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1 Introduction

The Gender Evaluation Methodology for Internet and ICTs (GEM) is a guide to integrating a gender analysis into evaluations of initiatives that use information and communication technologies (ICTs) for social change. GEM provides a means for determining whether ICTs are really improving women’s lives and gender relations as well as promoting positive change at the individual, institutional, community and broader social levels. It was developed by the Association for Progressive Communications Women’s Networking Support Programme (APC WNSP).

An evaluation plan was developed for GEM to:

- Determine the effectiveness and marketability of GEM’s capacity-building model/approach
- Determine the effectiveness of the GEM Practitioners network platform

The results of this evaluation will be used to improve the capacity-building model/approach used by the GEM project and to contribute towards the GEM business development strategy. They will also be used to design effective strategies for animating and sustaining interest and commitment to gender evaluation and in encouraging the growth of the GEM practitioners network.

Specifically the evaluation sought to answer the following evaluation questions:

1. To what extent has GEM contributed to change in attitudes and practices in relation to gender and gender-power relations among GEM practitioners / GEM users and GEM facilitators?
2. To what extent has GEM contributed to increasing capacity in gender evaluation and gender evaluation facilitation?
3. To what extent has GEM contributed to increasing inclination and capacity towards policy advocacy in relation to gender and ICT issues?
4. To what extent has GEM appropriately engaged with the GEM practitioners (past and present, throughout phases 1 and 2)

This report looks at each of these four questions and their implications for APC WNSP’s efforts to further promote the wider application of GEM.

2 Methodology

The following sources of information were analysed:

- The results of an evaluation questionnaire. A survey had been sent to 67 facilitators and users of GEM in September 2009 with 51 responding (including 3 partial responses). Of those surveyed only two reported that they had not collaborated with the GEM team / APC WNSP. The list of those who responded is provided in Annex A and the survey questions along with some summary information on responses are provided in Annex B.
- A review of interviews with selected people who have engaged with GEM. The list of the interviews that were reviewed is provided in Annex A.
A review of 13 out of 18 digital stories (it was only possible to review those digital stories available in English and/or with English subtitles; 4 are in Spanish and one was uploaded late, as per the request of the owner). The digital stories are available on [http://www.genderevaluation.net/mygem/videos](http://www.genderevaluation.net/mygem/videos) and the list of digital stories reviewed is provided in Annex A.

A review of articles (ten on www.apc.org and two on www.apcwomen.org/gem), emails and documents sent by the GEM team.

A review of the project documents and financial statements of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of GEM.

GEM as a methodology is publicly available and promoted through various fora and it is not possible to know the full extent of the awareness and use of the methodology. As one member of the GEM team wrote after attending a workshop: “I realised that GEM is widely used and often we don’t know about this”. However, this evaluation only looks at the feedback from those known to the GEM team and who, therefore, have typically had some sort of interaction with the GEM team.

### 3 Engagement with GEM Practitioners

The GEM team has primarily engaged with GEM practitioners through training workshops and by providing mentoring, support and funding to apply GEM. Feedback on the support provided has been very positive with practitioners reporting that the support has enabled them to understand and use GEM. This section looks in more detail at this engagement with GEM practitioners and their feedback. This question is looked at first since it is both the engagement with the GEM team as well as with the methodology that has led to changes in attitudes and practices and increased capacity in gender evaluation and in addressing gender and ICT issues.

It is also important to understand what this engagement costs. GEM received a total funding of about 1.4 million USD for Phase 1 (2001–2004) and Phase 2 (2006–2011) of the project which, if split evenly across the nine years of funding, is about 160,000 USD per year. Roughly one-third of this was used for GEM project staff time, one third for capacity-building activities (workshops, travel exchanges, GEM adaptation research) and the remainder for the development of the GEM resources and tools (e.g. the GEM manual, website, publications etc.) and administrative costs. Further detail on the funding that was available to develop GEM and to promote and support the use of GEM is provided later in this section.

#### 3.1 Type of engagement and support provided

The first phase of GEM focused on developing the evaluation tool and gathering data to examine the interconnections between gender and ICT. The project trained GEM workshop facilitators and practitioners in the use of GEM and enhanced learning through the evaluation of ICT projects. During Phase 1, APC WNSP also identified two main reasons for the lack of integration of a gender perspective in ICT for development: there is lack of skills and practice in evaluation and evaluative thinking and; there is little understanding and experience in gender analysis.

The second phase of GEM looked at adapting GEM for four very specific thematic areas (ICT localisation, rural ICT for development, national ICT policy advocacy processes and telecentres) and
forming and sustaining a learning community of practitioners. The approach taken in each of the thematic areas was to start off with a thematic adaptation workshop of interested GEM adaptors, assist these GEM adaptors during the workshop to come up with draft or close to final evaluation plans, provide online mentoring and onsite mentoring (at least one onsite visit) and to provide some general guidelines for documenting the process.

The type of support that has been provided by the GEM team has included:

- Face-to-face GEM training workshops
- Mentoring and ongoing support to groups to apply GEM, including on site visits: This has included support to develop evaluation plans; to develop data gathering methodologies; to carry out data gathering activities; and to analyse and write up their results.
- Providing visibility to and promoting GEM partners including, in some cases, identifying potential partnerships.
- Assisting with funding to apply GEM
- Exchange of experiences (e.g. at workshops, through digital stories etc.)

3.2 Feedback on the Support Provided

There was very positive feedback on the support provided and the feedback indicated that it enabled people to understand and use GEM.

The workshops have helped people to get to know the methodology and how to use it in a project. One respondent from Africa stated that “the GEM workshop was an eye opener for our organisation” and that it helped them to shape their proposal and understand the issues. They stated that “the GEM facilitator empowered us and helped us to better understand and make optimal use of GEM”. These workshops appear to have been critical in terms of promoting awareness, understanding and interest in GEM as well as gender issues.

The feedback also indicated that continuous support through the different GEM phases was very valuable. This included the ongoing communication and engagement with the GEM team throughout the process and the feedback given on results reporting. This was also mentioned in the report on GEM from APC WNSP in November 2008 which commented that GEM adaptors found the onsite mentoring visits useful and that the APC WNSP was considering providing second onsite visits especially for those GEM adaptors who were new to GEM or who were still struggling with its application in their communities.

Specific relevant feedback from the survey is provided below. The survey asked:

- How the collaborations with the GEM team / APC WNSP supported the achievement of their organisation’s or project’s objectives? Respondents indicated that it increased their capacity, that they were able to identify and address gender and ICT issues, that they were able to use GEM and that it raised the profile of their organisation. The interviews also indicated that defining the evaluation question is difficult when undertaking evaluation but that the discussions in the workshops helped to do this.
What was the most critical/important support that they received from the GEM team / APC WNSP in their application of GEM? Most frequently mentioned were the ongoing monitoring, feedback and communications with the team and the training. It is worth noting that a number of GEM facilitators also commented that the APC WNSP created a warm and empowering space.

If the support provided was sufficient to enable them to apply GEM? The majority of those who received support provided positive feedback and reported that the support was sufficient. Four respondents mentioned that insufficient funding was an issue, one mentioned that they wish they had more specific training in applying GEM, one mentioned that it is still difficult to apply GEM to its maximum potential and one stated that they would have liked to have been pushed more by the GEM team to not delay their work.

Examples of some of the feedback provided:

- “Everything was useful. I feel clear. Before then it was fuzzy. Now I can actually confidently talk about GEM. I feel like FINALLY I get it … All the sharing and the peer reviews was fantastic” (respondent from Africa)
- “That support was sufficient due to the fact that the trainings created gender awareness amongst men and women” (respondent from Africa)
- “The support provided by the GEM team enabled us to master the GEM tool and clarify the project document” (respondent from Africa)
- “These collaborations helped people to get hold of GEM, to appreciate the tool and see that it could really support their needs” (respondent from Latin America)
- “The support was very good. We received continuous support as we used the different phases” (respondent from Latin America)
- “The support was quite sufficient. We were able to develop our evaluation plan as needed, and also got very relevant feedback on writing up results” (respondent from Asia)
- “[The support was] sufficient but lack of funding” (respondent from Africa)
- “From now on, we will even be able to develop our own gender evaluation plans” (respondent from Africa)

Comments were also received on the value of being part of and interacting with a global community – that this helped people feel more confident and supported. It was commented that the collaboration with other participants in the regional or thematic workshops was helpful. For instance, one commented that other participants in the workshop “raised points that we had either ignored or omitted in our evaluation plan”. It was noted that being part of a global community can also help in terms of getting recognition and acceptance from others. GEM provides a recognised, tested framework for evaluation.

A theme that emerged was the need for the training and workshops to be tailored to reflect the local contexts and ensure that GEM is relevant to the audience. One member of the GEM team reported on the importance of having a face-to-face meeting with workshop organisers to plan the workshop in order to understand participants’ needs and how GEM fits into the work they are doing. GEM covers broad concepts but needs to be based on local realities so it has been important that GEM facilitators...
have worked to ensure it is relevant to the local context and to adapt GEM depending on what is required. Ensuring that GEM was relevant to the local context was cited as a key challenge by a number of facilitators. The fact that the GEM team was able to provide real life examples was felt to be important.

Some additional comments that were made which are relevant to discussions of future development of support include:

- The need for smaller regional practitioners networks to share information from the global network as well as regional specificity. It was suggested that this could help to link GEM to the regional context and enable practitioners to feel more engaged.

- It can be a challenge for practitioners to find key information about GEM online and keep up to speed with new information that becomes available, particularly for those who are not only focusing on GEM in their work. The GEM team may want to consider proactively pushing a summary of key information to practitioners (e.g. to alert GEM practitioners to new resources and information available on the GEM practitioners site).

- One practitioner mentioned that they would like guidance on how to combine GEM with other methodologies (e.g. outcome mapping, most significant change) and the key elements of GEM which must be maintained if used with another methodology.

- One facilitator mentioned that “it would also be helpful if GEM is accompanied by a Gender Sensitivity Training Manual for GEM facilitators especially if existing project/project implementers where GEM is applied is not gender sensitive or not gender aware”.

### 3.3. GEM Funding

Approximately 1,414,203 USD of funding was received to promote and support the use of GEM during Phase 1 and Phase 2. This funding covers both Phase 1 (2001-2004) and Phase 2 (2006-2011) of GEM and roughly breaks down as follows:

- 509,610 USD in salaries for GEM project personnel (ranging from roughly 60,000 USD to 100,000 USD per year)
- 491,378 USD in capacity building activities (workshops, training exchanges, GEM adaptation)
- 139,285 USD for the development of resources and tools (e.g. website, publications, GEM manual, translation of resources, practitioners network etc.)
- 162,510 USD in support costs (communications, administrative fees etc)

A number of these costs are one-off costs (e.g. related to the development of the methodology and guidance for how it can be adapted, establishment of the website, translation of materials etc.). It is also important to note that these figures do not reflect the time and funding of partners which was not remunerated by the GEM project. It has also not been possible to disaggregate how much time of GEM staff was spent on each of the activities (e.g. how much of their time was spent mentoring and supporting individual testers and adaptors). It is recommended that the GEM team consider monitoring
their time against the different activities to assist the planning and budgeting for potential future support.

A summary of how the funding was used in each Phase of GEM to promote and support the use of GEM is provided below.

**Phase 1:**

GEM received 566,448 USD in funds over about 3 and a half years for Phase 1 of the project. The bulk of this funding supported GEM project personnel (252,777 USD), global and regional workshops (141,378 USD) and publications, documentation and lobbying (47,612 USD). GEM personnel spent at least 60% of their time on capacity building activities (i.e. facilitating workshops and guiding GEM testers in their evaluations). GEM received the following funds for Phase 1 of the project:

- **IDRC provided CAD 113,258 USD for the period from August 1, 2001 to Feb 1, 2004.** This funded the GEM Project Manager for one year plus global planning meetings, three regional training workshops (one in Africa, one in Latin America and one in Asia) and GEM framework consolidation and documentation.
- **DFID provided 300,917 GBP (430,849 USD) for the period from June 1, 2002 to Mar 31, 2004.** This had a budget of 117,936 GBP for personnel costs which funded the GEM Project Manager, 4 Regional Coordinators (Africa, Asia, Latin America and Central and Eastern Europe/Balkans, the Gender ICT Policy Coordinator, and the Knowledge Sharing Site manager). It also funded a global training workshop, field testing activities, global planning meetings, publication of report findings, publication of toolkit, documentation, gender/evaluation trainers, editing and translation into French and Spanish, technical website support and a business development consultant.
- **Unifem provided 22,341 USD in 2002-3.**

The first Phase of GEM trained 31 GEM workshop facilitators from 20 countries speaking 18 languages. The evaluation practice brought together 103 women and 19 men from over 50 organisations in 36 countries, and trained them in the use of GEM. APC WNSP enhanced learning through the evaluation of 32 ICT projects spread over 25 countries in Africa, Asia, Central and Eastern Europe and Latin America.

**Phase 2:**

GEM received 847,755 USD from November 1, 2006 to February, 2011 from IDRC for Phase 2 of GEM. This funded personnel (a research coordinator, GEM practitioners/Website coordinator and GEM thematic coordinator) as well as workshops, conferences, trainings, field visits, GEM adaptations, GEM publications, development of a facilitators guide, translation, website development, evaluation, business plan development and equipment.

The level of funding to date for the different activities indicates that approximately:

- **46% (349,921 USD) of the funding was provided for capacity building activities (adaptation, training exchanges and workshops)**
- **11% (80,540 USD) of the funds supported the development of tools and resources.** This included translation in English, French, Spanish and Arabic (8,574 USD), education designers (3,500
USD), technical website design (15,868 USD), editors/writers/publications (7,823 USD), research (20,654 USD) and evaluation (24,304 USD).

- 34% (256,833 USD) of the funding supported GEM project personnel (who were involved in both the provision of capacity building and development of resources).

Specifically, the second phase of GEM supported:

- Thematic adaptation workshops for four thematic areas (rural ICTD, telecentres, national ICT policy advocacy and ICT localisation initiatives)
- The development of three case studies
- Online and onsite mentoring for seven organisations (Colnodo in Colombia which benefitted from two onsite visits, CEPES in Peru, Afriklinks in Mali, PhilCeC in the Philippines, UgaBYTES in Uganda, Dareecha project in Pakistan\(^3\), D.Net in Bangladesh)
- GEM thematic adaptation workshops for 19 initiatives (5 telecentre initiatives, 7 localisation initiatives, 4 national ICT policy advocacy initiatives, and 3 rural ICTD initiatives) but finally, only 11 were officially GEM adaptors.

The amount of funding provided to each of the organisations/initiatives varied quite significantly. However, the largest amount of funding provided to an organisation for capacity-building was approximately 30,000 USD with the bulk of this supporting travel costs (e.g. for adaptation and training workshops).

4 Increased Capacity in Gender Evaluation and Gender Evaluation Facilitation

There is an increased capacity in gender evaluation and gender evaluation facilitation amongst those with whom the GEM team have engaged. Most of those included in the review indicated that they had an increased confidence and ability to use GEM. A number of practitioners and facilitators have also expressed a real passion for GEM and report that they are sharing their experiences of using GEM with others and promoting GEM. However, a key challenge will be to grow the network of those using GEM.

This section looks in more detail at the extent to which GEM contributed to increasing capacity in gender evaluation and gender evaluation facilitation. It looks at the capacity of the existing network of GEM practitioners and facilitators as well as the expansion of this network. This is linked to Section 3 which looks at how the engagement by the GEM team has increased this capacity.

4.1 GEM Practitioners and Facilitators

The evidence indicates that GEM has increased knowledge and skills in gender evaluation. The majority of those considered in the review were applying GEM in their projects (i.e. conducting needs assessments and evaluations using GEM). This capacity is further evidenced by the fact that approximately 25% of survey respondents stated that they used GEM for projects outside the direct

\(^3\) Onsite mentoring visit could not be made to Pakistan due to the security issues at the time. The team were mentored in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
collaboration with the APC WNSP / GEM team. The stories, interviews and survey results also highlighted an enthusiasm for GEM and the impact it can have.

Only four of those surveyed indicated that they have not used GEM yet – one for internal reasons and one has only an awareness of GEM but has not engaged with the GEM team or participated in workshops. Three of the four plan to use GEM in the future. Of the others, the majority of those who have used GEM have used it for evaluating projects, some have used it for programme design and implementation and needs assessment and a few for training on gender and ICT and to raise awareness on gender and ICT issues.

It was interesting to note that even those who have a strong background in research and gender issues indicated that GEM was valuable in terms of building their capacity. For instance, Dr. Anupama Saxena, who is a director at the Women’s Studies and Development Centre at Guru Ghasidas University, stated that GEM allowed her to systematically visualise the gender gap and be more impact oriented. She stated that GEM “helped me observe the situation and present the gender gaps concretely. GEM helped in setting up the indicators and correlating the information very systematically and in deriving conclusions that are factual and convincing.” John Dada from the Fantsuam Foundation which is a women’s organisation also stated that applying GEM has been a steep learning curve. It has shown that they are just beginning to understand what it means to be gender sensitive and gender aware even for a women’s organisation.

A consistent theme throughout the interviews, survey responses and digital stories was an increased confidence, knowledge and ability to use GEM amongst practitioners and facilitators. This is consistent with the report on GEM from APC WNSP in November 2008 which stated that GEM facilitators “have shown more confidence in designing GEM workshops and developing new or adapting existing activities. Others have been actively supporting the design or delivery of sessions for GEM workshops. This means that capacity has slowly expanded from the core GEM facilitators who have more experience in delivering workshops.”

An enabler to the adoption of GEM is the flexibility of the methodology itself. Specifically the freedom and ability for those using it to adapt GEM to different needs was reported as important to the adoption and use of GEM. It was commented that “one is able to use the sections of the methodology independently which is useful”. People are using GEM differently, depending on their local context, and some have also combined GEM with outcome mapping. One facilitator also commented that “GEM was flexible enough to open the space to use these concepts and methodologies to train people”. However, practitioners and facilitators also commented on the importance of having a strong understanding of GEM and how to use it in order to localise and contextualise it. Practitioners also need to be able to effectively use GEM in the local language.

Some of the constraints to using GEM that were mentioned included:

- Lack of or insufficient funding to be able to undertake GEM activities or apply GEM in its entirety.
- Time – both individual and project-level time constraints
- The need for further mentoring and training, particularly in cases where engagement with the GEM team was limited to attendance at a GEM workshop. One member of the GEM team wrote that
“People/organisations who attend workshops are mostly enthused and convinced about using GEM, however what I have learned is that to ensure that they actually go through with using what they’ve learnt required continuing support. Organisations who we have worked with for a number of years demonstrate this.”

- Some reported that GEM is “a complex tool” (e.g. “civil society organisations working in telecentres for instance have indicated that the tool is a bit complex to work with at grassroots or even at civil society organisations levels”). Two also commented that those who are less familiar with research or evaluation would find it more difficult to understand. However, many others commented on how easy it is to use. GEM has evolved over time and it may therefore be that this is an issue that has already been addressed. It will be important during future workshops and support from the GEM team that this is proactively monitored.

- The need for GEM to be in the local language in order to be able to engage with and present GEM, particularly to government.

Since this review looked at those who have collaborated with the GEM team / APC WNSP in some way, it has not been possible to look at the challenges faced by those who have used it on their own without having had any direct engagement with a GEM facilitator.

4.2 Expanding the GEM network

GEM practitioners and facilitators report that they hear about GEM at workshops, meetings, online, through partners and in some cases as part of a requirement for the evaluation of their project (e.g. for some of those working on the projects supported by the Global Knowledge Partnership). Most seem to have found out about it through collaboration or projects with APC (e.g. APC WNSP and GenARDIS), Global Knowledge Partnership (GKP) and IDRC. The majority of those surveyed had participated in at least one GEM workshop.

GEM practitioners and facilitators are sharing experiences of applying GEM in many different ways – in meetings (conferences, seminars and workshops), talking to or emailing people, in articles, within partnerships and networks, by sharing findings, training, mailing lists, blogs and on TV shows.

The survey asked how GEM practitioners and facilitators were able to influence or persuade others to use GEM. Many of the respondents stated that they have not persuaded others to use GEM. However, a number indicated that they have been doing activities to raise awareness of and promote GEM. Some report that they are raising interest in GEM even if this has not yet translated into real use of GEM. Those who have been able to influence others to use GEM seem to have mainly done so through providing support to partners and through training and workshops. For instance, D-Net organised a national GEM training and explained that “it was encouraging to see that people who underwent the training felt committed to incorporating GEM into their own monitoring and evaluation strategies, and that they wanted more in-depth training, as well as additional support to introduce the methodology to their partners”. One responded that they have influenced others by inviting them to “accompany us in the project”.

Awareness-raising activities have included localised GEM workshops, gender-sensitisation training, dissemination of results and promotion through individual and organisational networks. Practitioners
and facilitators are, for instance, trying to convince people by sharing ideas about GEM, discussing the usefulness of GEM for the success of a project, disseminating the results of GEM use and showing that the methodology is flexible. Most of those surveyed indicated that they have shared their experiences of using GEM with others. In addition, approximately 46% of survey respondents said that they collaborated with the GEM team to build up awareness, knowledge and/or capacity on GEM by organising workshops with APC WNSP / GEM. These awareness-raising activities appear to be generating interest in GEM.

Some of the challenges to being able to influence others to adopt GEM mentioned were:

- A “lack of appropriate opportunities which we can synergize with”.
- The need to provide ongoing support to ensure people go through with using GEM. One of those interviewed, for instance, stated that it requires more than one regional meeting but requires a practitioners network, more contact, examples and joint action for people to feel confident to use it.
- For those involved in ICT policy advocacy, the need for a critical mass of interest in a country or region for it to be used effectively and more widely. They mentioned the need for there to be a recognition of the importance of gender and ICTs to be able to get traction and move forward with being able to get GEM used more broadly and that this interest has tended to be driven by external factors.
- The fact that NGOs are understaffed and can have difficulty with staff retention – both of which makes it hard to promote GEM.

It was also noted in some of the interviews that raising awareness on gender and ICT issues and getting it on the agenda of government and civil society networks is a process which takes time.

Of relevance to expanding the GEM network is that most existing GEM facilitators surveyed indicated that they would remain a GEM facilitator (although some to a more limited degree). Fanta Tounkara from Mali also stated in the questionnaire that “we wish to become facilitators, especially for francophone Africa which does not have access to as many facilitators as English-speaking countries. This is particularly relevant as French-speaking countries are increasingly involved in this work”. The factors that the facilitators felt would either help or hinder them in terms of remaining as facilitators were:

- Constraints around time (e.g. other work commitments and the time away from home to facilitate workshops were mentioned)
- “Receiving mentoring and having a community of reference would also be key for keeping involved”
- Having places and spaces where learning and mentoring is shared including “building the community beyond virtual”
- Working with other experienced facilitators and being able to rely on support
- Spending more time testing and working with the tool to increase confidence in running a workshop
The report on GEM from APC WNSP in November 2008 also stated that “While we recognise that more efforts must be made with French-speaking and Spanish-speaking GEM facilitators, the identification and commitment of these facilitators are very much dependent on availability, timeliness of opportunities and relationship-building”.

5 Increased Inclination and Capacity towards Policy Advocacy

This section looks at the extent to which GEM contributed to increasing inclination and capacity towards policy advocacy in relation to gender and ICT issues.

There appears to be less use of GEM in policy advocacy and few GEM practitioners working in this area. For instance, in the survey only 6 answered “to do policy analysis using GEM” to the question about how they had collaborated with the GEM team/ APC WNSP. This is also recognised in the report on GEM from APC WNSP in November 2008 which states that the approach taken “may not be so suitable for the thematic adaptation area on national ICT policy advocacy—entry points and processes. This is because this particular group of adaptors are more affected by externalities—opportunities and threats within their own local and national contexts. It has been more difficult and most often out of our control to align and re-align the timing of decisions, consequences and events that would support a speedier implementation of the proposed evaluation plans by the groups concerned.”

Examples of where GEM has been used in policy advocacy including some of the challenges:

- The collaboration with the GEM team helped Colnodo to promote gender and IT issues in Colombia and specifically in telecentre projects. They reported that the visits from the GEM team helped them to influence partners on gender issues. GEM was used in two telecentres and through meetings, workshops and sharing the results from this pilot project they were able to involve more organisations such as the Ministry of Information and Communications Technologies (ICT). They reported that the support provided by the GEM team “was key to influence ICT public policies” and that the government unit allowed them to use GEM in 22 other telecentres installed by the Compartel programme.

- Dr. Anupama Saxena used GEM on a rural e-government scheme in India to document evidence of gender gaps and share the results of this research with government. Dr. Saxena reported that progress has been slow and that “we have invited government officials to come and listen to us, which they have done, but they are not yet convinced about the existence of gender issues in such a technical field”. However, she stated that “GEM has given me the confidence to follow through with my advocacy” and has transformed Dr. Saxena’s team’s research approach from one that was purely academic into one is more outcome and impact-oriented. She states that “we realised that if we really want to change the minds of policy makers, we should have a sustained effort and engagement with the issue and policy makers. In order to do that, we need partners
from different sectors, like civil society, something that had never occurred to us before using GEM.”

- CICEWA (Communication for Influence in Central, East and West Africa) could not do much other than ensure that there is a gender theme running through most of their activities. CICEWA focused mainly on creating a community of practice on internet governance and have held national and regional IGFs. These have always included a session on gender and internet governance. It was difficult for CICEWA to integrate GEM due to lack of funding and capacity. CICEWA works with animators in five countries who are all volunteers and who are already overloaded in terms of work. They had not requested funding support from the GEM team but felt it would have been useful to have someone paid to do GEM work and also funding to support GEM activities as well as workshops/capacity building on GEM.

- The “Women in Connection” network in Chile is seeking to include gender in the digital inclusion agenda. They have been involved in the public process of consultation on the digital agenda and have been running workshops with NGOs and women’s networks to try and get this issue on their agenda. However, it was commented that it is a long process to set the agenda in policies and civil society networks. They have had to wait for there to be a greater interest in gender issues and an increase in the social use of ICTs in the country for there to be an interest in gender and ICT. They feel that there is now an opportunity to move this forward.

- The Philippine Community eCenter Program used GEM in pilot studies on two rural telecentres in the Philippines. Their pilot study and adaptation of the GEM materials were so successful that the adaptation of GEM is recommended to other Community eCenters across the Philippines. The Commission for Information and Communication Technologies (CICT), through the National Computer Center of the Philippine government will use the results to plan on how to address the gender issues and encourage equal opportunities for men and women to use telecentres.

- The Dominican Republic has promised to include a “gender perspective” in every information and communications technology initiative and policy developed by the government from now on. The tool the Dominicans have chosen to design and evaluate all the public policies is GEM and the APC women’s programme was invited to run the GEM training for government officials. This appears to have come from previous GEM workshops in the country – for instance one participant in a previous workshop which took place in Santo Domingo became the executive secretary of the Council of Women’s Units’ Ministers in Central American Countries (CONMCA) and helped move this forward.

---


6 Changes in Attitudes and Practice

This section looks at the extent to which GEM has contributed to change in attitudes and practices in relation to gender and gender-power relations among GEM practitioners / GEM users and GEM facilitators.

The evidence shows that GEM has influenced thinking and increased gender awareness and the confidence of GEM practitioners and facilitators – that it has impacted them at a personal and professional level. It has increased awareness and sensitivity in relation to gender issues, challenged thinking in many cases and increased confidence in working in gender, gender and ICT, and evaluation. The review indicates that it has impacted the three areas defined in the evaluation plan – attitudes toward gender insensitive women and men, an individual's own gender-power dynamics, and an individual's ability to negotiate around gender-power dynamics. This is evidenced through the survey results, digital stories and interviews.

The majority of respondents to the questionnaire indicated that they have seen a change in both themselves and their projects and teams since using GEM. Two of those who responded felt that it was too early to assess the change and two indicated that they had not used GEM. However, forty respondents indicated that GEM has had an impact on themselves (only two responded that it had no impact) and 39 respondents indicated that they have seen an impact within their project and team members/project partners/community (only three responded that they saw no impact). Forty respondents considered these changes transformative. This is also backed up by the digital stories where many talk about changes at both a personal level and in their projects and/or organisations as a result of using GEM. Another common theme in the digital stories is that GEM gives confidence.

Of note is that change has happened independently of previous level of engagement in gender issues. Those who have not considered gender previously report that they are now able and willing to. Those who have already been working on gender feel that they can now do it more effectively because of GEM.

Examples of some of the quotes from GEM practitioners and facilitators:

- “You can see that they do not only start looking at ICTs from a gender perspective but also to other matters in daily life, which is something I see as a key result of using GEM”, GEM facilitator
- “GEM makes it a lot clearer. I am better able to analyse the reasons for reactions. I am better able to see the gender components”.
- “They educated me to think gender sensitively in the development and implementation of projects”

---

6 The responses to the question “What changes have you seen in yourself” are listed on page 40
7 The responses to the question “What changes have you experienced and seen within your project and team members/project partners/community since the use of GEM” are listed on page 37.
8 One of those who responded that it had no impact has not used GEM, engaged with the GEM team or participated in workshops
9 The responses to the question “Do you think the changes mentioned as transformative? Why or Why not?” are listed on page 45.
• “Though many women and men understood the gender issues around them, they had considered them implied in their lives, creating no room for gender equity for them to realise changes in their lives. The trainings influenced their thinking and belief to be gender focused and aware.”

• “Before getting involved in GEM project I thought that I am a gender sensitive person but later on I found that I had had the wrong definition [understanding] of gender.”

• “Being a GEM facilitator has helped me be more sensitive on gender matters in general and a factor that shapes how our communities approach the different aspects of our society. In short, the experience has somewhat made me a gender [equality] practitioner. Initially, gender was all about the number of users (how many women and men visited the telecentre today) but now I understand it is more than that.”

The majority of those in the questionnaires, interviews and digital stories spoke about how GEM impacted their understanding of gender issues in relation to ICT and gender evaluation; how they used it in their work; and how it impacted them on a personal level. However, a few also spoke about how they internalised GEM within their organisation and how this impacted practice at an organisational level. Of particular note was Fantsuam Foundation and D-Net who have both used GEM since 2005:

• Fantsuam Foundation used GEM for their organisational development assessment. Until they worked with GEM, they thought they were doing well as an organisation from a gender perspective but when they looked deeper, they saw that they came up short as they had few women at a senior level in the organisation. They now have a comprehensive strategy to ensure they have women managers.

• D-Net sees GEM not only as an evaluation methodology but also as a way to integrate gender issues into the organisational framework of D-Net. They have developed D.Net's own gender policy and have changed their management structure from a vertical model with few people at the top to a more horizontal structure so that more leadership positions exist within D.Net. They also felt that capacity-building in GEM should be institutionalised rather than only targeted at an individual level. They now have 4 to 5 people in the organisation who know GEM and are trained in GEM. This means that as an organisation, they are oriented to it and consciously thinking of gender when designing projects.

GEM has also helped raise the profiles of organisations using it, improved community perception of the organisation and made their work “more transparent to stakeholders”. One respondent, for instance, stated that the “evaluation exercise that ensured there were changes” and “this increased communities confidence in the organisation”.

7 GEM’s Contribution to Change Processes

This looks at six specific examples of engagement with the GEM team/APC WNSP and the use of GEM and how this engagement has impacted on capacity, attitude and practices in relation to GEM and gender issues. It provides case studies to help illustrate the key findings summarised in this report.
7.1 Colnodo

This case study is based on feedback from Olga Paz and presents her experiences and perspectives in terms of engagement with GEM. Olga Paz works at Colnodo\textsuperscript{10} which is a non-profit organisation established in 1993 with the main goal of facilitating the communications, the exchange of information and experiences among Colombian organisations at local, national and international level. Olga reported that she first found out about GEM in 2002 when she was invited to the first GEM workshop in Latin America that took place in Cuernavaca, Mexico. She has also heard about GEM on an electronic list. Olga participated in four GEM workshops from 2002 to 2008 and has collaborated with the GEM team/APC WNSP twice. Colnodo undertook field testing of GEM in 2002 and 2003 in two telecentres called neighbourhood information units located in Bogota and adapted GEM in 2008 and 2009 in two telecentres that were part of the national programme for telecentres (Compartel). Olga, with the Colnodo team and the Universidad Autonoma de Occidente, also coordinated a GEM workshop in July 2009 where they trained 20 facilitators (members of the National Telecentres’ Network\textsuperscript{11}) to use GEM in 22 telecentres.

The GEM team/APC WNSP collaborated in the organisation of GEM workshops and provided mentoring support and funding to use GEM. Olga reports that they received a lot of support to adapt and implement GEM and that visits by the GEM team helped them to influence their partners on gender issues and the Ministry. This collaboration helped them to promote gender and ICT issues in Colombia and specifically in the telecentre projects. While they received some funding from the GEM team, they were able to build partnerships with several actors at the national level in order to obtain the resources required to use GEM in two telecentres and widen its use to 22 more telecentres. Olga reported that the most important support received was their training as GEM facilitators for her and partners of Colnodo.

GEM helped Colnodo to design an evaluation model for the role that telecentres play in communities. In 2009, they were able to integrate GEM in the general framework of their strengthening telecentres project. Through meetings and workshops and by sharing the results from their pilot project in 2 telecentres, they were able to involve more organisations in the implementation of GEM and also in gender and ICT advocacy (e.g. the National Telecentres Network and the Ministry of ICT). Some of their partners are now interested and are also planning to use GEM further and apply a gender focus in the planning of social projects which use ICTs.

Olga was motivated to become a facilitator because of her commitment to gender and communication issues and the opportunity to learn about GEM and to involve more people as GEM facilitators. She feels that sometimes the discourse on gender and ICT issues is too abstract and that it is important to formulate a down to earth discourse on gender and ICT issues. She felt that it was easier to talk about gender issues using concrete products, like GEM, so as to achieve results that people and organisations are able to verify. It was important to involve men; to involve more actors and sectors like government and civil society in the use of this methodology; and to disseminate widely the results of this use.

\textsuperscript{10} www.colnodo.apc.org
\textsuperscript{11} www.telecentros.org.co
Olga mentioned that it is not easy to address gender issues because it touches sensitive matters but that GEM made her feel safe when talking about these issues. She and the Colnodo team now feel more confident when implementing gender perspectives in different projects about ICT for development. She feels more at ease when discussing gender and ICT issues in a project and when pushing this issue as a cross-cutting factor in the design and evaluation of projects. She also feels that she is able to coordinate gender workshops with men and women in community telecentres and has learned to lead the discussion so that people would not feel hurt. She reported that the changes she has seen in herself since the use of GEM were transforming at a personal and professional level. She stated that “At a professional level, I feel I have integrated gender issues in my work and as a woman, I’m more assured of my own role and my commitment to involve more actors and sectors in gender and ICT issues”.

Since using GEM she finds that team members and organisations within the National Telecentres’ Network, including the government body that worked with them, are more aware of gender issues. They want to go on working on this type of gender issue and GEM is now included in the projects of the National Telecentres’ Network. As an organisation she feels that Colnodo has strengthened its intervention around gender issues and their own legitimacy as gender and ICT experts.

7.2 UgaBYTES

UgaBYTES is a Uganda-based NGO that works to promote access to ICTs in rural East Africa. Staff at UgaBYTES first heard of GEM from telecentre.org and then took the initiative to learn more about GEM from the APC website. They later participated in a number of GEM workshops (one staff member reported participating in three workshops – two in 2007 and one in 2008). They used and adapted GEM to conduct a study over two rural telecentres to gain a better understanding if the telecentre services were meeting the different needs of women and men. They used GEM to conduct a needs assessment and to evaluate impact. They report that telecentre managers are starting to integrate GEM in their telecentre activities.

The GEM team/APC WNSP collaborated on workshops and throughout the project they provided training and ongoing mentoring support as well as financial support which enabled the training workshops to be conducted in the two telecentres. For Sarah Mpagi at UgaBYTES, GEM was new and abstract and she did not understand how it could be adapted for use in rural telecentres. The GEM workshop demystified GEM and developed her confidence such that she could teach GEM to the UgaBYTES team working to adapt GEM in telecentres12. In his digital story13, Francis Mwathi from UgaBYTES said that the GEM manual helped him to understand what GEM was and how to use it but that the visit by the GEM team was when he finally got it properly and was able to share the GEM concept with other people.

---

12 “Creating Empowered Communities”
http://www.genderevaluation.net/mygem/video/creating_empowered_communities_sarah
13 “From Board to Grassroots: Passing on GEM”
http://www.genderevaluation.net/mygem/video/board_grassroots_passing_gem_francis
Sarah reported that the most important support received was the funding for the whole evaluation project and the follow-up activities program to ensure that what was evaluated and recommended was implemented. She felt that the support provided was sufficient as the trainings created gender awareness amongst women and men. She stated the for many women and men “the trainings influenced their thinking and belief to be gender focused and aware.” She also felt that using GEM increased the communities’ confidence in UgaBYTES since the research they conducted yielded benefits.

Francis agreed that the support by APC WNSP was enormous and catered for the whole process. He felt that the most important support received was that it allowed them to take the research to the telecentre community on the ground and to consult beneficiaries through workshops and the research.

He felt that the GEM research helped them to identify in their telecentre community the scale of the gender divide in access to ICTs, why it is there and how it can be addressed from an administrative to community level.

Francis reported that he learnt a lot since he had not initially thought that gender could have such adverse effects on how ICTs are embraced in rural communities. He stated that the GEM experience was an eye opener for him. He wrote that “without applying GEM, the possibility of having one gender (male) utilising more than the other is highly likely but through application of GEM there is sensitisation on all stakeholders involved. In a community already facing challenges of gender balance, GEM is key in advancing equitable access to information using ICT.” He feels that since using GEM, he has become more gender sensitive in both his professional and personal endeavours. He feels he is well equipped and has experience in advocating for equitable access to information at all levels of the socio-economic ladder. He feels that these changes “are transformative as I do believe they will continue shaping my future and that of the people that I will be interacting with in future”. Francis also feels that those in UgaBYTES, the telecentre managers and some in community administration have become gender sensitised and now pay an interest in gender (e.g. telecentres promised to exercise gender balance in staffing and assignment of responsibilities).

Sarah felt that being a GEM facilitator has made her a gender practitioner and has helped her be more sensitive on gender matters in general. Initially, gender was about how many men and women visited the telecentre but she now understands that it is more than that – that it requires involvement of both men and women at all levels of administration and in all sectors. Sarah studied gender in her post graduate degree but this evaluation has increased her interest in gender issues and has made her more gender sensitive. She feels that this change was transformative “because I no longer think like before and I do my work professionally, while thinking of the marginalised and how best their lives could be improved”. She also feels that there have been changes in the team members since using GEM and that for the first time there was gender awareness and they were focused on realising gender equity in telecentres and the use of ICTs. She reported that the telecentre and community leadership worked together to ensure there would be gender equity in telecentres and the use of ICTs.

7.3 Philippine Community eCentre

Philippine Community eCentre Program is the umbrella organisation for all Community eCenter (Telecentre) initiatives in Philippine government. Staff at PhilCeC Program heard about GEM through...
telecentre.org and participated in two workshops (at the thematic workshop in Kuala Lumpur in 2007 and the one in Philippines in 2008). In 2008, they adapted GEM to evaluate gender sensitivity in two rural telecentres and improve the CeC services. They undertook evaluation to improve the design and implementation of the community e-centre project and to evaluate not only the needs of men and women in ICT but also all sectors of the community. They used GEM throughout the whole process, from planning and design to implementing and monitoring and evaluating. The CeC managers from both communities also had prior GEM orientation training with the APC. As a result of using GEM, telecentres are becoming more focused on the users.

Their pilot study and adaptation of the GEM materials were so successful that the adaptation of GEM is recommended to other Community eCenters across the Philippines. The Commission for Information and Communication Technologies (CICT), through the National Computer Center of the Philippine government will use the results to plan on how to address the gender issues and encourage equal opportunities for men and women to use telecentres.

The GEM team/APC WNSP provided mentoring support, training and financial support for the project and trainings. They supported the team until they finished the project and evaluation. They provided support in the development of a communication plan. PhilCeC felt that they were able to identify the needs of men and women in ICT and all the sectors in their community so they can now serve them well.

Three members of PhilCec responded to the questionnaire. All reported that they and their team have become more gender sensitive since using GEM and able to undertake gender analysis. They report that they are more aware that gender issues exist and have learned to appreciate the difference between men and women. All felt that these changes were transformative. It was reported that PhilCeC has become more conscious in taking into consideration gender issues in policy and planning. In her digital story 14 Eloisa San Mateo speaks about how she felt gender was not an issue in the Philippines and how this changed when working with APC and GEM. Working with GEM has changed how she understands gender equality.

Angelo Juan Ramos is Chairman of the Philippine Community eCentre Network (PhilCeCNet) which is a multi-stakeholder learning and collaborative community for eCentres. He reported in an interview15 that they have “become more aware of, and sensitive to gender issues, and are more careful to integrate gender in the development of indicators for monitoring and evaluating their projects”. He stated that they will be conducting training for 400 to 500 telecentre managers. They will also offer a five-day certificate course in CeC management, which includes a section on monitoring and evaluating and will include some aspects of GEM.

---

14 “Relevance of gender and information and communication technology” http://www.genderevaluation.net/mygem/video/relevance_gender_and_information_and_communication
7.4 D.Net

D.Net is a non-profit organisation that focuses on technology for economic development. D.Net learned about GEM through the GKP in 2004 and they participated in four GEM workshops. They were oriented with GEM and how to apply the methodology in an evaluation framework in 2004 and first applied GEM in 2005 in action research on their Mobile Info Lady project.

D.Net has been involved in organising GEM workshops, testing the GEM methodology, applying and adapting GEM, translating GEM into Bangla and conducting evaluation and training. The GEM team provided mentoring support and training – they built up the capacity of staff and provided funding to help D.Net to carry out the GEM evaluation. The GEM team provided peer learning and visited D.Net and D.Net’s field projects to facilitate the capturing of learning. They report that this support leads to a gender sensitive mindset which is reflected through all their activities from project design to evaluation.

Their use of GEM started when they were awarded a seedgrant by the GKP and started receiving emails from APC WNSP on gender and ICT issues. These seemed an extra burden and they started the project without understanding these questions. However concerns came up in the project and they got in touch with APC WNSP who visited to help them set indicators to address the social and behavioural issues which were coming up. This experience helped them to use GEM in other projects – rural telecentre project, localisation project and ICT literacy project. They received GEM training in 2006 and now are adopting gender policies in D.Net – they have “transformed from GEM applying to GEM adapted organisation”16.

Initially somewhat sceptical about the value of using a gender-focused methodology, D.Net has now come to realise that technology is socially constructed, meaning that culture and social norms have a direct impact on gender roles and therefore affects to what extent it is socially acceptable and appropriate for boys and girls to access ICTs. Initially the D.Net team thought of GEM as a research evaluation tool but now they feel it is more than an evaluation tool and that it could be applied in other aspects like design and process monitoring.

In her digital story17, Fatema Begum Labony explains how she received training as a GEM adaptor in 2009 and that this training helped her to get the answers to many of her questions about how to apply GEM and gave her confidence. She said that her experience with GEM has changed her mindset, has “changed her from a follower to a pathfinder”, changed her attitude towards ICTs, changed her status among colleagues (she is now considered an expert) and changed her family’s attitude toward her as a working girl. She also explains that gender is now central to all projects they develop at D.Net. Afrina Tanzin also talks in her digital story18 about how GEM has given her confidence to challenge cultural barriers facing women. She stated that GEM was easy to understand since it was in her local

---

16 “Journey from unknown territory into something new”
http://www.genderevaluation.net/mygem/video/journey_-_unknown_territory_something_new_mahmud_h
17 “My journey from a cocoon to a butterfly”
http://www.genderevaluation.net/mygem/video/my_journey_cocoon_butterfly_fatema_begum_labony
18 “Looking through GEM: a new vision for me”
http://www.genderevaluation.net/mygem/video/looking_through_gem_new_vision_me_afrina_tanzin
language and spoke of how helpful the mentoring support was that was provided by the GEM team. GEM gave her confidence in gender issues and provided new opportunities professionally.

In 2010, GEM organised a national GEM training with ten participating organisations. “The objective was to introduce GEM to development practitioners in Bangladesh,” Mahmud Hasan states. He explains that it was encouraging to see that people who underwent the training felt committed to incorporating GEM into their own monitoring and strategies, and that they wanted more in-depth training, as well as additional support to introduce the methodology to their partners.19

7.5 Fantsuam Foundation

Fantsuam Foundation is a rural-based non-governmental organisation in Nigeria that works with local communities to fight poverty and disadvantage through integrated development programs. Fantsuam Foundation first heard about GEM in 2004 and participated in the GEM thematic adaptation workshop held in Manila. They have been involved in testing and using GEM since its inception and have adapted GEM for use in their rural wireless project and have conducted a needs assessment. The results of the evaluation of their wireless service formed the basis for two new project proposals. The GEM team/APC WNSP have provided mentoring support, training and financial support. They have also referred a GEM enquirer from a Nigerian university which was helpful in raising the profile of GEM and the Fantsuam Foundation with that university.

John Dada was directly engaged in GEM when he attended a GEM workshop in 2007. He reported: “I am suddenly seeing GEM everywhere, in everything I do. I suppose that is what you mean by being gender-sensitive, that you don’t take things for granted any more. You begin to appreciate why sometimes the women that are part of our community resist the empowerment process and want to do things as they have always done. I used to be annoyed and think, ‘Can’t you see that you are oppressed? Can’t you see that you are being cheated?’ Now I understand that this is the product of years of conditioning and it will take some effort to reverse the trend. With GEM, you pull away all of the cultural cover-ups, social constructs and biases and you see the situation for what it truly is. And it is only when you appreciate the truth of a situation, that you can actually effect any change. Otherwise you just scratch the surface. GEM helps you see the situation for what it is, so you can optimise your resources where you can make the maximum impact in creating change.”20

John felt that the thematic adaptation workshop in Manila was thorough and included a one-on-one session which helped them to fine-tune their work plan. He felt the mentoring for the design of their action plan was important and that the support clarified what was feasible and raised their appreciation of the methodology. However, John reports that they have been rather slow in influencing others to use GEM due to lack of appropriate opportunities which they can synergize with.

As mentioned previously Fantsuam Foundation also used GEM for their organisational development assessment. John Dada states that “until we worked with GEM and internalised that disaggregation is

19 “Culture is a bigger barrier to Bangladeshi girls going online than lack of money or computers” http://www.apc.org/en/news/culture-bigger-barrier-bangladeshi-girls-going-onl
more about numbers, we thought we were doing well. But when we looked deeper and really questioned who was where and why and how our own structures are a reflection of the very structural inequality we were fighting against, we found ourselves coming up short.21

7.6 Guru Ghasidas University

Dr. Anupama Saxena is an associate professor in political science and director of the Women’s Studies and Development Centre at the Guru Ghasidas University in India. She first heard about GEM in 2005 when she was working on a WSIS gender caucus sponsored study and was trying to find an appropriate methodology to adopt for her work. She found GEM on the internet and subsequently participated in three GEM workshops. She conducted an evaluation of a rural e-governance project using GEM. The university is also including GEM case studies in their course on Public Administration. Dr. Saxena delivers lectures on GEM and its application to evaluate one of the e-government schemes to teachers and researchers in higher education institutions in India.

The GEM team/APC WNSP have provided mentoring support, training and financial support. Dr. Saxena reports that the support provided was sufficient and that the continuous mentoring was the most critical support received. She states that the continued online support by the GEM team has helped her refine her concepts, research skills, use of terminology and advocacy strategies. In addition, “being supported by an international community of organisations who feel strongly about gender and ICTs has given me the strength to face the scepticism of government officials and members of the ICT sector”.

Dr. Saxena has shared her findings with the Minister of IT and others who are engaged in formulating and implementing rural-e-government programmes. However, despite her efforts, bringing about a change in attitude and the commitment of policy makers and state programme implementers has been slow.

Dr. Saxena reports that engagement with GEM helped them become more systematic and more impact-oriented. It has helped them realise that they need to have a sustained engagement with policy makers and that they need partners from different sectors. It has also helped them become more connected to the global community of researchers and advocates that has increased their confidence and identity. Engagement with GEM has also helped their students to get better jobs because of the knowledge they received and also because of the association with a globally recognised organisation like APC.

Dr. Saxena feels that the changes brought about through the use of GEM have been transformative. She reports that using GEM has increased gender sensitivity in team members (students of Post Graduate in Public Administration). The girls feel that now they are able to identify the gender-based forms of discrimination prevailing in the society that they have been facing and more importantly to realise that this is a discrimination that should be resisted not accepted as a social norm. The change in the mindset also happened with male students as well. They feel that now they have become more sensitive towards the needs of the women. The interaction with female village heads made them

21 “Time to move on” http://www.genderevaluation.net/mygem/video/time_move_john_dada
realise the problems a rural woman faces while working in a male-dominated society. These male students feel that they have become more sensitive towards the needs of the women.

Dr. Saxena also reports that using GEM has increased her level of confidence to pursue gender studies. “GEM” she says, “has given me the confidence to follow through with my advocacy”\(^{22}\). She feels that GEM is a very good evaluation methodology to collect, analyse and present data on gender in the sphere of ICT and is extremely helpful for advocacy with the government. She stated that “GEM has also helped me become a better teacher and advocate. Now I incorporate new networking tools like Ning (a social networking site) and Flickr (a photo-sharing site) and advocacy tools like digital stories (short videos using images and sounds to tell a personal story)”.

8 Conclusion and Recommendations

The evidence examined shows that GEM does change attitudes and practices in relation to gender and gender-power relations among GEM practitioners and facilitators. It is having an impact at both a personal and professional level. Where it is being applied, it is leading to changes in the way projects are being delivered and so also having an impact on project beneficiaries, communities and partners. In some cases, it is also leading to changes at an organisational level.

GEM has also contributed to increased capacity in gender evaluation and gender evaluation facilitation. The support provided by and engagement of the GEM team has been important in terms of promoting and supporting the use of GEM. It has been well received and, in general, been appropriate and sufficient. There appears to be a high level of interest in GEM when it is promoted at workshops and meetings and a real enthusiasm for GEM amongst practitioners. Where there has been less activity is in the area of policy advocacy.

The key challenges will be how to grow the network of practitioners and facilitators and, if GEM wishes to continue to have a focus on ICT policy advocacy, to look at how to best support this.

The following looks at what these findings might mean for GEM moving forward and makes some recommendations for the GEM project team to consider. It looks specifically at the issue of capacity-building, the GEM practitioners network, GEM and ICT policy advocacy and resource requirements.

8.1 Capacity-Building

It will be important to build the community of individuals and organisations who are using GEM. The capacity-building approach needs to both increase the awareness of the importance of and interest in gender and ICT analysis as well as the skills and confidence in using GEM. These are two different activities and require two different approaches.

- Building an understanding and interest in gender and ICT issues and analysis: This is a key challenge and the GEM team and facilitators will have a role to play in proactively driving forward this interest. The training workshops and dissemination of findings from the use of GEM are important in this regard.

---

Ability to use GEM: There will be different levels of support required by those who are seeking to use GEM. Many commented that GEM is easy to use and the feedback in the review indicates that those who have knowledge in evaluation and research will require less support in understanding how to use the methodology.

Some recommendations in relation to a potential capacity-building approach moving forward:

- **GEM facilitators continue delivery of training workshops**
  
  A pre-requisite to using GEM is a recognition of the importance of gender issues and ICT analysis and there is an ongoing need to raise awareness and understanding of the importance of looking at gender and ICT issues. The training workshops have been important in this regard. The training workshops should focus on:
  
  - Developing a better understanding of the importance of gender in ICT for development
  - Developing an understanding of how to use the GEM methodology and the opportunities it provides (e.g. how it is being used in project design, needs assessment, project evaluation and the different thematic areas).

- **Ensure training and mentoring are services promoted by the GEM network**
  
  The review highlighted that the training and mentoring support by GEM facilitators were valued by practitioners and that they were seen to be very important in terms of developing capacity to adopt and adapt GEM. This is a service which should be offered and promoted by GEM facilitators moving forward.

- **Establish a regional network of confirmed and identifiable GEM facilitators**
  
  To both grow and support the network of GEM practitioners, it would be valuable to have established GEM facilitators in each region who can promote GEM and an awareness of gender and ICT issues (e.g. in workshops, meetings, etc.) and who can provide support to those who interested in applying GEM. These would need to be people who understand GEM and their regional context and who have the ability and interest to dedicate some time to providing support on GEM. It is suggested that the GEM project team look at identifying and supporting a network of confirmed facilitators who could take on this role. If possible, it would be valuable to organise meetings of GEM facilitators to share experiences, develop knowledge and maintain interest and engagement. Potential next steps could be to:
  
  1. Draft a terms of reference for the facilitator role if this does not exist already.
  2. Identify who could take on this role – this would also identify both the strengths and gaps are at a regional level.
  3. Undertake a skills audit of potential facilitators to determine their capacity building requirements and potential strategies for addressing these.

  Facilitators have had different levels of experience with and exposure to GEM. The skills audit should seek to identify their level of experience in evaluation, gender issues, facilitation, coaching, the GEM methodology and running GEM training workshops. Facilitators will need to be comfortable with facilitating discussions on gender issues with audiences of mixed understanding and experience in this area and with how to apply GEM.
It is recommended that all facilitators have attended a training workshop on GEM so that they understand the methodology and how it is being used (e.g. on its own, in different thematic areas and with other methodologies such as outcome mapping). GEM facilitators need ensure that GEM is relevant to the local context and that they are able to adapt GEM depending on what is required. If GEM facilitators are to support others to use and adapt GEM then it is important that facilitators are comfortable with all aspects of the methodology. A training workshop taking facilitators through this methodology would help address this and help ensure that facilitators have a common understanding of the methodology.

When a facilitator is delivering their first training workshop they should be paired with an experienced GEM facilitator where possible, as this has been the practice of GEM. This will help build the confidence and skills of facilitators and will also help with the sharing of best practice.

4. Publish and promote this network of facilitators so that those who are interested in GEM are aware that there are people in their region who can provide support.

- Ensure that GEM materials are in a format that make it easy to translate and adapt

A key theme which emerged was the need for people to be able to customise and localise GEM (e.g. to translate it into the local language or to incorporate elements of GEM within their own evaluation or planning processes). It is important that the GEM materials are in a format that makes it easy for people to translate or extract specific components for use.

It is also suggested that the GEM team monitor views on the complexity of GEM and ease of using the GEM materials during future workshops and support.

8.2 GEM Practitioners Network

GEM is a global network and this is valued by practitioners and facilitators. Key benefits of the practitioners network has been the sharing of experiences and ideas as well as the credibility of being part of a recognised global network.

The online space and discussion lists for the practitioners and facilitators network has not yet been completed but it will be important that it includes the methodology, guidance on how to adapt it, guidance for running GEM workshops, guidance on where to go for support and spaces for engaging with other practitioners and facilitators and for sharing information. Some of these resources are being developed as part of Phase 2 of GEM\(^{23}\). It would also be useful to have guidance on how GEM can and is being used with other evaluation methodologies (e.g. outcome mapping, most significant change). This could either be developed by the GEM project team or be shared by practitioners who are using it with these other methodologies. In addition, it is recommended that this space include links to other relevant materials (e.g. gender sensitivity training materials).

\(^{23}\) E.g. the facilitators guide and the guides for those working on telecentre initiatives, on rural ICTD projects and on localisation initiatives and for those who want to use GEM to evaluate their policy advocacy work or use it to evaluate policy advocacy processes.
GEM is being applied in very diverse ways by different organisations (e.g. some are using it with outcome mapping, some are using it for organisational assessments, some are using it for project design and evaluation etc.). It is important that practitioners and facilitators share these experiences and the lessons learnt to help build understanding in how GEM can be used and to help inspire others. GEM should ideally develop into a network that is owned and driven by the GEM practitioners who support each other and those interested in applying GEM, share information about their adaptation and use of GEM and the material that they develop.

The GEM team has trained and supported a number of people in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America. There is now a group of GEM practitioners who are committed to and passionate about GEM. It is therefore likely that once the practitioners and facilitators space has been developed this can a relatively “self-driven” network of practitioners. Once practitioners have a space to share and engage with each other as they feel is useful, the GEM team can focus more on growing the network than facilitating the existing network.

The areas where the GEM team may wish to consider providing support to the existing network include:

- Proactively pushing out a summary of key information to GEM practitioners and facilitators (e.g. through an emailed newsletter). Practitioners and facilitators face time constraints which mean that they are not always able to search online to see if there is any updated information or resources related to GEM.
- A number of those in the review commented on the usefulness of being able to go “beyond the virtual” and the value in the collaboration with others when developing their evaluation plans at some of the workshops. Where possible it would be valuable to organise sessions where practitioners meet to share experiences and ideas (e.g. where there are meetings/conferences attended by a number of GEM practitioners).

In addition, there may be some value in exploring whether some GEM facilitators are interested in also establishing regional networks for sharing regional issues and experiences. I.e. a regional hub where facilitators can help share with practitioners what is happening at the global level but can also bring in the local specificity. It was suggested by one facilitator that regional/sub-regional practitioners networks would help practitioners to feel engaged.

### 8.3 GEM and ICT Policy Advocacy

There is a need to consider the challenges for using GEM for ICT policy advocacy. There are a couple of elements to consider:

- If the GEM team decides to continue with a focus on ICT policy advocacy there is a need to increase the network of people who are confident in using GEM in ICT policy advocacy and who have the capacity to monitor opportunities for intervention and respond when these arise. Policy advocacy requires a different approach as well as the need for GEM practitioners looking at ICT policy advocacy to develop partnerships and networks with a range of stakeholders.
- It is not clear that those using GEM for community level projects are feeding their findings up to the policy level. This limits the impact to a project or community level rather than also impacting on
national policies. However, there are examples where findings from using GEM have been shared with government and where this has had an impact (e.g. in the Philippines and Colombia telecentre examples mentioned previously). This should be actively encouraged and it may be useful to look at whether there are opportunities for sharing the findings of those working at the community level in policy advocacy and with government. It may also be useful to either develop the capacity for those working at the community level to also engage at the policy level or look at whether partnerships can be established with those who are engaged at the policy level.

It is recommended that the GEM team:

- Seeks to raise the level of interest in gender and ICT policy amongst policy makers and those working in policy advocacy by running training workshops and ensuring that the results of findings from using GEM are being shared with government.
- Monitor where there are opportunities for intervention in the policy arena
- Facilitate partnerships between GEM practitioners and those in government and those working on policy issues

### 8.4 Resource Requirements

Some of the areas where funds will likely be required moving forward are:

- Staffing: There is likely to be an initial requirement for the central coordination role to continue in order to undertake the activities outlined in the recommendations above. This role would promote and support GEM and the GEM network as it transitions to becoming a fully “self-driven” network. It may also be useful for someone to focus specifically on the issue of gender and ICT policy (e.g. to monitor opportunities for intervention, to support practitioners to have a greater impact on policy, etc).

- An important pre-condition to the use of GEM is also an awareness of gender and ICT issues and the importance of a gender analysis in ICT for development initiatives. The allocation and costing of time (e.g. of GEM facilitators) and budget for activities related to promoting and building this awareness will need to be considered. It is recommended, for instance, that the GEM team and facilitators seek to obtain the funds required to deliver training workshops in order to proactively raise awareness of the importance of gender in relation to ICT initiatives and an interest in undertaking a gender analysis.

- Where training and mentoring is provided by the GEM team and GEM facilitators, this needs to be budgeted. It is recommended that the GEM team look at how much time has been provided to those who have received support to date in order to develop an indication of the range of services that the team can offer and how much each costs. E.g. how much it has typically cost in terms of time to deliver training to a project team, to provide mentoring to develop an evaluation plan, to provide mentoring to develop data gathering methodologies etc.

- Other costs to consider will be for providing translation support, maintenance of the website, etc. GEM partners also need to ensure that they factor in the time and budget required to undertake evaluation-related activities. This is often underestimated and emerged as an issue for a number of
those in the review. It is important that the GEM team emphasise with partners the need to sufficiently plan in the time and budget required to undertake evaluation activities.

In addition, the evidence indicates that establishing partnerships with funders (e.g. IDRC, GKP, GenARDIS) has been very important in promoting awareness, understanding and use of GEM and helps ensure there is funding to help take GEM-related activities forward. To grow the network of those actively using GEM, it will be important to continue to target those funding projects (e.g. government, international donors, etc) and to promote the incorporation of gender evaluation in the projects they support. This will also help ensure that those delivering projects are provided with the time and resources to use GEM.
### Annex A: List of questionnaire respondents, interviews and digital stories

This table provides a list of those who responded to the evaluation questionnaire and the interviews and digital stories that were analysed as part of this review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Digital Story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vera Veira</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Fernando</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Paz</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anupama Saxena</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela M Kuga</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Apolinaro</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Partial response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim Toko</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanta Tounkara</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanna Tipan</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Mpaji</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloisa Basilio-San Mateo</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajendra Poudel</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudasir Mustafa</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatima Begum Labony</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesenko Osmanagic</td>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dafne Sabanes Plou</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma Saligumba</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenka Simerska</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvie Niombo</td>
<td>Congo Brazaville</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheekay Cinco</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Radloff</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet Were</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat Garcia Ramilo</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Munyua</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika Smith</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valeria Betancourt</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogayah Jaafar</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Digital Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jivka Marinova</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally-Jean Shackleton</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Williams</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Amatorio</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMWIK</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papy Clement Nkubizi</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dada</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvie Siyam</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentina Pellizer</td>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danijela Babic</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmud Hasan</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chea Sok Huor</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Mwathi</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Escobar</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayapadma</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tess Camba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika Cervantes</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammy Hoyos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Rocha</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Jose Salado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcelo Galarza</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assetou Diarra</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’sHub</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huda Sarfraz</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Earl</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarita Sharma (Datamation India)</td>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Juan O. Ramos</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papy Clement</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrina Tanzin</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 Annex B: Evaluation Questionnaire

A GEM evaluation questionnaire was sent via Survey Monkey to 67 people in September 2009. 51 people responded (including 3 partial replies).

The questions in the survey are provided below. Where it has been possible, an attempt has been made to summarize responses.

1. How and when did you first find out about the Gender Evaluation Methodology (GEM)?
2. In which fora or circles or arenas do you hear about the Gender Evaluation Methodology, it at all?
3. Were you ever a participant at a GEM workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. If you have stated “yes” in the previous question, please state how many GEM workshops you have participated in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If you participated in 1 or ore GEM workshops, please provide details for each of the workshops on when it was held and the organizer(s).

6. How many times have you or your organisation collaborated with the GEM team or with APC WNSP on GEM?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Please describe form(s) and time-frame(s) of collaboration with the GEM Team (in the present and past). Choose multiple choices, if relevant. Did you collaborate with APC WNSP by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Providing inputs for GEM’s conceptualization (time frame/years)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Building up awareness, knowledge and/or capacity on GEM by organizing GEM workshops with APC WNSP / GEM (time frame / years)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Testing the first draft methodology of GEM (time frame / years)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Applying and adapting GEM manual (time frame / years)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Translating the GEM manual (time frame / years)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Using GEM for other projects outside the direct collaboration with APC WNSP / GEM Team (time frame / years)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Playing the role of GEM lead facilitator (time frame / years)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Playing the role of GEM co-facilitator (time frame / years)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Other, please specify (time frame / years)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Other” responses: Participating in discussion lists or spaces mentioning GEM concepts and work (1); writing articles (2); drafting and finalizing first draft of GEM and fundraising for GEM II (1); assistance with workshop preparation (1); co-organized workshop (1); presentation about GEM (1); in projects (3)

8. What was your / your organization’s / your project’s role in relation to the collaboration with the GEM Team / APC WNSP? Multiple response answer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) To test out the first version of the Gender Evaluation Methodology (GEM)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) To conduct a needs assessment using GEM 10
(c) To conduct an evaluation (of a programme / project / organization) using GEM 24
(d) To do policy analysis using GEM 6
(e) To conduct a training using GEM 14
(f) To provide new knowledge on how to better apply GEM 11
(g) To make GEM more accessible to others by translating GEM 5
(h) Other, please specify 10
No response 3

Some of the comments under “Other”: Making GEM known to other people (1); to use GEM for the implementation of a project (1); To provide information to the GEM team (1); Applying with feminist popular education methodology (1); workshop preparation/organization (2); to build up gender analysis capacity of grantees (1); none (2)

9. What was the GEM Team’s / APC WNSP’s role(s) in relation to the collaboration with you / your organization / your project? Multiple response answer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) GEM Workshop organizer</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) GEM Mentoring support</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) GEM training / trainer</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) GEM financial support</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) GEM facilitator / evaluator</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Other</td>
<td>To help write project proposal (1), Financial support (1); Workshop participant (1), None (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. To what extent was there any other form of support provided by the GEM Team / APC WNSP in relation to the collaboration with you / your organisation / your project? For example, these might have taken the form of support in identifying projects, identifying other resource persons for arising needs such as local gender experts etc.

The details of the responses are in survey report but below attempts to cluster the responses into broad themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of support</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. To what extent was the support provided by the GEM Team / APC WNSP sufficient to enable you to apply the Gender Evaluation Methodology? (If you have feedback on the different forms of support, please provide as much details as possible).

47 responses. Two responded that they had received no support and four that this question did not apply to them.

The majority of those who received support reported that the support was sufficient and provided very positive feedback. Four mentioned insufficient funding as an issue. One mentioned that they wish they had more specific training in applying GEM. One mentioned that it’s still difficult to apply GEM to its maximum potential. One mentioned that they would have liked to get more pressure from GEM – not having it made them leave reports for later on and they had to hurry the work.

12. What was the most critical/important support (if any) that you received from the GEM Team / APC WNSP in your application / use of the Gender Evaluation Methodology?

The details of the responses are in survey report but below attempts to cluster the responses into broad themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of support</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring / Feedback / Communication</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding support</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing experiences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to adopt GEM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. How did this/these collaborations support the achievement of your / your organisation’s / your project’s objectives?

47 responses. Four responded that this question was not applicable. One responded that they were not able to take GEM forward for internal reasons, one responded that they did not have many opportunities to use GEM due to lack of funding (although they have been using it internally during the project planning phases) and one responded that they had not collaborated with the GEM team. The rest of the responses were positive and fell into the following general themes: that it increased their capacity; that they were able to identify and address gender and ICT issues, that they were able to use GEM; and that it helped raise the profile of their organisation.

14. In what ways have you used the Gender Evaluation Methodology? (For example, evaluation to improve the design and implementation of a project, evaluation to design a new project, needs assessment, evaluation to identify impact, etc.)

48 responded

Four stated that they have not used GEM yet – one because of internal unexpected events but they are waiting for a new opportunity; one had mentioned in a previous answer that lack of funding prevented them from conducting an evaluation to date; one appears from previous answers to be only aware of GEM but not had any engagement with the GEM team or participated in any workshops; and one has not used GEM yet but plans to integrate it into the next phase of their project.

The majority of those respondents who have used GEM have used it for evaluating projects. Some have used it for programme design and implementation and needs assessment and a few for training on gender and ICT and to raise awareness on gender and ICT issues.

15. In what ways have you managed to influence or persuade others to use the Gender Evaluation Methodology?

48 responses

Many of the respondents stated that they have not been able to persuade others to use GEM. However, quite a few indicated that they have been doing activities to raise awareness of and promote GEM even if they have not yet been able to persuade others to use it. Awareness raising activities included workshops, training, promotion through individual and organisation networks and dissemination of results. Some have been able to influence others to use GEM (e.g. through working in partnership with others they were able to influence and provide support; through training and workshops).

16. In what ways have you shared your experiences of using / applying GEM with others?

48 responses
In presentations (at meetings, conferences and workshops), talking to or emailing people, in articles, within partnerships and networks, by sharing findings, training, mailing lists, blogs, TV shows

17. In what ways have others shared their experiences of applying GEM with you/your organisation/your project?

48 responses

Talking, articles, blogs, websites, emails, reports, meetings (conferences, seminars, workshops), within organisations and networks

18. Are you a GEM facilitator?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. What were the motivational factors or facilitating factors that encouraged you to become a GEM facilitator?

14 responses

The factors included: interest in gender issues, the usefulness of the tool, the “warm and empowering space created by the WNSP team”, the opportunity for expanding skills and for work.

20. What “lessons learnt” have you gained from the experiences of being a GEM facilitator?

14 responses

21. In what ways has the role of the GEM facilitator challenged you at a personal level and/or in your work?

13 responses

22. To what extent would you remain a GEM facilitator? What would be the facilitating factors in order for you to continue to play this role? What would be the obstructing factors in order for you to continue to play this role? If you have stopped being a GEM facilitator, please elaborate on the reasons why and on your specific context.

15 responses

11 people said that they could be a facilitator in the future (although some to a more limited degree), one who is not currently a facilitator stated that they wish to be a facilitator, one stated that they could be if the need arises but would prefer not to be too central in the GEM team and one said they were not sure. Obstructing factors included time spent out of home, other work...
commitments and the need for more time working with the tool. Facilitating factors included mentoring, having a community of reference, working with other facilitators.

23. What changes have you experienced and seen within your project and team members/project partners/community since the use of GEM?

- 39 respondents indicated that it has had an impact (responses range from increasing awareness and sensitivity to changes in projects and organisations).
- Two respondents felt it was too early to assess the changes.
- Three responded that there were no changes.
- One respondent felt the question was better answered by GEM users.
- One respondent felt not qualified to answer the question.
- Two respondents indicated that they have not used GEM yet.
- Three did not respond.

An anonymized version of the responses:

- I can see changes within many projects and people who took GEM workshops. Its especially obvious when I compare the starting point of some participants when they arrive to a GEM workshop, then observe how they go through the learning process and the way they think and express themselves when they leave the workshop. If there is a follow up phase after a workshop in terms of them applying GEM and us having the chance of mentoring, the process of change and effects of GEM is even better seen.
- It has broaden my perspective on gender issues, specially because of leading workshops with people from so diverse backgrounds.
- 1. Increased gender sensitivity in team members. Working with GEM has changed the thinking of the team members: The girls feel that now they are able to identify the gender based discriminations prevailing in the society that they have been facing and more importantly to realize that this is a discrimination that should be resisted not accepted as a social norm. Like earlier if they are working with their male classmates they felt guilty and tried to hide it and if found working together tended to give explanations. After associating with GEM they felt that working with male colleagues is as normal as working with female colleagues. The change in the mind set also happened with male students as well. They feel that now they have become more sensitive towards the needs of the women. As they met almost 20 rural women and worked with three female students for almost one year. The interaction with female village heads made them realize the problems a rural woman faces while working in a male dominated society. Now they appreciate her courage. Earlier they used to laugh at rural women. These male students feel that they have become more sensitive towards the needs of the female while working with a team where only two were male and four were women. Small small things like women do need toilet facilities. They can’t use open air toilets in the rural areas like their male colleagues. 2. Increased level of confidence to evaluation studies.
- The environment for GEM use has become more critical.
- We have change in hierarchy order. 1- My self- The project which has conducted before 2007 were not serious about GENDER balance and GEM was far. Now every project I apply we plan to do GEM for measuring real impact of the project. 2- We have trained 3 female...
candidates and one male candidate. Now every time when they think about the training or project in grassroot they are aware about GEM

- I would say most of us (GEM team, the telecentre managers and some people community administration that we interacted with) have become more sensitized and there is a difference in their approach to telecentre activities as you notice they now pay interest on gender balance. For example telecentres did promise to exercise gender balance in staffing and assignment of responsibilities. At telecentre network level we also try to highlight equitable access to information is key in development during our social engagement as an organisation
- I can now more sensitive to the needs of men and women in our community specially in ICT
- We have adapted GEM in one of our largest project which is providing computer training to the rural youth. Before adapting GEM, team has selected schools according to the infrastructure, students result in public exam, location etc. Now they are considering girls school though those schools are not fulfilling their all requirements
- My team loves the Gender Empowerment Framework used in GEM. When they are facilitating workshops they love to use it to explain deep gender issues. They always talk about women controlling resources rather than only accessing these resources. This a major change in my team.
- Team members everything they do they think in terms of creating gender equity in telecentres and ICT Community. For the first time there was gender awareness amongst women and men and they were focused to realise gender equity in telecentres and the use of ICTs. This affected them the most that they highlighted areas they believed would realise the changes. The telecentre and community leadership worked together to ensure there was gender equity in telecentres and the use of ICTs.
- GEM framework is being used for monitoring and evaluation of the project and female took as separate boundary partners, so every member of the team realized and know the importance of female in the project. After identify gender and ICT issues by using GEM, most of team members realized how to maximize women participation in the project. To facilitate female boundary partners, female team members was hired in the project. It was surprising that there were only two male member in the project out of 9 members, one male was project trainer and other was technologist (technical resource).
- They became more gender sensitive and are able to make gender analysis
- Breaking gender discrimination
- We have just recently conducted the GEM workshop and have not yet assessed the changes of the 2 communities so cannot say about the level of change GEM have influenced them on a personal or work level.
- more women taking policy advocacy roles at national level
- People have definitely become more aware of gender issues in their projects and beyond. People are more aware of gender and ICT and policy issues There is commitment to addressing women’s empowerment more. The power of storytelling as a methodology of sharing and learning.
- More gender focused
- The evaluation done in institutions utilizing the GEM appears more systematic than others
- There is more capacity now in the organisation to conduct gender evaluation of our work.
- Our ratio of men to women within our project team is almost equal. In the communities women are now aware that they can also use localized software; use the computer like most men does. Team members are more aware of women’s capabilities to achieve any task.
- Since we had GEM in mind since the start of the project, I can’t say that we have seen any changes, but I guess we were more aware of the challenges we were going to face from the
gender perspective, and hence had time to prepare ourselves when we started the execution of the project.

- Not used GEM yet.
- thinking formally about planning and evaluation and employing a consistent approach across projects and focus areas
- As we prepared our new strategic document, team members acknowledged that our credentials as a gender-sensitive organisation is clear from our program approaches
- The change observed during the workshops and exchanges with members is the understanding of gender has changed, and also made more links between gender and ICT. But also, some members saw that the GEM was useful for their work, even if not fully utilized, their parts have helped
- We became more aware of gender issues at the workplace, and sensitive about having to deliver services taking into consideration these issues
- I think I see a higher level of capacity among the GEM facilitation team members and GEM practitioners who were involved in the adaptation of GEM but who were also users of GEM in the past. But you know, it's all relative and I actually do not have that advantage of having a comparative point of relativity. I do see a growth in knowledge and capacity and skills when I compare initial evaluation plans and subsequent improvements that take place in the design, implementation and final analysis as a result of the onsite mentoring. I truly believe the onsite mentoring helps the partners and also the team members a lot in collective learning. I also see how for some groups, the application of GEM takes off on a much wider scale after being able to forge local partnerships or after being able to fundraise to upscale projects. These are of course, just my perceptions. I need to think about this a lot more.
- One of the most remarkable changes I have seen throughout the last few years is how project partners have changed institutionally in the way that they address gender. I also seen how GEM trainees have become GEM facilitators
- Our projects accommodate for the needs of women more effectively.
- Strengthened ability to proactively engage and position the concerns of women within the ICT framework at different fora.
- Initially they thought of a research evaluation tool, gradually feel that it is more than a evaluation tool and thus could apply GEM in other aspects like design, process monitoring, evaluation etc.
- I have a better understanding of gender issues related to my field of work after being familiar with GEM. I have also seen that new organisations are interested in knowing GEM and applying it for their work.
- The biggest change that we observed in the team members was an increased awareness about gender equality, as many of us had not previously analysed the situation. The GEM workshop held in Bamako convinced many of us that the problem is really a social and not a natural construct
- Within our team, few people have managed to effectively understand the use of GEM
- we will see in the next stage of the project.
- I don't have a project to use GEM
- I've seen a greater participation in people according to their potentialities, better team work, better relations between men and women leaders in different groups, a greater empowerment of projects, that achieve social sustainability.
- Greater sensitivity around gender roles and gender relationships in our work. We were able to create interest around gender issues in the population we work with.
- I was quite aware of the importance of using a gender perspective before I started to use GEM and I believe most of the members of my team were also aware, at least in theory. But using
GEM Evaluation Report

GEM to an evaluation project has contributed to highlight the importance of considering ICT projects with a gender perspective. On the other hand, we were also able to have some influence in organisation we work with, that is dedicated to rural development. Regarding grassroots organisations and the community, I find that it was a great success to convince a mainly male organisations (and machista in many ways) to conduct an evaluation with a gender perspective. I also believe that the evaluation itself and the presentation of its results were able to influence in some members' way of thinking and in the community, both men and women.

- None specifically
- I find that team members and organisations within the network, including the government body that worked with us, are more aware of gender issues and they want to go on working on this type of issues. Implementing GEM was a good starting point for them. GEM is now included in the agenda of the network. As an organisation, has strengthened its intervention around gender issues, both regarding human resources and their own legitimacy as gender and ICT experts.
- They are much sensitive regarding gender prospective
- A different view of reality and a new perspective in our work
- the partners appreciate GEM in that we would not have been able to apply it to other skills, which we are now able to do. Also, GEM has afforded us new initiatives which are even more suited to the needs of our target public, which helps us within the association

24. What changes have you seen in yourself?

- 42 indicated changes
- Two responded “none”
- Two responded that they had not used GEM yet
- One responded that it was too early to assess the changes

An anonymized version of the responses:

- During this second phase of GEM, I’ve been seeing GEM in a different way than before. I really truly started appreciating it as a methodology, as well as a concept and a way of working towards gender equality both from within communities and projects and on the higher decision making level. Its not that I had not trusted GEM in this respect before, I just saw it more as a project raising awareness around gender and ICTs and a sequence of steps that organisations can take to evaluate. I think this “new love” or new view is a coincidence of a few factors: much more exposure to other evaluation methodologies and opportunity to compare, some kind of growing more mature in understanding concepts and gender and the way development works, becoming a mother plays a role in this as well as taking a break, accumulation of all the previous experience that somehow got digested at this point, and going out of the regional box and working globally. As a result of it all I’d say I’m much better able to facilitate GEM (in a workshop and in its application) and promote it
- I’m more aware of gender and cultural issues, but I also know that I can have a strong argument respecting others, but forwarding women’s rights first
- Increased level of confidence to pursue gender studies
- Broader worldview and planning processed take GEM into account
- I am very much interested to work with GEM and want to be GEM facilitator. After GEM workshop I am introducing GEM in the large profitable business project. It helped to manage
private organisation and build the international capacity in of the organisation by empowering female candidate.

- Personally I think I have become gender sensitive and I pay close interest to it not only professionally but even in my individual endeavours. I am now sensitised, well equipped and have an experience in advocating for equitable access to information at all levels of the socio-economic ladder right from national to community level.

- I worked with gender issue before but involving in this project gave me opportunities to learn and analysis gender issue very deeply and clearly. This experience helps me to find critical gender issue in a project. Now I always try to see beyond the BOX

- I have been working in the development sector for 8 years. I have never seen such a fascinating concept like GEM. Since I first heard about GEM I never looked back. I am more and more become interested in Gender based programmes and issues. I have want to do my Masters research in GEM.

- am gender sensitive to everything unlike before. I studied gender in my post graduate, but I never gave it much wider interest to dig deeper in gender, but this evaluation really impacted on my thinking that I need gender more than before and I want others to think like me and implement such to effect changes in women's lives especially, who are always disadvantages in many ways. Am more gender sensitive than before.

- Now, I see any issue regarding project not only with a gender lens but also focus on the question “why”.

- I have increased gender awareness and am able to make gender analysis

- It enhanced my knowledge and made me more critical

- more women in project

- A better understanding of gender and tech concepts. Being a GEM facilitator allowed me to experience first hand the limitations of current 'gender frameworks' in addressing gender gaps in communities. I've learned through the projects that I've worked with in GEM that the solutions are never uniform and that local context is key in ensuring that gender is addressed sufficiently in any project.

- the ability to look crosscutting and with a system-vision

- I am on the one hand more tolerant of people or projects which struggle with integrating gender and on the other very intolerant of the continual appropriation of resources by men in communities. One sees this when GEM is applied or a gender lens used to interrogate practices. I am more determined to ensure that women's empowerment is the "bigger part" of gender equality.

- Bigger interest in using technologies for GEM

- I am more conscious and aware of the broader issues regarding gender evaluation for international projects on women than before. The stages in the GEM tool really guide you through a systematic approach to evaluating with gender as the central theme

- My self-belief in achieving anything that I wish to has increased or doubled. Also I can now feel that I as a woman must make a difference in any way possible in other women's lives. Especially those who are less privileged. I believe that empowering women is the best way to develop a whole nation/world.

- I'm not sure, perhaps I am aware of women's issues when interacting with technology better than I was before.

- Not used GEM yet.

- I think the same as above - a consistent and comprehensive approach to evaluation... and being privy of the thinking behind GEM was very useful
I see gender in every aspect of my personal and professional life. I see gender awareness and sensitivity as key to sustainable progress, continuity and inclusion in all my activities.

My own understanding of gender and ICT has also changed, and I see things I could not before. It also prompted me to research resources on evaluation in general, read and also participate in training locally in my country.

I am more aware that these issues exist and that these are considered in the policies, plans, programs that we develop.

I've learnt to be more zen.

My engagement with GEM is at very deep level which has made me more evaluative and reflective in the way I do my work. Through GEM, my conceptual understanding of feminist and gender analysis has become more solid and I have learned so much about evaluation.

I approach projects completely differently, emphasising evaluation as a key and constant component - something that should be participatory, can and should be carried out by those who are involved in the project and not outsiders, and not be something done at the end. The crazy pace of APC WNSP makes it hard to really take our learnings and build from them, but evaluations of our work over the years have been a source of reflection and input for me as I prepare annual reports or articles. Sometimes there is far too much distance from the moment of evaluation and the analysis of results to properly incorporate learnings into new phases of work - and sometimes that same distance helps me to learn more. But all of this does not necessarily mean that I have a more gendered lens or improved analysis which is more subtle and insidious - I think that GEM and evaluation in general have helped improve practice in workshops I give and design of projects that I do. Where I have gained more gender insights directly from GEM has been in reading about the way others apply GEM, what their learnings are, how those learnings led to actions (i.e., D.Net's restructuring), or, for example, in the policy advocacy workshop how people were breaking down what interpreting policy - a difficult area for me - and advocacy from a gendered perspective would mean, or the localisation adaptation. Having the opportunity during the global exchange to debate the research framework for the rural-ict4d working group was extraordinarily enriching. As I do not do rural work, it broke with all sorts of stereotypes and helped expand my gender lens by having the opportunity to exchange with such diverse people and experiences.

I was able to improve on my knowledge base on gender analysis. Made me connect the practical and strategic needs to the work that we do in different spaces and its importance and relevancy to women's empowerment. I can also now be able to view the disparities in ICT access, use, content in different spaces (IT, radio, newspapers) and I have a global view.

Loving GEM and always explore GEM issues in any of the activities I have undertaken.

I have a better understanding of gender issues related to my field of work after being familiar with GEM.

The change that I have seen in myself has been a strengthening of my previous knowledge about the gender issue, especially in relation to technology.

I find that I am increasingly aware of the often hazy aspects of gender; I have also found it much easier to identify and incorporate gender issues when developing my projects.

We will see in the next stage of the telecomms review project.

I don't have a project to use GEM.

I have achieved a better understanding of what people from different cultures and backgrounds think about gender issues.

A better understanding of gender issues in rural organisations and its importance in development projects.

To get to know that there are more options to analyse gender and ICTs.
As I have mentioned before, I feel more at ease when discussing gender and ICT issues in a project and when pushing this issue as a cross-cutting factor in the design and evaluation of projects. I have been able to work on many good ideas around ICTs strategic use in projects.

I am much open for personal and community changes.

New practices in gender and ICTs

I have a better understanding of the material use of the activities in which we are involved, as I can see their impact and am thus able to make improvements and corrections.

25. What was the most significant change for you since you used GEM?

An anonymized version of the responses:

- I think internalizing learning for change as a concept and understanding projects and evaluation process holistically with less emphasis on accuracy in use of methods while being able to stay rigorous and valid. Also being able to explain GEM to gender/ICTs/d practitioners without being too worried about scholarly accurate teachings.

- I’ve found that like mentoring others and helping others to grow as facilitators and coordinators. It is good to know that there are capable people doing your job and that one day they will be ready to take over. It is important to learn how to share knowledge with others and I find that GEM, with its open and inclusive philosophy helps to do so.

- Increased level of confidence to pursue gender studies

- Planning and delivery always incorporates the question of who is invisible or absent and how to incorporate their spaces

- Heartily realization-- Realization the important of GEM for the not only community based project but all the small to big business project too. It only not help you to evaluate the project but also gives you ideas how to mange gender issues in your organisations.

- I would say I now approach my responsibilities especially on community empowerment through telecentres with a renewed gender outlook.

- more sensitive to men and women's needs and wants

- Before involving in GEM project I was thinking that I am a gender sensitive person but later on I found myself with the wrong definition of GENDER. Now I have little bit idea regards gender issue and I can think methodically about this. I can help project people to asses their project to find out gender gap and also can help them to adapt GEM for reducing the gap

- I have since ever internalise issues of men and women. I have then joined AWID: Association for Women's rights in Development. I receive news and latest development in women's issues.

- I became more gender sensitive to the use of ICT and telecentres, when I became one of the people who united the telecentre and community leadership to ensure they all worked together, to realise gender equity in telecentres. This was about bringing unlike terms together who have for generations not even gotten concerned about telecentres and their communities and in many cases believing they were enemies.

- By using GEM framework, now I felt Gender, gender and gender everywhere.

- I learned to appreciate the difference in men and women

- Becoming critical.

- more women in project

- I think this would be better answered by the GEM users.

- Empowerment

- Listening to stories, working in a team, seeing changes in work practices of people after a GEM training. I learnt enormously from participating in the workshops and on the field visits. I have more confidence in what I know and in my abilities as a trainer/facilitator not just of GEM but generally.

- I started a new gender organisation
I have become more passionate about women and health issues affecting women and children and the drive to evaluate our global efforts towards a more women friendly curricula.

The capacity of the organisation to conduct gender evaluations internally. Also, having a resource like GEM for small groups like us is a great resource for the evaluation requirements of our work.

I try to look at a situation through a gender perspective, so I am more alert/cautious.

Not used GEM yet.

:-) I suppose the most significant was seeing evaluation as an exciting and empowering experience rather than a chore that was not very illuminating and not very informative

Gender is not about women, it is about recognizing that all humans have incredible potentials if given their rights and due recognition

It is to be more engaged in the cause to empower women through the use of ICT in the region

better awareness and understanding of gender issues

I need to think about this a lot more. I think I'd rather hear about the most significant change for those who have applied GEM on the ground. I'm still reflecting on what could be the most significant change within me. I think it's better if I can pinpoint this because it is "my change" and so I'm better able to talk about it. Change in others is best talked about or described by those who experienced that change.

I have seen GEM grow from an idea -- to a project that has resulted in a GEM tool translated in various languages, in workshops in so many countries, in organisations learning how to find out how their work changes women's (and men's) lives. I have also seen GEM grow into a community and go beyond just the APC WNSP (as project implementers). When I think about this questions, I think the most significant change for me is the extent and the ways that GEM is being used by others

to realise that there is difference in how men and women use ICT

GEM is how I started working formally with APC! While I have always been passionate about women's strategic use of ICT, I think it was through GEM and my work as an APC WNSP team member that I began to understand gender and ICT from a more analytical perspective. Definitely GEM opened my eyes regarding gendered (ICT) policy, software, localisation, etc. It has sharpened my gender analysis.

To understand that there we gender issues within the ICT framework. Initially my perception was that technology is technology.

Believe in GEM.

I have a better understanding of gender issues related to my field of work after being familiar with GEM.

My skills in easily identifying gender aspects when developing my projects

we will see in the next stage of the project.

I don't have a project to use GEM

To understand that we have to work with a gender perspective in all community processes, understanding that people have their own skills, and that working with the same aims leads to the construction of projects that are firm and longstanding. To analyse and deepen in these concepts, that before I had only understood superficially, is something that I have done with pleasure.

Greater interest in gender issues in my own work and in my daily life.

As I have said before, I already worked with a gender perspective, so this methodology has produced changes at a technical level, regarding the use of the methodology, and also in what respects to information (getting to know the real context of the case to be studied)

to get to know the methodology
To be able to coordinate gender workshops with men and women in community telecentres. I was able to see the effects of machism and cultural issues. Machism is stronger in some areas, women have gained more empowerment in others. I have learned a lot in these workshops about my own role as a woman. I learned to lead the discussion so that people wouldn't feel hurt. Sometimes I had to mediate, so that people wouldn't start arguing in a workshop or women wouldn't think that all men are bad. The aim is to be able to build more equitable gender relations and not to exclude men, because they are also victims of social, cultural and historic matters. Other change I really appreciate is to be able to invite, involve and convince other male and female professionals to work with a gender perspective in their ICT projects and to use GEM in their projects, too.

Gender prospective is shared with huge number of activists and media audience. A new perspective of looking at these issues and working on them.

The change is primarily within mindsets - as I have already said, we can now ask the right questions.

26. Do you consider the change/s mentioned above as transformative? Why or why not?

- 40 responded positively
- One responded “none”
- Two responded that it was not very transformative
- Two responded that they have not used GEM yet
- Two felt they could not respond at that time
- One response was unclear
- Three did not respond

An anonymized version of the responses:

- Yes, for sure. Because it all had effect on me as a person and the way I see the world and am able to contribute to gender equality in ICTD.
- Yes, they are, because they help to have a broad and inclusive perspective in other spaces in life.
- Yes. literally, it is a change that has transformed the way I work in this area.
- Of-course it is transformative. Because it is based on practice.
- The changes are transformative as I do believe they will continue shaping my future and that of the people that I will be interacting with in future.
- Yes because I can now give the best service to all our clients in the telecentre.
- YES. Because I can help other to know the correct definition of GENDER. I can help project people to find out gender gap in their project and also can help them to adapt GEM to reduce the gap.
- Yes, I do. As an African man issues of women have never crossed my mind. I always thought that only women can become activists in terms of issues that affect them. However with exposure to GEM I more and more become involved in women’s issues and I want to be an activist.
- Yes, because I no longer think like before and I do my work professionally, while thinking of the marginalised and how best their lives could be improved.
- Yes, these changes are transformative because to focus on the question “why”, I have learnt from GEM team.
- Yes, because it changed the way I would respond to the needs of men and women.
YES. This is fundamental. PS: I forgot to say that GEM needs to consider also the racial and ethnical perspectives

Yes.

yes it is

at individual level for sure at organisational I will be able to answer in the coming Yes I do as it has affected me personally, in my life generally and has affected my deepened commitment to my work.

Yes. My new job is more focused

definitely transformative as we all learn about the sensitivities and complexities of effective evaluation of programmes and projects which have a gender perspective

Yes, of course. Evaluation is tricky with small organisations. Most of us don't have the capacity and the know-how to do it. So having a resource like GEM makes it easier for us to carry out evaluations.

Yes its trans-formative as it has contributed a lot in my efforts to be a better human being.

Not very transformative. Perhaps being a woman myself, I was subconsciously aware of the issues brought forward by GEM, but GEM served to formalize them somewhat.

Not used GEM yet.

yes - because it changed my approach and behaviour... and resulted in deeper analysis and improved impact

I consider them fundamental and strategic. If mine and my organisations services are not sustainable and fully inclusive, we shall be missing out on the vital contributions which others can make to enhance our services

I think these changes are transformative in that it changes the way we conceive, plan and manage projects, but also able to see the impact of the use of ICT in the lives of women and girls

Can't respond to this right now. Still processing and hoping that I'll be able to process this by the time I have to develop and produce my digital story.

I think that people/organisation's experience with GEM has itself been a transformative process -- in varying levels. Many of our partners have themselves talked about how using GEM have transformed the way they think and the way they do things. They have reported how their work has contributed to empowering changes for women's lives. These transformations are more at an individual level, some are institutional level.

I understood that technology is very much adjusted to the world of men, not women.... It is mostly created by men for men and reflects societal gender issues...

Of course! For starters, being a much more critical thinker regarding gender. (would need to come back to this to think about more, will not go deeper for now ,=)

Yes because it enables me to appreciate why women and men's issues need to be discussed and addressed differently. Without this, the change that we are yearning for cannot be achieved and hence the development process will instead lead to imbalance.

Once people believe in GEM, then they could able to explore all aspects of the tool

Qualitative change is difficult to measure. However, I think that any attempt to question gender imbalances are opportunities to transform something. In that sense, GEM is a powerful tool to provide practical and theoretical elements for change.

these changes will help to transform many things. If the team, which is the primary organisation assisting with the establishment and monitoring of telecentre programmes and projects, is really able to develop a clear vision of this problem, it can help to change the vision of the partners, which will lead to a major change with relation to telecentres.

Yes, I am more aware, and I am initiating more and more projects affecting women

we will see in the next stage of the project.
o I don't have a project to use GEM
o Yes, I have learned a lot and I think I'm now a better person.
o Yes, they were, because little by little we are including these issues in our agendas.
o No. I did my postgraduate studies in gender issues and before that I was quite aware of the importance of considering gender issues and the feminist struggle. I
o Yes, in the use of new tools
o Yes, these changes were transforming, both at a personal and professional level. As a professional, I feel I have integrated gender issues in my work and as a woman, I'm more assured of my own role and my commitment to involve more actors and sectors in gender and ICT issues.
  o Yes! These changes transform attitudes and behaviours of our beneficiaries and partners.
  o Yes, because they have now become cross-cutting issues in our organisations' work
  o The change is at the level of decision-making within the association. Reasoning is clear with regard to our activities, and people now ask questions whenever they wish