for Violence Prevention”. Available at: https:// [www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/sem\_framewrk-a.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/sem_framewrk-a.pdf)  Surtevant, B. R. et al. 2007. “A Toolkit Modeling Approach for Sustainable Forest Management Planning: Achieving Balance between Science and Local Needs”. Ecology and Science 12(2):7. Available at: http://www.ecologyandsoci- ety.org/vol12/iss2/art7/ | Gender Environments  Marginalized voices |

**Gender** = Developed to respond to gender equity and

empowerment

**Environments** = Developed to promote environmental

analysis

**Marginalized voices** = Developed to highlight the voices of marginalized groups

**Systemic** = Developed to promote systemic thinking

**[A](#_bookmark1)** [**B**](#_bookmark15)ISE4GEMS TOOL 8: **Facilitators’ field guide meeting planner**



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Facilitator:** | **Location:** | **Date:** |
| **Stakeholders present:** | | |
| **Introductions** | Introduce members of the team | |
| **Overview of the project** | Facilitate a discussion about the evaluation—objectives, ToRs, etc. Discussion of the intervention’s Boundary Story | |
| **Introduce the ISE4GEMs approach** | Describe figures 4.1, B.1 and B.2  Value of drawing boundaries to think about the project and efforts to capture emergent outcomes of the interven- tion  Value of thinking about gender, socioecological landscapes and marginalized communities Value of using transdisciplinary methods  Value of capturing emergence | |
| **Review the planning matrix** | Review the locations, communities, targeted individuals, environmental and geographical obstacles, gatekeepers and support staff, resources, vulnerability, risk and ethics | |
| **Review the methods** | Review the methods selected and make adjustments, adaptations and other changes to the planning matrix | |
| **Emergent issues** | Leave time to discuss other issues | |
| **Document changes** | Document all changes to the matrix plan and record why changes have been made | |
| **Capacity building** | What skills, knowledge and relationships have been formed from this meeting?  Have all staff written/discussed their expectations of the project? What do they seek to gain, achieve and learn? How this can be achieved? | |
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ISE4GEMS TOOL 9: **GEMs data analysis (1/2)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender responsive** | **Data reveals:**  **Weak Strong** | |
| Was there an effort by implementers to identify and analyze evidence of a potential gendered impact and possible repercussions? | Risk assessment does not probe for differentiated harmful impact  Planning consultations was not gender representative | Detailed planning is recorded by the implementers to account for risk and harm  Planning reveals efforts to foresee outcomes reflected in the ToC |
| What evidence is there of a gender responsive monitoring system used throughout the interven- tion? | Little or no evidence of monitoring processes  Indicators selected were not adequate to capture gender differences  Data collection has followed a systematic routinized collection methodology  No evidence of complexity considerations in method selectio | Regular monitoring from multiple source methods (e.g., staff reports, surveys, interviews, etc.)  Intervention altered and changed to respond to emergence and recognition of bias  Mitigation efforts of negative outcomes enacted in response to early feedback |
| Does the data substantiate that the outcomes of the intervention benefited women and men in culturally appropriate and acceptable ways? | Indecision concerning benefits for women  Denial that benefits to women matter or harms to women occurred (negative)  Female benefits automatically accrued through the position of a male figure (e.g., father, brother, son) | Wide recognition and examples provided of benefits accruing to women/ girls  Evidence that these benefits were acceptable to women as expressed by women  OR  Evidence that women are worse off due to unforeseen emergent circum- stances that are explained and reinforced in the data from multiple sources |
| Was there an analysis of power dynamics both institutional and interpersonal? | Limited or no analysis: Lack of awareness, Indecision, or indif- ference about why differences occurred  Denial of harms therefore no cause given | Detailed explanations can be found in the data with multiple source cor- roboration |
| What other gender responsive elements are im- portant to capture for evaluating the intervention? |  |  |
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ISE4GEMS TOOL 9: **GEMs data analysis (2/2)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Environments** | **Data reveals:**  **Weak Strong** | |
| How have ecological systems or services interact- ing with or potentially affected by the intervention been identified? | Data reveals lack of awareness, indecision or indifference Denial of harms therefore no cause given | Evidence of localized meanings of “sustainable development” to improve human settlements and ecological systems  OR  Evidence that local environments are worse off due to emergent circum- stances revealed in the data from multiple sources. |
| Were ecological systems or services central or peripheral to the intervention? | Data reveals lack of awareness, indecision or indifference | Wide recognition and examples of ecological systems’ inclusion in the intervention |
| Who was consulted or represented the interest of the places, assets or ecological systems of signifi- cance? | No evidence of consultation with ecological knowledge bear- ers (e.g. experts, academia, local land holders) | Diverse data collections informed by multiple stakeholders. |
| What other gender responsive elements are im- portant to capture for your intervention? |  |  |
| **Marginalized Voices** | **Data reveals:**  **Weak Strong** | |
| Were intersectional differences (e.g., according to sex, sexuality, age, income, ethnicity, ability, status or religion) accounted for? | Evidence is weak or lacking. | Evidence of inclusive planning and engagement with people to account for intersectionality |
| What evidence is there of engagement with mar- ginalized voices (e.g., according to sex, sexuality, age, income, ethnicity, ability, status or religion)? | Evidence lacking or poor Poorly described groups Desk-top studies poor | Detailed explanations can be found in data Detailed explanations can be found in data from multiple perspectives multiple perspectives |
| What structural barriers or enablers (social, political) limited or promoted the intervention’s capacity to support marginalized voices? | Data reveals lack of awareness, indecision or indifference | Detailed explanations can be found in data from multiple perspectives |
| What interpersonal relationships effected the intervention’s capacity to support marginalized voices? | Data reveals lack of awareness, indecision or indifference | Detailed explanations can be found in data from multiple perspectives including evidence of reflexive analysis by implementers |

**[A](#_bookmark1)** [**B**](#_bookmark15)ISE4GEMS TOOL 10: **GEMs integration tool**



The arrows represent a strong interconnection between the G, E and M running through a theme(s) and that there is strong evidence to support this from

**GEMS THEME EVIDENCE INTERPRETATION**

**Source/evidence**

**Source/evidence**

**Source/evidence**

**Stakeholder Interpretation**

**Theme**

**Source/evidence**

**Stakeholder Interpretation**

**Theme**

**M**

**Source/evidence**

**Stakeholder Interpretation**

**Theme**

**Source/evidence**

**E**

**Stakeholder Interpretation**

**Source/evidence**

**Theme**

**Source/evidence**

**G**

**Stakeholder Interpretation**

**Theme**

**Source/evidence**

the data.

The arrows represent a softer interconnection between a theme but with

some evidence.

**[A](#_bookmark1)** [**B**](#_bookmark15)ISE4GEMS TOOL 11: **Final Reflections**



**Final reflections**

What lessons have been learned as you reflect on your experiences in undertaking the evaluation?

What did you try that was different?

What didn’t work and why? What would you do differently?

What worked well for you and why? Would you do it again?

What power dynamics did you notice that were new for you? Did anything worry you about this?

Would you do it again? What would you do differently?

Were you able to prioritizegender equality, environments and marginalized voices? What would have supported you to do so?

[www.unwomen.org](http://www.unwomen.org/) [www.facebook.com/unwomen](http://www.facebook.com/unwomen) [www.twitter.com/un\_women](http://www.twitter.com/un_women) [www.youtube.com/unwomen](http://www.youtube.com/unwomen) [www.flickr.com/unwomen](http://www.flickr.com/unwomen)