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INTRODUCTION

The Gender in Humanitarian Action training of trainers (ToT) workshop, which took place from 23 to 26 April 2019 in Yangon/Myanmar, was designed to meet the demand for dedicated training on gender in humanitarian action (GiHA), enabling humanitarian practitioners to have an increased understanding of gender equality programming and its applicability in their respective areas of work. The GiHA ToT provided participants with a variety of practical and transferable tools on gender that aimed to strengthen their capacity to integrate gender equality programming in cluster/sector-wide humanitarian action, with a focus on implementing gender transformative approaches.

The training was organized by UN Women in collaboration with the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) on behalf of the Inter-Cluster Coordination Group in Myanmar and with funding from UN Women. The training was facilitated by Marie Sophie Pettersson, Programme Specialist Humanitarian Action and Resilience Building, UN Women; Aye Thiri Kyaw, Senior National Coordination Officer, OCHA; Su Mon, GBV Programme Analyst, UNFPA; and Chow Su, GBV Programme Analyst, UNFPA.

TRAINING OBJECTIVES

The training was designed as a training of trainers to enable trained participants to form a pool of local GiHA trainers to support conducting further GiHA trainings in Myanmar and to strengthen gender mainstreaming efforts across humanitarian response efforts in Myanmar.

The objectives of the training were to provide participants the skills to:

- Define key terms of gender and gender equality in humanitarian action;
- Strengthen the integration of gender equality measures into the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) by learning how to use different gender tools and by creating a practical gender lens;
- Support the clusters/sectors in developing gender assessments, analysis and strategies; and facilitate coordination processes that meaningfully integrate critical gender, vulnerability and capacity dimensions;
- Articulate clearly the imperative for gender equality programming in the humanitarian legal and architecture frameworks;
- Strengthen gender mainstreaming efforts across humanitarian response efforts in Myanmar;
- Create action plans of how to apply the gained knowledge from the workshop in practice.

The training targeted mainly local staff members from different humanitarian sectors, clusters and working groups across different geographical areas in Myanmar including from Yangon and Nay Pyi Taw as well as from Rakhine, Kachin, Kayin and Shan states. A total of 37 participants attended the training. This included representatives from Lutheran World Federation (LWF), Plan International, Action Contre La Faim, Save the Children, Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED), International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Action Aid, Relief International, Myanmar Red Cross Society (MRCS), Community Partners International (CPI), Danish Refugee Council (DRC), International Rescue Committee (IRC), Community and Family Services International (CFSI), Nyein Foundation, Metta Development Foundation, Trocaire, Solidarité International, World Vision, KBC-HDD (MKA), KMSS-MKA, Shalom, UNOPS, UNICEF, WHO, UNAIDS, UN Women, UNFPA and OCHA.
BACKGROUND

Protecting human rights and promoting gender equality is central to humanitarian action. The crises in Kachin, Northern Shan and Rakhine (Myanmar) have different impacts on women, girls, boys and men among crisis-affected populations based on gender, age, disability, ethnicity, religion, citizenship status, sexual orientation and gender identity, and other diversities. The crises disproportionately affect women and girls, as well as the most vulnerable and marginalized population groups, by perpetuating and exacerbating pre-existing, persistent gender and social inequalities, gender-based violence (GBV), and discrimination. These gendered barriers lead to a lower ability and opportunity of women and girls, and the most vulnerable and marginalized to survive and recover from crises, including accessing scarce and overstretched humanitarian relief services, as well as lower resilience against and influence in preventing future shocks and conflict escalation.

Notably, pre-existing gender norms of roles also shape the differential impact of the crises on men and boys, who have been exposed to human rights violations due to performing their gender roles as heads of households and breadwinners. Evidence from disasters and crises in the Asia-Pacific region demonstrate that Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex, and Queer (LGBTIQ) persons face increased vulnerability, particular risks and discrimination during times of crisis and in crisis aftermaths, including due to discriminatory laws and socio-cultural practices which can create barriers to their safe and equitable access to relief, services and information and render them particularly vulnerable to sexual and GBV and other forms of harassment and abuse.

Addressing gender equality during a humanitarian crisis therefore implies planning and implementing humanitarian programming that addresses the specific needs of different groups in a community. Strengthened efforts to integrate gender equality measures into the crisis responses, as well as preparedness, recovery and resilience building processes, is critical to ensuring that all women, girl, boys, and men — particularly the most vulnerable and marginalized — have equitable access to and benefit equally from relief, services, information, community level activities and decision making. Humanitarian responses often miss opportunities to transform gender relations through the leadership and empowerment of women and girls in their role as decision makers, first responders and economic actors — notwithstanding the fact that these are key to response effectiveness and to communities’ longer-term resilience and social cohesion.

Over the past few years, there have been strengthened efforts to place gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls (GEEWG) at the centre of humanitarian action, as well as across the humanitarian-development-peace nexus, in Myanmar which has led to changes in the lives of crisis affected women and girls in the country. Smriti Aryal, Humanitarian Action and Resilience Building Regional Adviser, UN Women Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, highlighted during her opening remarks of the GIHA ToT workshop in Yangon:

“In Myanmar, under HCT leadership, humanitarian actors have progressively increased efforts on gender mainstreaming over the past years. What we need now is dedicated and strong gender capacity to be able to take forward these commitments through a robust implementation effort.”

Smriti Aryal, UN Women Regional Humanitarian Action and Resilience Building Adviser
GEEWG commitments are integrated as central and cross-cutting in the 2019 Myanmar Humanitarian Response Plan, Humanitarian Needs Overview and Emergency Response Preparedness Plan to inform gender-responsive humanitarian action. With technical support from UN Women, the Myanmar Humanitarian Fund ensured 100% compliance with the IASC gender marker for all its proposal rounds in 2017 and 2018 which increased financing of GEEWG humanitarian programming. To promote the voices and influence women and their advocates in humanitarian action, UN Women organized a consultation on promoting GEEWG across the humanitarian-peace-development nexus in Kachin State on 6-7 August 2018 together with the Kachin State Women Network which led to the development of a Common Charter of Demands by Women’s Groups in Kachin State circulated with the Kachin State Government and the Humanitarian Country Team. To strengthen gendered evidence base, UN Women led the development of the Myanmar Gender in Humanitarian Action (GiHA) Profile through consultations with humanitarian and gender actors at national and sub-national level which will serve as a guidance and advocacy tool to inform gender-responsive humanitarian action in Myanmar in 2019 and will be updated on an annual basis. To operationalize the GiHA profile, UN Women and UNFPA led the development of a 2019 GiHA action plan submitted for final ICCG and HCT endorsement in March 2019 to inform key priority activities in 2019.

Strengthening the capacity of humanitarian actors constitutes one of the key priority actions in the Myanmar GiHA Action Plan in order to enhance accountability of the Government, donors and the HCT to implement the IASC GEEWG policy commitments, including through provision of GiHA training and strengthening the gender mainstreaming coordination mechanisms within the humanitarian architecture at the national and sub-national level.

Smriti Aryal, Humanitarian Action and Resilience Building Regional Adviser, UN Women Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, giving the opening speech of the GiHA ToT. Photo Credit: Yulia Boyko/UN Women.
The three and a half-day GiHA ToT workshop was built on a variety of methodologies, stressing active learning through a range of small-group exercises, role-plays, quizzes, presentations, team, and individual activities. The training was intended to be practice-oriented: a minimal number of didactic sessions presented frameworks which were then applied through exercises and case studies to allow participants to see how general principles apply to their geographic situation. The training design also placed a strong emphasis on the need for practical tips to support and implement gender equality programming activities in complex humanitarian settings in Myanmar as well as within the HPC.

The training was composed of sessions articulated around principles of gender and gender equality used in humanitarian settings, their applicability in the humanitarian legal framework and within each element of the HPC. The sessions allowed participants to familiarize themselves with tools strengthening their gender analysis competence such as the importance of collecting sex, age and diversity disaggregated data and the new Gender with Age Marker tool.

Illustrated by an average score of 68% which the participants achieved in the pre-workshop test, the participants’ knowledge on GiHA prior to the ToT was rather high. Overall, the workshop group was very strong and remained highly engaged throughout the training. A pre-/post-workshop analysis showed an increase of 7% in the participants’ GiHA understanding upon completion of the ToT.

**Training Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
<th>Day 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is Gender? – Key Gender Concepts</strong></td>
<td>Context Overview: Crises in Myanmar and gender and humanitarian architecture</td>
<td>Sex, Age and Disability Disaggregated Data (SADDD) and Gender-Sensitive Assessment</td>
<td>Adult learning and Training tips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Equality and Humanitarian Legal and Normative Frameworks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turning the Gained Knowledge into Practice: Group Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key CSO Experts take on promoting Gender Equality in Humanitarian Action in Myanmar</td>
<td>Gender Mainstreaming Key Concepts</td>
<td>Way forward: Action Planning for GiHA in Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender, Diversity and Intersectionality</strong></td>
<td>Gender and the Humanitarian Programme Cycle</td>
<td>Gender Mainstreaming in Sector/Cross-Sector Humanitarian Programming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why GiHA? &amp; Key approaches for effective gender-integrated humanitarian response</strong></td>
<td>Gender with Age Marker</td>
<td>Gender Equality Humanitarian Programming – Women’s Leadership, Empowerment, Access and Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protection against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA)</td>
<td>Addressing Gender Based Violence (GBV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SESSION I: WHAT IS GENDER? – KEY GENDER CONCEPTS

Through a mix of presentations and inter-active activities and games, the first session of the workshop allowed participants to develop a basic understanding of gender concepts as well as the impact of gender norms, gender role stereotyping and power relations in regards to gender equality and gender equity. It enabled participants to revise their knowledge of concepts such as sex, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, and group gender norms and roles.

Gender Socialization Exercise

The Gender Socialization Exercise served as an ‘ice-breaker’ and created awareness on gender issues from a personal perspective.

Participants shared and discussed first in groups and subsequently in plenary the different privileges and vulnerabilities that women, men, boys and girls face as well as the participants’ first memories when they realized being treated in certain ways based on their gender.

“While I was already aware of basic gender and gender mainstreaming concepts before this workshop, this training has enabled me to gain a more in-depth theoretical and practical understanding of these concepts and tools, which makes me confident about conducting GIHA trainings myself in the future,” Julie Nge from OCHA, Sittwe, said during the evaluation session of the GIHA ToT workshop.

1. Examples of participants’ first memories of when they became aware of their gender

- While girls and boys used to be friends during primary school grade, they were not allowed to mingle anymore during secondary school and girls were prohibited to spend time outside the house;
- Boys who wanted to wear girls’ clothes were forbidden to do so;
- Priority for education was given to boys over girls;
- Women faced higher requirements than men regarding entrance marks for universities for some subjects.

2. Privileges and vulnerabilities based on gender.

Participants perceived women in general as less privileged and more vulnerable due to prevailing religious and socio-cultural norms. Examples raised during the discussion included women’s and girls’ discrimination in terms of educational opportunities, their restrictions in freedom of movement as well as in areas such as education, workplace and decision-making.
After the Gender and Sex Relay Race, participants discussed in plenary the meanings, definitions and examples of important key gender concepts such as gender roles and norms, gender mainstreaming, gender identity, gender equality and gender equity. Subsequently, the discussion evolved around terms such as sexual orientation, sexual discrimination and discrimination against women.

Key Takeaways from the Gender Session:

- Gender Equality benefits not only women but the society as a whole in many different ways, e.g. it leads to a country’s economic development and the strengthening of peace-building processes as well as to a decrease in GBV.
- Gender is socially constructed through a socialization process and hence, gender concepts change over time.
- Gender mainstreaming means that gender aspects needs to be considered in all the different humanitarian sectors and clusters and the different needs of women, girls, men and boys across different ages, abilities, sexual orientations, genders, etc. need to be assessed and considered in all stages of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle.
- Gender equality and gender equity (substantive gender equality) are different terms. We should strive for substantive gender equality.
- While women face proportionally more discriminations based on their gender, it is essential to consider that men and boys also face certain discriminations.
SESSION II: GENDER, DIVERSITY AND INTERSECTIONALITY

Power and Privilege

Trough the Power Walk activity, participants were able to explore the concept of power and privilege. Each participant was given a character adapted to the context of Myanmar which they had to empathize with and role play during the activity. Upon distribution of the character cards, the participants were requested to stand in a line and to take a step forward if they are able to exercise the statements which the facilitator read out loud.

The facilitator read a series of statements and asked participants to step forward if the statement was true for them and to stay where they are standing if the statement was not true. For each true statement, the participant took one step forward. At the end of the training, participants were standing in many different areas and asked to reflect on why their character was farther ahead than others.

During the plenary discussion of the Power Walk exercise, participants shared the ways in which they felt their character was privileged and ways in which their character experienced disadvantages. Participants who reached the front of the Power Walk representing systematically advantaged people shared that they felt privileged, confident and convinced that they would not face major challenges in their lives due to their statuses, identities and conditions. Participants who remained at the back of the Power Walk expressed feelings of disadvantage, discouragement, fearfulness, insecurity, hopelessness and concerns about their lack of access to humanitarian services and infrastructure. One of the participants shared the following feeling about the Power Walk exercise:

“I learnt through the Power Walk activity that in real life, there are situations where people have no access to anything. Therefore, it is important for the people who are systematically advantaged to be aware of what policies and programmes should be implemented to support the people who are systematically disadvantaged in order to ensure that no one is left behind.”

Key Takeaways:

- Power and privilege come in several different forms, e.g. through being male, being wealthy, having a high government position, etc.
- Some disadvantages are more “hidden” but can seem more impactful at a personal level – e.g. a woman who is a survivor/victim of sexual and gender based violence may see this as her biggest barrier and disadvantage to engaging in society, even if she is otherwise advantaged. It is essential for humanitarian workers to understand these more invisible power factors as best as possible to meet the different needs of the target population based on their different vulnerabilities.
- Different dynamics need to be taken into account when planning and implementing humanitarian programmes. For example, a person who comes from a wealthy family may have certain privileges but may face vulnerabilities because of other factors, e.g. based on the person’s sexual orientation.
- While those with greater advantages are much more likely to receive assistance, survive and recover from disaster, people who are systematically disadvantaged face a range of protection risks.
- Persons with authority and persons who do not possess any major systematic disadvantages can also become vulnerable depending on how their identities or characteristics are perceived in the local context, e.g. humanitarian aid workers who are perceived negatively by the local media of the country where they work or who become targets of violence.
Diversity and Intersectionality

The intersectionality session strengthened the participants’ awareness that gender should not be treated as an isolated category of analysis since various other categories, such as class, ethnicity, age, etc. interact with gender and the environment a person lives in and hence, mediates personal agency and power. Through different case studies and the use of the intersectionality wheel (pictured below), the participants were thought about the importance of considering all relevant identity aspects when mainstreaming gender in humanitarian action in order to ensure that women, girls, men and boys are all able to participate meaningfully and benefit equally from humanitarian interventions.

Through a group exercise, participants used characters from the Power Walk to identify different advantages and disadvantages people might have during a disaster situation. By means of the intersectionality wheel as an analytical tool, they then discussed how the different aspects of identities could translate to capabilities or vulnerabilities in a disaster context. Participants identified systematically advantaged and systematically disadvantaged groups of persons among their characters and explained the different vulnerabilities and protection risks versus the privileges which the characters they represented may face, with a focus on the humanitarian context.

The factors represented in the intersectionality wheel determine if a person is systematically more advantaged or disadvantaged. E.g. even if a person is male, this person can systematically be disadvantaged if for example, this person suffers from a chronic disease and is from a lower class. All different factors need to be taken into account when planning and implementing humanitarian programmes.
SESSION III: WHY GENDER IN HUMANITARIAN ACTION?

The final session of Day I explored the reasons why GiHA is important by the analysis of three case studies, in which a lack of adequate gender mainstreaming during the planning and implementation phase of humanitarian programmes led to gendered outcomes. By means of a gender lens, participants had to find out what the potential reasons were for the respective outcomes of the three scenarios and were encouraged to brainstorm ways in which these incidents could have prevented.

Through the case study examples, participants learnt that the needs, realities and experiences of women, girls, men and boys are different and that it is therefore essential to strive for equal representation of women and men in humanitarian programming and interventions, as otherwise, certain groups may be left behind. Moreover, the case study exercise illustrated that crisis settings can determine the future and longer term development of the affected population and if gender issues are not considered at the immediate outbreak of a crisis, the impact of gender norms can deteriorate in the long-run. As a result, the application of a gender lens during humanitarian action, including the integration of substantive gender equality considerations into the entire HPC, is crucial in order to be able to transform discriminatory gender practices.

Case Study I: Food Security

The majority of male youth living in IDP camps showed signs of malnutrition. WFP increased their rations but malnutrition continued and some of the youth died. EFP conducted an assessment to identify the problem and to find a solution.

What do you think they found?

How do you think we can resolve the problem?

"For humanitarian programmes to ensure the dignity of all people, an increase in gender budget is needed. We also need to avoid that gender concepts are limited to women and men only, as this excludes many other genders and marginalized groups from meaningfully participating and benefitting from humanitarian action, Aye Thiri Kyaw, Senior National Coordination Officer, OCHA, and facilitator of the GiHA ToT, highlighted.

Samples of participants’ responses:
- Rations were not enough.
- Food rations were sold to generate an income.
- Women were prioritized for food rations.

Actual Cause: The male youth living in the IDP camps were not taught how to cook the food that was distributed. Because cooking is traditionally a woman’s role, the male youth did not know that they needed to cook the food before consuming it or how. This issue could have been resolved in numerous ways, by either providing lessons on how to cook the food for the male youth, or distributing food that did not need to be cooked.
Case Study II: Nepal Earthquake

55% of those who died from the Nepal earthquakes in 2015 were female. 25% of households in the most earthquake affected districts are female headed households. It was reported that widows and single women in particular did not have access to relief distribution lines, services and information.

What do you think they found?
How do you think we can resolve the problem?

Actual Cause: Widows and female headed households did not have access because of social gender norms – in Nepal if a woman becomes a widow or lives without a husband, she is typically not allowed to move around freely due to social stigma and is perceived as ‘bad luck’. She might face verbal or physical assault. There was only one distribution line not close to their homes and widowed women did not feel comfortable or safe to enter the same distribution line as men.

Case Study III: Rohingya in Cox’s Bazar

In Cox’s Bazar, Rohingya refugee camps, a UN Women and UNHCR Gender assessment found that 94% of surveyed women spend 21-24 hours a day inside their shelter.

What do you think they found?
How do you think we can resolve the problem?

Participants identified correctly that this issue is related to the prevailing patriarchal socio-cultural norms and roles among the Rohingya communities, which prevent women from leaving their homes. Some participants mentioned that even under normal living circumstances, Rohingya women tend to stay inside their homes due to patriarchal norms and that the Rohingya women’s low level of education also leads to women’s restricted ability to participate in decision-making processes.

Key Takeaways:

- Existing power inequalities between women, girls men and boys exacerbate during crises due to lack of access to and control of resources, lack of decision making power, experience of violence, etc.
- It is important to ensure that all people affected by a crisis are acknowledged and that all their distinct needs, vulnerabilities and realities are taken into account.
- It is important to facilitate the design of more appropriate and effective responses to ensure equitable and safe access and equal opportunities for women, girls, boys, and men.
- Women and girls are an important resource in designing and delivering humanitarian programmes and it is absolutely essential to engage women, girls, men and boys equally in humanitarian programming and interventions.
SESSION IV: THE HUMANITARIAN ARCHITECTURE

Day 2 of the GiHA ToT Workshop started with a presentation on the global, regional and national humanitarian architecture. The participants were provided with an overview of the humanitarian response actors on the local, national and international level, followed by the development and evolution of the global humanitarian coordination (HC) as well as the global humanitarian cluster cycle structure. Subsequently, participants were introduced to the structure of the humanitarian country team (HCT) in Myanmar, which is chaired by the RC (Resident Coordinator)/HC. The overall responsibility of the HCT consists of providing operational level related assistance through the cluster coordination groups. The RC/HC, who consists of the same entity in Myanmar, reports to the UN Secretary General through the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC). Rather than being a fixed and static structure, the global humanitarian cluster cycle may change under certain circumstances, as it is adjusted to the local context whenever necessary.

Following the humanitarian architecture, the participants explored the global GiHA architecture as well as the GiHA Architecture in Myanmar, emphasizing that no formal gender mainstreaming structure currently exists in the humanitarian architecture neither globally nor nationally. The Global IASC Reference Group on Gender in Humanitarian Action (Gender Reference Group), co-chaired by UN Women and Oxfam, supports the Interagency Standing Committee in its efforts to integrate gender equality and women’s empowerment in the humanitarian-
an action system through 1) guidance on and accountability to gender equality; 2) engagement and knowledge management; and 3) coordination and leadership. While the Gender Reference Group (Gender RG) is not a formal structure, it is increasingly recognized that the Gender RG needs to become more formalized and built into the work of all agencies.

In Myanmar, no formally established GiHA working group exists as of yet. Efforts are being made to strengthen existing coordination structures to integrate gender mainstreaming including through a regularly updated GiHA Action Plan and GiHA Profile.

Globally, a new trend is currently evolving to work more on the nexus between humanitarian action, development and peace. Although a humanitarian structure still exists, there are many links to development and peace building processes. This shift is also increasingly recognized in Myanmar, where many clusters/sectors do not entirely work on humanitarian action but also on development processes, e.g. through the UN Gender Theme Group, the GEWE Development Partners Group, the Gender Equality Network, among others.
Session IV provided the participants with an overview of the humanitarian situations in Rakhine, Kachin and Shan states with an emphasis on the gendered nature of the humanitarian context in Myanmar.

Gender in Humanitarian Action Profile

The participants were then introduced to the content, purpose and strategic goals of the Myanmar GiHA Profile, which provides an overview of the gendered context for crisis situations in Rakhine, Kachin and Northern Shan and outlines key gender needs, issues, gaps, responses, challenges and recommendations for future action points.

It serves as a guidance document for the HCT and ICCG strategies, planning and advocacy, as well as the operational work of sector coordinators and members. It also acts as an advocacy document for donors and external audiences to bring visibility to the issue of GiHA and demonstrate the HCT/ICCGs priorities and efforts on this. The Myanmar GiHA Action Plan, which has recently been designed for the next two years, directly links to the Myanmar Humanitarian Response Plan, whose responsibility ultimately lies with the HCT and HC.

Examples of the gendered nature of crisis in Myanmar include the following:

- Gender-segregation and rigid gender norms, masculinities.
- Literacy, education, language, Information. Decision making power.
- Health and nutrition status – sexual and reproductive health.
- Documentation/citizenship and access to justice. Lack of HLP rights.
- Fewer livelihood/economic opportunities, gendered division of labour, lack of control and access to resources.
- Early, forced and child marriage; SGBV incl. IPV and CRSV; SEA.
- Militarisation and security (forced recruitment, arbitrary arrests, landmines etc.) - movement restrictions.
- Especially the ethnic/religious minorities, stateless, IDPs, poorest, most vulnerable and marginalized (age, disability, SOGIE, marital status).

"The needs of women, men, girls and boys in humanitarian contexts are different and distinct. Existing data from the region, including from Myanmar shows that women and girls, as well as the most vulnerable and marginalized population groups, are worst affected by crisis and disasters. These situations often also perpetuate and exacerbate pre-existing, persistent gender and social inequalities, gender-based violence, and discrimination, which affects people’s ability to cope with shocks and situations and recover," Smriti Aryal, Humanitarian Action and Resilience Building Regional Adviser, UN Women Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, highlighted during her opening remarks of the GiHA ToT.

“Consultations with women and women’s involvement in humanitarian programming is essential since women often have different needs and know better what is needed for themselves and their children. The role of gender trainers is therefore essential to replicate GiHA programming at the grassroots level,” Hlaing Bwa, Senior Child Protection Specialist with World Vision, Yangon, highlighted.
SESSION VI: GENDER EQUALITY AND HUMANITARIAN LEGAL AND NORMATIVE FRAMEWORKS

The discussion during session V focused on the four humanitarian principles, the IASC policy on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE), including an overview of the IASC Gender in Humanitarian Action Handbook, the World Humanitarian Summit Commitments, the Grand Bargain Commitments, and the UN Resolutions on Women, Peace and Security (WPS).

In addition to these frameworks, participants were given a brief introduction to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Beijing Platform for Action, and the priority areas of the Myanmar National Strategic Plan for the Advancement of Women (NSPAW, 2013-2022). Women in Emergencies constitutes one of NSPAW’s priority areas and which can be used by humanitarian actors advocating with the Government of Myanmar, as the Government has already committed to it. While Myanmar has signed and ratified CEDAW, it has not ratified the Optional Protocol to CEDAW, which means that there are not complaint and inquiry mechanisms in place for CEDAW.

During the overview of these frameworks, the underlying emphasis was on the importance of human rights (Rights Up Front). It was highlighted that needs, risks, capacities, and realities during a crisis are different for women, girls, boys, and men and that the goal is to meet these needs with an emphasis on safety, security, well-being, and dignity for all affected people.

The Grand Bargain Commitments

Following the presentation on the humanitarian gender frameworks, a discussion around the purpose of the Grand Bargain Commitments evolved. The Grand Bargain Commitments are intending to achieve changes in the financing structures of humanitarian organizations to ensure that the funding of humanitarian programmes reaches the populations with the greatest needs. While the Grand Bargain targets donors and their ways of financing humanitarian actions, it aims to increase the targeting of local humanitarian actors for humanitarian funding.

In terms of the localization of the Grand Bargain in Myanmar, the Myanmar Humanitarian Fund (MHF) represents one step in implementing the Grand Bargain Commitments. 40% of the MHF funding is targeted at local humanitarian organizations. While this is a significant action point in increasing the involvement of local humanitarian actors in humanitarian prevention and response efforts, the conditions and positions of local civil society organizations (CSOs) and their potential to receive funding from sources such as the MHF are rather different, e.g. some CSOs may not have the capacities to adequately fill in MHF proposals, which are quite complex, or some CSOs are not legally registered and therefore not entitled to apply to this and similar funding sources.

Participants attentively listening to the facilitator’s presentation. Photo Credit: Cecilia Truffer/UN Women.
During session VI, which was dedicated to a panel discussion about the role of CSOs in promoting GiHA in Myanmar, participants learnt about the importance of CSO inclusion in humanitarian action, namely women and LGBTIQ rights organizations and networks, and the barriers that they face in Myanmar in participating more meaningfully in humanitarian response due to a lack of existing mechanisms for their engagement and contribution to humanitarian decision-making as well as the little investment in enhancing their capacities, financing their work with communities and protecting the spaces in which they operate. The panel consisted of Seng Hkam, GBV Coordinator, Metta Development Foundation; Htoo Lwin Oo, Programme Manager, MRCS; and Nicki Rangoon, Spokesperson, National Transgender People Alliance of Myanmar.

It was agreed that more support for the participation of women and other marginalized groups such as LGBTIQ and people with disabilities across the humanitarian-development-peace nexus is required, specifically on the ground level, in order to make humanitarian response efforts more effective. Htoo Lwin Oo from MRCS mentioned:

“There is a certain level of involvement by the LGBTQI community in rights advocacy at the national level such as through the Pride event which was organized in 2018. Yet, these advocacy efforts need to trickle down more to the ground level and LGBTIQ and other marginalized groups need to become more involved in humanitarian programming and policy-making.”

In addition, Nickie Rangoon from the National Transgender Alliance Myanmar highlighted that support is needed for increased educational opportunities and leadership skills building training for LGBTIQ individuals, sensitization about the importance of the involvement of Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Expression (SOGIE) considerations in humanitarian action processes among the LGBTIQ community as well as behavior change and awareness raising about SOGIE issues among the greater Myanmar society. Nickie Rangoon stated:

Seng Hkam from the Metta Development Foundation added that gender concepts also need to be included in school curricula and that the personnel of the media and entertainment industry need to be sensitized to ensure LGBTIQ issues are appropriately portrayed.

Finally, as a means to increase the participation and contribution of CSOs in humanitarian action, the conduct of mappings during needs assessments was highlighted to explore where CSOs, e.g. women’s CSOs, are located and how humanitarian organizations could potentially collaborate with these. Additionally, it was emphasized on the significance of targeted humanitarian funding for local CSOs and the support of CSOs in their registration processes.
SESSION VIII: GENDER AND THE HUMANITARIAN PROGRAMME CYCLE

In Session VII participants were given a more in-depth overview the different cycles of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC), including 1) needs assessment and analysis; 2) strategic planning with a focus on the Myanmar Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP); 3) resource mobilization, highlighting the Gender with Age Marker (GAM); 4) implementation and monitoring; 5) and operational review and evaluation. Emphasis was given to the importance of mainstreaming gender across each step of the HPC.

SESSION IX: IASC GENDER WITH AGE MARKER

Session VIII introduced the participants to the IASC Gender with Age Marker (GAM), which is the new standard marker for humanitarian programming and which serves as a self-assessment and reporting tool. The differences between the old IASC Gender Marker and the new GAM were explained to the participants, stating that while the old Gender Marker only measured gender considerations at the needs assessment, planned activities and outcome level, the new GAM, which came out in 2017, measures gender reflections in much more detail, as it touches upon all stages of the HPC, including monitoring and project design, and makes age more explicit.

12 Indicators of Gender-Sensitive Programming
Participating groups were then split into groups according to their areas of work and were given samples of project proposals, which they had to assess using the online GAM tool. The GAM scorings of the different groups reflected the gaps in the Gender with Age Marker tool, as programme proposals can be scored with a relatively high score even if the programme does not consider gender aspects sufficiently. The participants agreed that while the new GAM is an improvement from the old IASC Gender Marker, the tool still exhibits gaps.

During the discussion of the group exercise, questions about the way in which the age component of the GAM is measured arose. It was clarified that while the GAM requires humanitarian organizations to be inclusive in their programming and interventions, it does not oblige them to work with all different age groups. Instead, specific targeting of certain vulnerable groups and gender-sensitive programming are required.

Compared to the IASC Gender in Humanitarian Action Handbook, which offers sectoral guidance and guidance on each stage of the HCP, the GAM consists of a simplified tool, which enables humanitarian actors to cross-check if they meet the minimum gender and age requirements.

SESSION X: PROTECTION AGAINST SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE (PSEA)

Session X discussed the PSEA core principles and their importance, and introduced the participants to the definitions of sexual exploitation, abuse, and harassment. By means of a case scenario, participants were then requested to discuss in groups whether the PSEA code of conduct has been breached in the scenario, which rules that have been broken and what measures they would implement in reaction to the incident described in the scenario.

An engaging discussion arose around the definition of sexual abuse and exploitation and about what categories of sexual abuse and exploitation would fall under this definition, including forced sex between staff members (which is considered as rape); procuring from sex workers; a humanitarian staff member and a beneficiary falling in love with each other; and having sex with a sex worker outside of working hours as a right of staff members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAM Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Takeaways included:
- Our beneficiaries are particularly vulnerable.
- We as aid workers have power.
- Procuring from sex workers does constitute as SEA. “Survival Sex”
- Staff are on duty “24/7” even outside official working hours.

Zero tolerance to PSEA by everybody, staff, consultant, partners, sub-contractors, etc.!!!
SESSION XI: SEX, AGE, AND DIVERSITY DISAGGREGATED DATA

Session XI explored the importance of sex, age, and diversity disaggregated data (SADD) as an integral part of mainstreaming gender. The rattlebox activity served as a fun opener to an illuminating discussion about the importance of collecting SADD data to inform the HPC planning and implementation.

Rattlebox Exercise: A tin box full of various objects was shaken in front of the workshop audience. Participants were asked to guess what was in the box making the sound. Only one of the participants’ suggestions were accurate. In reality, there were many things in the box, some of which did not make sound when the box was shaken. The purpose of the activity was to recognize the importance of SADD data, noting that things are often not what they seem and they are often more complex than they appear.

Following the rattle box exercise, the participants were introduced about the collection and importance of SADD. Participants were then asked to reflect on how SADD is used in their current work and how it could be improved.

Key points raised during the session included:

- Age definition varies according to the organization or institution who collects age disaggregated data. For example, in Kachin State, many different organizations and camp authorities use different age categories. While many participants perceived this as a problem, it was agreed that it is also difficult to standardize categories across all stakeholders working in the humanitarian and development sector.

- The collection of SADD in comprehensive manners can be challenging due to access and security restrictions.

- By virtue of the sensitivity of SADD collection, it is important to have appropriate SADD assessors, who need to be trained on how to collect SADD including in how to detect and refer potential GBV cases.

- Due to the time-consuming characteristic of SADD, it is often assumed that there is not enough time to collect disaggregated data in emergency situations.

- GBV is often underreported, even if it is not reported, it does not mean that GBV does not happen.

- Statistics, especially including SADD, are essential for gender advocacy and programme design.

- It is crucial to partner with local organizations to collect SADD to be able to gather data from ALL communities.
SESSION XII: GENDER-RESPONSIVE ASSESSMENT

During session XII, participants were introduced to the tools, importance, objectives and principles of gender-sensitive assessments as well as its implementation in programming and policies. Participants were explained how to incorporate gender analysis into the planning, design, implementation, and analysis process were shared.

Gender-Sensitive Assessment Role Play

The participants were then split into three groups and were given a scenario of an emergency setting after an earthquake happened in a fictional state in Myanmar. The participants were tasked to conduct a gender-responsive assessment of the situation, focusing on the damage to infrastructure, equipment and supplies, the availability of services, and the needs of the affected populations. The participants were further requested to discuss their use of secondary data sources, methodology, the assessment team and potential risks in carrying out the gender-responsive assessment.

Human Rights Based Approach to Gender Analysis

Participants were encouraged to adopt a human-rights based approach by exploring causal analysis to identify the root of a problem, rather than merely developing programs to soothe causes.

The Human Rights Approach helps humanitarian and development workers to answer the following four questions:

- Who has been left behind?
- Why? Which rights are at stake?
- Who has to do something about it?
- What do they need, to take action?

Participants were then introduced to the Tree Model, which is an analytical tool to conduct gender analysis related to a specific issue. It helps to identify the immediate, underlying and root/structural causes of a certain problem, which is essential from a gender perspective in order to understand where the greatest needs are.

Key Takeaways included:

- Various factors such as location, customs, timing, etc. need be considered when collecting SADDD.
- Gender balance in assessment team is sometimes difficult to achieve – if there is a lack of female enumerators, humanitarian actors should at least aim to interview female community members individually.
- In such cases, where access to conflict or crisis settings are restricted, ICT application can be considered, yet there may be safety issue when using ICT applications. Moreover, women and other marginalized groups may not have equal access to ICTs.
- It is important to create safe spaces when conducting FGDs about sensitive issues such as GBV, Child Protection issues, etc.

Example of child marriage:

- Potential immediate cause: lack of financial means to feed children;
- Potential underlying causes: illiteracy, lack of education, lack of employment and poverty;
- Potential root/structural causes: gender power imbalance and patriarchal norms.

Participant sharing her groups’ assessment findings, using the egg and tree models, in plenary. Photo Credit: Cecilia Truffer/UN Women.
SESSION XIII: GENDER MAINSTREAMING

Session XII gave the participants an introduction of what gender mainstreaming is and what mainstreaming gender requires to ensure that gender-unequal and gender-blind strategies are avoided. Emphasis was laid on the need to consider gender throughout all stages of the HPC. The session explored important concepts that need to be taken into account when assessing a programme’s effectiveness and impact such as:

- Gender-unequal,
- Gender-blind,
- Gender-sensitive,
- Gender-responsive,
- Gender-transformative.

It was highlighted that gender-transformative programming is needed if we want to address the root causes of an issue.

Participants were subsequently given an overview of the Egg Model, which can directly be combined with the Tree Model to address the different types of causes of a problem.

Case Studies Group Work

Participants were split into six groups according to their areas of work. The groups, which represented the Education, WASH, Nutrition, Food Security/Livelihoods, Health and CCCM sectors, were then requested to review the problem stated in the different case studies using a human-rights based approach. Using the problem tree, participants were asked to delve deeper into an issue to discuss what the major underlying causes are and to address the problem at its root. Participants were then asked to think of a gender-transformative approach to address the manifestation through responsive action, remedial and environmental building actions (the egg model). Also very importantly, groups were asked to discuss WHO is responsible for taking these actions and who are the key stakeholders they are to work with.

The key takeaway of this exercise was that although sectors are different, the root causes often seem to be similar for all sectoral issues. Therefore, coordination is crucial. All sectors need to address gender inequality in coordinated ways.

SESSION XIV: GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE (GBV)

Session XIII explored the concept of GBV including its types, causes, contributing factors and consequences and introduced participants to the survivor-centered approach as well as guiding principles such as the importance of confidentiality and seeking informed consent. Participants gained a deeper understanding about the model of the GBV Tree as well as GBV response and referral services and looked at different GBV myths and realities. By means of case studies, participants were then requested to review different GBV scenarios, discussing issues such as confidentiality and referral pathways.
On Day IV, the participants had the chance to turn their acquired knowledge into practice by designing and presenting their own training modules in a group exercise.

Prior to this group activity, the participants were provided with adult learning and training tips based on the IASC training modules. Participants learnt about the four different phases of the training cycle, which includes 1) the identification of learning needs, 2) the definition of the purpose and learning objectives of the training, 3) the design and preparation of the training, 4) the training delivery as well as 4) the evaluation of the training.

Participants were then given an overview of different learning styles, which have implications for the selection of training methods and tools. For example, personality tests prior to the training can help in finding out what types of learner the training participants are. Participants were recommended to use a mix of different learning styles, as there is usually a mix of different learning types in the participant group.

The participants then designed in groups different teaching modules on 1) the Humanitarian Programme Cycle, 2) Basic Gender Concepts, 3) PSEA/GBV, 4) SADDD, 5) Gender Mainstreaming, 6) Diversity and Intersectionality, and 7) Why GiHA, which they presented to each other. The groups came up with very creative exercises, including, a HPC spinning wheel game, a paper-based power walk game, PSEA case studies, and a debate on whether it is a luxury to consider gender in a life/death situation.

The HPC spinning wheel game: The audience had to spin the wheel and explain how gender should be integrated into the respective HPC stage that the dart hit. Photo credit: Cecilia Truffer/UN Women.

Participants playing the Power Walk Activity on a flip chart. Photo credit: Cecilia Truffer/UN Women.
SESSION XVI: WAY FORWARD: ACTION PLANNING FOR GIHA MYANMAR

The workshop was concluded with a session on planning for the way forward to promote GiHA in Myanmar. For this last session, participants were split into three groups according to the three geographical areas, Kachin/Northern Shan, Rakhine and Yangon (national level) and developed a range of interesting action points:

1. Kachin/Northern Shan:
   - Convene a meeting on GiHA coordination at Kachin/NSS level to discuss follow-up actions.
   - Introduce GiHA to different clusters/sectors by cluster/sector gender focal points.
   - Conduct internal GiHA trainings within the organizations of the participants at Kachin/NSS/Yangon level.
   - Conduct GiHA trainings for implementing partners of the participants’ organizations.
   - Collaborate with UNFPA, UN Women and OCHA to provide them with support for future GiHA trainings.

2. Yangon/National level:
   - UNFPA, UN Women and OCHA to conduct GiHA training with line
   - Creation of GiHA resource persons for clusters, who can help conducting future GiHA trainings at state and regional level.
   - UN Women to conduct future GiHA trainings with CSOs at Yangon level.
   - To discuss about future GiHA trainings in upcoming GTG meeting in June/July 2019.
   - Explore integrating GiHA into the workplan of the UN GTG to support the HCT and ICCG on the implementation of the GiHA Action Plan and GiHA profile overall, linking with subnational level GiHA focal point systems as well as with Yangon level GiHA focal points and women’s CSOS/networks.

3. Rakhine:
   - GiHA training to 8 clusters and CBO/CSOs in Central Rakhine.
   - Inter-cluster GiHA training in Central Rakhine.
   - GiHA training to Government representatives in Central Rakhine.
   - GiHA Rakhine Team training planned for 3rd of May.
CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the GiHA ToT workshop, which was conducted by UN Women in collaboration with OCHA and UNFPA in Yangon/Myanmar from 23 to 26 April 2019, strengthened the participants’ understanding of gender equality programming in humanitarian settings and created a strong pool of GiHA resource persons in Myanmar. While the participants already had a good understanding about GiHA prior to the workshop, an analysis of the participants’ pre-/post-workshop test results revealed that the participants increased their understanding about gender mainstreaming in humanitarian action at the end of the workshop.

Participants were very engaged throughout the workshop and contributed their own expertise and practical examples from their respective areas of work. This exchange of knowledge and experience was fruitful and the participants perceived it as essential to have such learning exchanges.

“It was very interesting to learn how different humanitarian actors implement different projects in different regions across Myanmar and to see where the gaps are in terms of gender mainstreaming.”

Mya Myitzu Kyaw from Community Partners International (CPI), Yangon, said, and she added:

“The training was very useful for me in terms of integrating gender mainstreaming into strategic planning, especially the session on the Gender with Age Marker tool, as well as the session on PSEA, since CPI is currently in the process of remodeling its own PSEA principles.”

Reflected by the evaluation summary, participants evaluated the workshop overall as very positive. The following sessions were evaluated as the most useful ones: Basic gender concepts, intersectionality and diversity, why GiHA?, SADDD, Gender with Age Marker, PSEA principles, and gender mainstreaming concepts. Sessions which the participants found as least useful were: CSO roundtable on promoting gender equality in humanitarian action in Myanmar, gender equality and legal and normative frameworks as well as gender and the humanitarian programme cycle. Further details on which sessions the participants found the most and least useful can be found in the attached evaluation summary.

The majority of participants mentioned that they felt confident about carrying out GiHA trainings in the future. Yet, a number of participants expressed that they require additional trainings to further increase their technical expertise on GiHA and to be ready for the conduct of GiHA trainings on their own. Cho Lay Mar, Programme Officer with Community and Family Services International (CFSI) highlighted:

“The training freshened up my knowledge on gender mainstreaming and provided me with the opportunity to learn new concepts such as the Gender with Age Marker, which is a very useful tool. I am confident to give trainings in the future.”

In terms of future GiHA trainings, participants made several recommendations, including the conduct of a combined GiHA training at Yangon-level for UN Agencies, local and international NGOs and CSOs together with Government representatives, as this would provide Government and non-Government staff members with an opportunity to learn from each other, share the respective barriers they face and to develop ways in which collaborations among them can be strengthened.

Additionally, it was suggested to include a wider range of monitoring and reporting tools to measure the impact of gender mainstreaming, including qualitative tools, in future trainings, as this is perceived as an area that is crucial for donor reporting.
EVALUATION FORM

The training/workshop in general

1. very poor
2. poor
3. good —— 34% of the participants ticked ‘good’
4. very good —— 54% of the participants ticked ‘very good’
5. excellent —— 12% of the participants ticked ‘excellent’

The examples provided (videos, case studies, etc.) in terms of quality, diversity and relevance for your work

1. very poor
2. poor
3. good —— 40% of the participants ticked ‘good’
4. very good —— 54% of the participants ticked ‘very good’
5. excellent —— 6% of the participants ticked ‘excellent’

The interactive learning materials (group exercises, handouts, etc.)

1. very poor
2. poor
3. good —— 71% of the participants ticked ‘good’
4. very good —— 29% of the participants ticked ‘very good’
5. excellent

How would you assess the usefulness of each section of this program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you assess the usefulness of each section of this program</th>
<th>Not useful at all</th>
<th>Only a little useful</th>
<th>Fairly useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is Gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, Diversity, and Intersectionality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why Gender in Humanitarian Action?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of Gendered Context in Myanmar the Humanitarian Architecture</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Equality and Humanitarian Legal and Normative Frameworks</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO Roundtable on Promoting Gender Equality in Humanitarian Action in Myanmar</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and the Humanitarian Programme Cycle</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender with Age Marker</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection Against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex, Age, and Diversity Disaggregated Data</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-Sensitive Assessment</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Mainstreaming Key Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Mainstreaming in Sector/Cross-Sector Humanitarian Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Equality Humanitarian Programming – Women’s Leadership, Empowerment, Access and Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing Gender Based Violence</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Learning and Training Tips</td>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Way Forward for Gender in Humanitarian Action in Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**How likely is it that you will use what you have learned in this programme in your work in the future?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not likely at all</th>
<th>Only a little likely</th>
<th>Fairly likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gathering Sex, Age and Diversity Disaggregated data and conducting gender analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning Gender with Age Markers and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample Responses to the following evaluation questions:*

1. **What did you like about the training?**
   - Inclusion of participants from different clusters/sectors and from different geographical areas.
   - Participatory and interactive nature of the training.
   - Use of Power Walk activity to introduce participants to the topic of diversity and intersectionality.

2. **What do you think could be improved?**
   - Make Power Point presentation slides available to participants after each day of the workshop.
   - Improve quality of translation.
   - Provide more feedback on group discussions/presentations.

3. **Please write three things that you will take with you/have learned.**
   - Gender with Age Marker.
   - PSEA principles.
   - Gender mainstreaming concepts applicable to humanitarian action.
   - Inclusion of gender and SADDD.

4. **Any other suggestions? Comments?**
   - Conduct a refresher ToT in the near future.
   - Adjust workshop length to more than 3.5 days, as the content of the workshop is quite heavy and difficult to understand within the provided timeframe.
### AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30-09:30</td>
<td>Welcome and Introduction</td>
<td>8:30-09:30</td>
<td>Recap of Day 1</td>
<td>8:30-09:30</td>
<td>Recap of Day 2</td>
<td>8:30-09:30</td>
<td>Recap of Day 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30-11:00</td>
<td>What is Gender? – Key Gender Concepts</td>
<td>08:45-10:00</td>
<td>Context Overview: Crises in Myanmar and gender and humanitarian architecture</td>
<td>08:45-10:45</td>
<td>Sex, Age and Disability Disaggregated Data and Gender-Sensitive Assessment</td>
<td>09:00-10:30</td>
<td>Adult learning and Training tips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td>10:45-11:15</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:30</td>
<td>What is Gender – continued</td>
<td>10:30-11:15</td>
<td>Gender Equality and Humanitarian Legal and Normative Frameworks</td>
<td>11:15-12:00</td>
<td>SADDD and Gender-Sensitive Assessment - continued</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Way forward: Action Planning for GiHA in Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:15-12:15</td>
<td>Key CSO Experts take on promoting Gender Equality in Humanitarian Action in Myanmar</td>
<td>12:00-13:30</td>
<td>Gender Mainstreaming Key Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:45-14:15</td>
<td>Gender with Age Marker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45-15:15</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td>14:15-14:45</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td>15:50-16:00</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15-16:45</td>
<td>Why GiHA? &amp; Key approaches for effective gender-integrated humanitarian response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45-15:45</td>
<td>Gender with Age Marker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:30</td>
<td>Gender Equality Humanitarian Programming – Women’s Leadership, Empowerment, Access and Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:45-16:45</td>
<td>Protection against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-17:00</td>
<td>Addressing Gender Based Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45-17:00</td>
<td>Wrap-up and end of day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45-17:00</td>
<td>Wrap-up and end of day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>