

United Nations
World Water
Assessment
Programme

Questionnaire for collecting sex-disaggregated water data

WWAP Working Group on
Sex-Disaggregated Indicators

Resource Paper

Gender and Water Series

United Nations World Water Assessment Programme



Published in 2015 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP, France

© UNESCO 2015

Suggested citation:

WWAP Working Group on Sex-Disaggregated Indicators. 2015. *Questionnaire for collecting sex-disaggregated water data*. Gender and Water Series. WWAP. Paris, UNESCO.



This publication is available in Open Access under the Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO (CC-BY-SA 3.0 IGO) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/igo/>).

By using the content of this publication, the users accept to be bound by the terms of use of the UNESCO Open Access Repository (<http://www.unesco.org/open-access/termsuse-ccbysa-en>).

The present license applies exclusively to the text content of the publication. For the use of any material not clearly identified as Belonging to UNESCO, prior permission shall be requested from: publication.copyright@unesco.org or UNESCO Publishing, 7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP France.

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The authors are responsible for the choice and the presentation of the facts contained in this publication and for the opinions expressed therein, which are not necessarily those of UNESCO, and do not commit the Organization.

This questionnaire is Tool No. 4 of the Gender Toolkit – an output of the UN WWAP UNESCO Project on Gender-Sensitive Water Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting.

Readers are encouraged to send comments, feedback and suggestions to Francesca Greco, f.greco@unesco.org, Project Coordinator and Editor.

Cover photo: Oxfam

Cover and layout design by Dimension Grafica
Perugia (Umbria), Italy

SC/WWAP/GT4/2015

Questionnaire for collecting sex-disaggregated water data

Author: WWAP Working Group on Sex-Disaggregated Indicators

Editor: Francesca Greco

Co-editors: Vasudha Pangare, Roselie Schonewille

This paper is the tool n.4 of WWAP Gender Toolkit

The WWAP Gender Toolkit is an output of the UN WWAP
UNESCO Project on Gender Sensitive Water Monitoring,
Assessment and Reporting

WWAP Gender Series n.3

Contents

About the Authors	5
General data form for interview/focus groups	7
General data form for intra-household surveys	8
Indicator 1 – WATER GOVERNANCE	9
Indicator 2 – SAFE DRINKING WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE	17
Indicator 3 – DECISION-MAKING AND KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION	24
Indicator 4 – TRANSBOUNDARY WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	29
Indicator 5 – WATER FOR INDUSTRIAL AND AGRICULTURAL USES	34

About the Authors

WWAP would like to thank all the members of the WWAP Working Group on Sex-disaggregated Water Indicators who tirelessly worked for the finalization of this paper:

- Elisabetta Aurino, Research Fellow School of Public Health Imperial College London, Research Associate Oxford University, United Kingdom;
- Susan Bazilli, Director of International Women's Rights Project, Canada;
- Alice M. Bouman-Dentener, Honorary Founding President of the Women for Water Partnership, Member Steering Committee of European Water Stewardship, The Netherlands;
- Marcia Brewster, President of United Nations Association – United States, consultant on water resources and gender issues, United States;
- Angela Calvo, Associate Professor at University of Turin, Italy;
- Alice Centrone, Gender and Rural Development Consultant, Researcher General Directorate for Development Cooperation – Italian Cooperation, Italy;
- Moa Cortobius, Programme Officer UNDP Water Governance Facility, Gender Focal Point Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI), Sweden;
- Emily Deschaine, Networking and Knowledge Management, Water Supply & Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC), Switzerland;
- Anton Earle, Director African Regional Centre, Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI), Sweden;
- Asma El Kasmi, UNESCO Chair "Water, Women and Decision Power", Al Akhawayn University Ifrane, Morocco;
- Amber Fletcher, Ph.D., Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, University of Regina, Canada;
- Christiane Froelich, Postdoc researcher Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at Hamburg University, Germany;
- Giovanna Gioli, Research Group 'Climate Change and Security' (CLISEC), Hamburg University, co-founder of the international Gender, Climate Change and Conflict Network (GCCN), Germany;
- Frederique Holle, Policy Officer, Women for Water Partnership, The Netherlands;
- Inga Jacobs, Senior Researcher at Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) South Africa;
- Eiman Karar, Executive Director for Management of Water Resources, Water Research Commission (WRC), South Africa;
- Evelyne Lyons, Independent consultant in Environmental Services Sector, France;
- Aishwarya Nair, Assistant Project Manager at Golder Associates, Editor-in-Chief wH2O Journal on Gender and Water, United States;
- Vasudha Pangare, Independent social development consultant and member of Gender and Water Alliance (GWA), Thailand;
- Carolyn Sachs, Professor of Rural Sociology and Women's Studies and Head of the Department of Women's Studies at Penn State University, United States;
- Viviana Re, Marie Curie Research Fellow, National Engineering School of Sfax (ENIS), Tunisia;
- Rosemary Rop, Water and Sanitation Specialist, World Bank, United States;
- Joni Seager, Professor and Chair, Global Studies Department, Bentley University, United States;
- Ilaria Sisto, Gender and Development Officer at FAO, Italy;

- Carolyn Sachs, Professor of Rural Sociology and Women's Studies and Head of the Department of Women's Studies at Penn State University, United States;
- Viviana Re, Marie Curie Research Fellow, National Engineering School of Sfax (ENIS), Tunisia;
- Rosemary Rop, Water and Sanitation Specialist, World Bank, United States;
- Joni Seager, Professor and Chair, Global Studies Department, Bentley University, United States;
- Ilaria Sisto, Gender and Development Officer at AO, Italy;
- Lyliose Umupfasoni, Programme Officer of Eastern Africa Sub Region at African Ministeria Council on Water (AMCOW), Director of Environment and Forestry, Ministry of Natural Resources, Rwanda;
- Barbara Van Koppen, Principal Researcher Poverty, Gender and Water, Southern Africa Regional Program, International Water Management Institute (IWMI), South Africa;
- Tom Williams, Programmes Director and Regional Group Director, International Water Association (IWA), The Netherlands;
- Lesha (B.M.) Witmer, Independent Expert on Water Governance and Sustainable Development, Steering Committee Member of the Women for Water Partnership, The Netherlands;
- Claudia Wendland, Water and Sanitation Specialist at Women in Europe for a Common Future (WECF), Germany;
- Seemin Qayum, Policy Advisor on Sustainable Development, UN Women;
- Kusum Athukorala, Chair of NetWater and the Sri Lanka Water Partnership;
- Emma Anakhasyan, Women for Water Partnership, Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment NGO;
- Nelson Gomonda, M&E project manager of African Ministers Council on Water (AMCOW).

We are grateful to the following colleagues at WWAP Secretariat for their valuable support: Michela Miletto, Diwata Hunziker, Valentina Abete, Simona Gallese, Vasudha Pangare and, in particular, to WWAP interns Alessio Lilli and Roselie Schonewille. We are equally grateful to UNESCO Publications Board, and to Gulser Corat and Cvetan Cvetkovski of UNESCO Division for Gender Equality.

The questionnaire was formulated by the members of WWAP Working Group on Sex-Disaggregated Indicators, between January and December 2014, under the coordination of Francesca Greco. The material was prepared and edited between January and August 2015. The list of questions is based on discussions held during meetings, teleconferences and email exchanges throughout 2014.

Based on the final results of the Second Workshop of the WWAP Working Group on Sex-disaggregated indicators (December 2014), the final list of questions approved for this questionnaire was transcribed by Roselie Shonewille and co-edited by Roselie Schonewille and Vasudha Pangare, under the editorial coordination of Francesca Greco.

General data form for interview/focus group

Country: _____

State/province: _____

Town: _____

*Urban

*Peri-urban (to _____ city/town)

*Rural

Questions about the interviewer

Sex: Female

Age: _____

Male

Function/job position/role: _____

Organization, if any: _____

Purpose and location of interview/focus group:

Questions about interviewee (please add additional sheets when working with focus group)

Sex: Female

Age: _____

Male

Function/job position/role: _____

Organization, if any: _____



○ **General data form for intra-household surveys**

Country: _____

State/province: _____

Town: _____

*Urban

*Peri-urban (to _____ city/town)

*Rural

Questions about the interviewer:

Sex: Female

Age: _____

Male

Function/job position/role: _____

○ Organization, if any: _____

Purpose and location of household survey: _____

Questions about interviewee:

Sex: Female

Age: _____

Male

Function/job position/role: _____

○ Organization, if any: _____

Position within household (including total number of household members):

Head of household

Partner of head of household

Single head of household, by reason of _____

Grandparent

Child, age _____

Other family member, _____

Total number of household members, _____

Literacy level (reading and writing) with no formal education or highest level of education of interviewee:

○ _____



INDICATOR 1 | WATER GOVERNANCE


INDICATOR 1a	Number of M/F paid staff in public water governance agencies, disaggregated by job category/level and decision-making capacity (and salary if available), at: national level; county/province/state level; town/village level (sample).
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of records and documentation of recruitment process and Human Resources policy; interviews with key informants to obtain information regarding relevant documents and information.

Questions:

1a.1 What is the number of M/F in various positions, what are their roles and responsibilities and what are their job specifications?

M/F	Position	Role and responsibility	Job specification

 1a.2 What is the process of recruitment and the selection of staff? Where are positions advertised? What are the Terms of References (TOR) for hiring people?

1a.3 What type of training is given to new and old staff? What are the capacity building opportunities offered to M/F staff, particularly with respect to upward mobility?

LEGEND OF SYMBOLS



Mobile phone

Consider using mobile phones when possible, according to the rules of the *Guidelines*, depending on the size of population sample, freedom of use of mobile devices and/or diffusion of mobile phones among the population sample. If mobile-phone inquiry is not possible, please proceed personally.



Separate sex

While sex-disaggregated data are collected through this questionnaire, it can also occur in mixed environments. In these particular cases, women and men need to be interviewed in a separate environment. Please, see the guideline for more information on how to proceed.



Validation

Information need to be validated at different levels. Please refer to the *Guidelines* on how to proceed.



1a.4 What are the constraints in the recruitment and selection process of M/F for different positions?

INDICATOR 1b	Number of M/F in paid and unpaid positions in local water governance formally structured entities (water users associations, etc.) at town/village level (sample); disaggregated by nature of relationship to the entity (e.g. 'member', 'board', 'executive', 'leadership', 'decision-making group', etc.) and types of tasks.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of records; Focus Group Discussions with members of these groups and associations; interviews with key informants identified as important sources of information during the FDGs.

Questions:

1b.1 What is the number of M/F in various positions, what are their roles and responsibilities and what are their job specifications?

M/F	Position (paid/unpaid)	Role and responsibility	Job specification

1b.2 Regarding the process of recruitment and the selection of paid/unpaid staff: where are positions advertised? What are the Terms of References for hiring people?

1b.3 What type of training is given? What are the capacity building opportunities offered to M/F paid/unpaid staff?

1b.4 What are the constraints in the recruitment and selection process of M/F for different paid/unpaid positions?



INDICATOR 1c	Intensity of M/F in (sample/representative) meetings of public entity bodies sampled at national, sub-national, and local levels, including outcomes such as: ratio of contributions in decision-making meetings by women and men; percentage of decisions adopted from women’s contributions in meetings.
---------------------	--

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of records of attendance, and minutes of meetings; (participatory) observation by attending meetings; interviews with key informants identified during the desk study and observation of meetings, and with office bearers in the public entity bodies.

Questions:

1c.1 Explain the process of decision-making: who proposes decisions? Who accepts decisions? Is there a discussion around it? How is the process monitored and facilitated? Who is responsible for the operationalization of decisions?

1c.2 How often are suggestions by M/F accepted? Can decisions be changed? Is there space for interventions/suggestions by M/F? Who sets the agenda for the meeting? Can new issues be added by M/F?

1c.3 What are the capacity building opportunities for empowering M/F participation in meetings?

1c.4 What is the effectiveness of decisions made by M/F participants and what are the differences? On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being least effective and 10 being most effective.

M/F	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10



INDICATOR 1d	M/F perceptions of gender discrimination (or equality) regarding women's participation in decision-making entities.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of attendance records, minutes of meetings and other relevant documentation in the form of communication, circulars, correspondence, etc. for tracking the decision-making process; Focus Group Discussions with members; interview with key informants; validation by cross-checking information obtained through multiple sources.

Tip: Have separate focus group discussions and interviews for men and women.


Questions:

1d.1 What positions do M/F staff have in decision-making entities? What is their type of participation?

M/F	Position	Type of participation

1d.2 What are the differences in views and opinions of M/F, if any? Was this difference evident in the discussions? Were there any discussions about the differences? How were disagreements resolved?

1d.3 Is there evidence that certain decisions were taken through participation by both men and women? Why, if not, is it felt that men's or women's views are given more importance?

 1d.4 On a scale from 1 to 10, how much do you think women are discriminated in water-decision making participation? (10= highly discriminated)

M/F	Position	Perception of discrimination from 1 to 10



INDICATOR 1e	Number of M/F staff responsible for water issues (disaggregated by job level) in gender ministry/lead agency
---------------------	--

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of employment records; interviews with key informants such as those responsible for recruitment as well as relevant department heads and those in position of responsibility, and any other individuals identified through the survey of records.

Questions:

1e.1 What is the number of M/F in positions related to water issues, what are their roles and responsibilities and what are their job specifications?

M/F	Position	Role and responsibility	Job specification

1e.2 What is the process of recruitment and the selection of staff: where are positions advertised? What are the Terms of References for hiring people?

1e.3 What type of training is given? What are the capacity building opportunities offered to M/F staff for upward mobility in the ministry/agency?

1e.4 What are the constraints in the recruitment and selection process of M/F for different positions?

INDICATOR 1f	Number of M/F staff responsible for gender issues (disaggregated by job level) in lead and other relevant agencies for the water sector.
---------------------	--

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of employment records; interviews with key informants, such as those responsible for recruitment as well as relevant department heads and those in position of responsibility, and any other individuals identified through the survey of records.



Questions:

1f.1 What is the number of M/F in positions related to gender issues, what are their roles and responsibilities and what are their job specifications?

M/F	Position	Role & responsibility	Job specification

1f.2 What is the process of recruitment and the selection of gender staff: where are positions advertised? What are the Terms of References for hiring people?

1f.3 What type of training is given to M/F staff? What are the capacity building opportunities offered to M/F staff for upward mobility in the agency?

1f.4 What are the constraints in the recruitment and selection process of M/F for different positions?

INDICATOR 1g	Designated ministerial responsibility for gender in relation to water policies; the extent to which gender-specific agencies are included in water sector decision-making.
---------------------	--

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of records and policy making process of the ministry of water resources and any other government authority involved in the policy making process to identify key decisions and constraints and understand the policy making process; interview with key informants identified through the desk study, and relevant officials from the ministry of water resources and other authorities involved in the policy process, including the gender specific agencies/organizations.

Questions:

1g.1 Identify the number and type of consultations with gender specific agencies/ organizations, and the process of these consultations.

Number	Type	Agency/organization	Process



1g.2 What evidence, if any, is there of inclusion of suggestions/interventions made by gender specific agencies/organizations/individuals in water policies and decision-making?

1g.3 What feedback, if any, is there from gender specific agencies/organizations regarding their ability to provide inputs?

INDICATOR 1h	Presence and nature of gender sensitive training within responsible ministries/lead agencies. Participation of M/F staff.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of records pertaining to the gender sensitive training; interview with key informants such as trainers and trainees; validation by cross checking with trainees and trainers about training content and effectiveness.

Questions:

1h.1 When were training programmes initiated? What is the frequency of training?

1h.2 What is the policy for participation by staff? Is it compulsory? Who gets to participate? What levels of staff are required to participate? Is there any incentive to participation in gender-sensitive training?

1h.3 What is the number of training programmes conducted since they were initiated? What is the number of participants M/F and what is their position in the ministry/agency? Can staff members request to participate in the training?

No. of programmes	No. of participants M/F	Job position	Possibility to request participation?



○ 1h.4 How were the trainers selected? What are the qualifications and experiences of the trainers?

Trainer	Selection process	Qualification & experience

1h.5 Was feedback taken from participants regarding the training? Was this feedback taken into consideration? What evidence, if any, is there that training programmes were changed/modified based on feedback from participants?

○ 1h.6 What is the content of the training programmes? What is the training method used? What evidence, if any, shows the effectiveness of the training?

INDICATOR 1i	The extent to which gender outcomes and gender-sensitive accountability indicators are included in M&E/impact statements/benefits analyses of national-level WASH-sector projects (project proposals and/or outcomes assessments). Sample projects.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of M&E reports; Focus Group Discussions with M&E staff, WASH officials; interview with key informants identified through the FGDs and the desk study.

○ **Questions:**

1i.1 Identify and assess gender-sensitive indicators in M&E plans. What gender outcomes are recorded/measured in M&E reports?

1i.2 Are the gender outcomes achieved? What are the accountability mechanisms related to these gender outcomes?

○



1i.3 What is the process for obtaining and integrating inputs in M&E plans? Is there room for adding gender sensitive indicators?

1i.4 Is the target group of the project or intervention disaggregated by M/F?

Project/intervention	Target group disaggregated y/n

1i.5 What is the budget for M&E? Is it adequate for assessing gender results? Are any additional costs for assessing gender indicators and outcomes made available? What is the number and type of outcomes that have been met/not met? What are the constraints in integrating and assessing gender indicators and outcomes?

1i.6 What is the process for assessing gender outcomes. Do M/F members of target group participate in the assessment?

INDICATOR 1j	The presence and nature of gender-specific objectives and commitments (or gender strategy) in national and sector-level water policies.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of policy documents and records related to formulation of policies and commitments; interview with key informants identified through these records as being able to provide relevant information.

Questions:

1j.1 When and how were gender-specific objectives and commitments formulated and integrated in national and sectoral water policies?



1j.2 What is the relevance and nature of the objectives and commitments made?

Objective/commitment	Relevance	Nature

1j.3 What are the processes in place for operationalization of gender-specific objectives and commitments.

INDICATOR 1k	The nature and extent of gender-disaggregated data related to water and sanitation collected by responsible public entities at national and local levels (in relation to the totality of social indicators on water and sanitation collected).
---------------------	--

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of records, documents, reports and data maintained by the public entities; interview with key informants from the public entities.

Questions:

1k.1 Is the data sex-disaggregated? Identify gaps in the data where disaggregated data needs to be collected.

1k.2 Identify the indicators on which the data is collected. How much of this is disaggregated?

Indicator used	Disaggregated y/n
Total number of indicators:	Total number of disaggregated:

1k.3 What are the constraints in collecting disaggregated data. What efforts are being made to deal with these constraints?



INDICATOR 2 | SAFE DRINKING WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE

Note: All the questions for Indicators 2a,b, and c can be compiled as an intra-household survey questionnaire to be administered by an interviewer or given as a self-assessment form for household members to complete. In order to administer the questions, the first step would be to identify the households without water on the premises, in rural and urban areas, through census or similar government records, and take a sample of these households to include in the survey.

A similar approach could be used for Indicators 2d, e, f and g on sanitation.

A structured self-assessment tool could be prepared consisting of the question below by putting them in a form, and given to interviewees to fill in, if personal household visits are not possible. This can only be done if the interviewees are able to read and write.

INDICATOR 2a	Percentage of households without water on premises, by sex of main person responsible for collecting drinking water and by type of household (using rural/urban samples).
---------------------	---

Alert for indicator 2a,b, and c: Records may not be accurate or reflect the current situation. If you go to a household that has water on the premises, even though the record says differently, then substitute that household with another household. The sample should include only households without water on the premises.

Questions:

2a.1 What is the percentage of households without water on premises (as per records)?

	Number	Percentage of total households
Households without water on premises		
Sample selected		

2a.2 Does the household have water on the premises? If the household has no water on the premises, which member of the household is responsible for the collection of water (M/F, age)?

INDICATOR 2b	Unpaid time spent by individual household members in supplying water, making it safe for use, and managing it (M/F informants).
---------------------	---

Methodology: Interviews with household members through an intra-household survey.



○ **Tip:** Talk to both men and women in the household.

Questions:

2b.1 What is the amount of unpaid time spent in supplying (obtaining, collecting, transporting the water from the source to the house) water, making it safe and managing it at the intra-household level? Please answer the question per household member.

Household member	Time spent on supply*	Time spent on making it safe for use	Time spent on managing** water at intra-household level

* collecting, obtaining, purchasing, and transporting water to the house.

** allocating water for washing, bathing, cleaning, cooking, etc.

○ 2b.2 What methods (boiling, filtering, storing, covering the water) are used for making water safe for use and/or consumption?

INDICATOR 2c	M/F perceptions of the adequacy of current water supply/availability in both quality and quantity in the household.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Interviews with household members, men and women, of different ages.

○ **Questions:**



2c.1 What is the level of satisfaction with the quantity of water? On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being least satisfied and 10 being most satisfied.

M/F	Age	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10



2c.2 What is the level of satisfaction with the quality of water? On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being least satisfied and 10 being most satisfied.

M/F	Age	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10



2c.3 What is the number of litres of water available per day?* What is the purpose for which this water is used? (Note quantity, if possible)

Purpose	No. of liters used
Drinking	
Cooking	
Bathing	
Washing	
Other, ...	
Other, ...	

*** Alert:** Be aware that respondents may not be able to quantify the amount of water in litres, but rather by type of container used (such as bucket or bottle). In this case, the researcher would have to make an estimate of the quantity in litres, and explain how the calculation was done.

INDICATOR 2d	Percentage of households with access to 'improved' sanitation facility, by household structure and by nature of 'improved' facility.
---------------------	---

Alert for Indicators 2d, e, f and g: If you go to a household that does not have access to an improved sanitation facility, then substitute that household with another household. The sample should include only households with access to improved sanitation facilities.

Methodology: Fact finding of percentage of households with access to improved sanitation through census or similar government records, visiting a sample of these households and observing the sanitation facility.

Questions:

2d.1 What is the percentage of households with access to improved sanitation facility (as per records)?

	Number	Percentage of total households
Households with access to improved sanitation facility		
Sample selected		

2d.2 If the household has access to improved sanitation facility, is there a sanitation facility present in the household? If yes, what type of sanitation facility? (Types according to JMP for water and sanitation)

Type of facility	Facility present y/n
Flush toilet	
Piped sewer system	
Septic tank	
Flush/pour flush to pit latrine	
Ventilated improved pit latrine (VIP)	
Pit latrine with slab	
Composting toilet	



INDICATOR 2e	Intra-household M/F use of/access to improved sanitation facilities.
---------------------	--

Methodology: Interviews with household members.

Questions:

2e.1 What is the total number of members in the household? Who uses the sanitation facility in the house? (M/F adults, children, guests, others, nobody.) If the facility is not used, what are the reasons for not using it?

INDICATOR 2f	M/F prioritization of gaining access to improved sanitation facilities; willingness to allocate household budget for such access.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Interviews with household members.

Tip: Interview M/F separately.

Questions:



2f.1 How often is the sanitation facility used? (Every day, often, rarely)



2f.2 Are you willing to pay for an (extra) toilet in the house?

INDICATOR 2g	M/F perception of the safety of sanitation facilities that are located outside the house; identified particular safety concern.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding and observation to view the location and condition of the sanitation facility, and interviews with household members.

Tip: Interview M/F separately.



Questions:



2g.1 What are your perceptions of safety in using the toilet located outside house?
On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being least satisfied and 10 being most satisfied.

M/F	Age	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10



2g.2 What is the perception of safety in using the communal toilet? On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being least satisfied and 10 being most satisfied.

M/F	Age	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10



2g.3 What are the main concerns related to safety? (List main concerns by importance as perceived by M/F household members)



INDICATOR 3 | DECISION-MAKING AND KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION

Note: Indicators 3a, b and c concern decision-making and knowledge production at the international level. Indicators 3d, e, f and g concern decision-making and knowledge at the intra-household level.

INDICATOR 3a	M/F participation in past decade of two major global international water meetings (and nationally significant comparable meetings): World Water Week (Stockholm); World water Forum (World Water Council) (could be topic specific or region specific).
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of records of participants; interviews with the organizers of the specific conferences and officials of the convening organizations.

Questions:

3a.1 What are the numbers of M/F participants and in which capacity did they participate? (Panel members/chairs/presenters/contributors/submitted papers/etc.)

M/F participant	No. of participants	Capacity of participant

3a.2 What efforts are made, if any, to increase the number of female participants, and to improve the nature of their participation?

Indicator 3b	M/F inclusion on nationally and internationally convened scientific panels and advisory boards.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of records on participants; interviews with officials who assemble relevant panels and boards, as well as with members of these panels and boards.

Questions:

3b.1 What is the number of M/F members of international convened scientific panels and advisory boards, and what is the type of their participation?

Panel/board	No. of participants M/F	Type of participation

3b.2 Is there evidence of contribution by M/F members? If yes, elaborate.

3b.3 What efforts, if any, are made to increase and improve participation of female scientists and advisors?

INDICATOR 3c	Gender audit of WHO/UNICEF 'Joint Monitoring Programme.' (could be topic specific or region specific)
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding through a review study of documents and resources from the 'Joint Monitoring Programme.'

Questions:

3c.1 Does the 'Joint Monitoring Programme' take into account sex-disaggregated information? Are they monitoring and assessing the data according to M/F differences?

INDICATOR 3d	M/F perceptions of or knowledge of current total household use of water, by category of use and by primary use.
---------------------	---

Note: A structured self-assessment tool could be prepared consisting of the questions below (Indicator 3d, e, f, and g) by putting them in a form, and given to interviewees to fill in, if personal household visits are not possible. This can only be done if the interviewees are able to read and write.



○ **Methodology:** Interviews with household members; direct observation wherever possible; structured self-assessment if possible.

Questions:



3d.1 What is the total amount* of water used in the household and what is the prioritization of the water use?

*** Alert:** Be aware that respondents may not be able to quantify the amount of water in litres, but rather by type of container used (such as bucket or bottle). In this case, the researcher would have to make an estimate of the quantity in litres, and explain how the calculation was done.

○ 3d.2. Who uses the water and for what purpose?

M/F	Age	Purpose of use

INDICATOR 3e

Household member primarily responsible for managing the household water; M/F perceptions of the nature of their household decision-making process of water priorities and use; M/F perceptions of the primary decision-maker on water issues within the household, if any; M/F perceptions of how-intra household conflicts related to water, if any, are solved.

○ **Methodology:** Direct observations wherever possible; structured self-assessment if possible; interviews with household members.

Tips: Interviewer/researcher would need to build trust with family members before discussing these questions.

Questions:



3e.1. What is the decision-making process within the household regarding water use and priorities?

○





3e.2 How are decisions taken related to the use of water in the household? What are the M/F perceptions on the prioritization of water use and what are the differences of opinion about water use?



3e.3 Does the primary decision-maker take into account views and opinions of other family members? How are possible differences resolved?

INDICATOR 3f	M/F expressed priorities for water use within households.
---------------------	--

Methodology: Interviews with household members; structured self-assessment if possible.

Note: Priorities of water use could be different from the current patterns of water use, as identified by Indicator 3d. Use this question to identify the disparity between these two.

Questions:



3f.1 List the priorities for water for use for M/F household members.

Use	No. of priority M	No. of priority F

INDICATOR 3g	M/F perceptions of household gender equality in water decisions.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Interviews with household members; structured self-assessment if possible.

Tip: Interviewer/researcher would need to build trust with family members before discussing these questions.





Questions:

3g.1 What is the process of decision-making related to water in the household?

3g.2 What are the perceptions of M/F household-members on whether their views and opinions are taken into consideration?



3g.3 On a scale from 1 to 10, how much do you think women are discriminated in water decision-making participation in your household? (10= highly discriminated)

M/F	Position	Perception of discrimination of women from 1 to 10



INDICATOR 4 | TRANSBOUNDARY WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

INDICATOR 4a	Number of M/F staff on transboundary water commissions (sample for pilot countries), disaggregated by job category/level and decision making capacity (and salary, if available).
---------------------	--

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of documents and records of HR department and recruitment policy; interviews with heads of relevant department in government.

Questions:

4a.1 List the number of M/F staff disaggregated by job categories and position. If possible, also note the salary paid to M/F for various positions.

Job category	Top level No. M/No. F	Middle level No. M/No. F	Lower level No. M/No. F
Executive			
Consultant			
Technician			
Administrative			

4a.2 What is the M/F staff contribution/involvement in decision-making processes as per job position?

M/F	Position	Involvement in decision-making

4a.3 What is the perception of M/F staff regarding women’s involvement/contribution in decision-making processes? On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being least involved and 10 being most involved

M/F	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

4a.4 What is the process for staff recruitment? Where are positions advertised? What are the Terms of References (TOR) for hiring people?



INDICATOR 4b	The extent to which gender outcomes and gender sensitive accountability indicators are included in M&E/impact statements/benefits analysis of trans-boundary agreements/activities.
---------------------	--

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of M&E records, impact statements, agreements and work plans; interviews with M&E officials and the technical people involved.

Questions:

4b.1 Identify and assess the gender-sensitive indicators, if any, in M&E plans.

4b.2 What are the gender outcomes recorded/measured in M&E reports and impact statements?

4b.3. Is there inclusion of analysis of gender outcomes in M&E impact statements and agreements?

4b.4 What are the accountability mechanisms, if any, related to gender outcomes?

4b.5 Describe the process for obtaining and integrating inputs in M&E plans; is there an opening for adding gender sensitive indicators?

4b.6 Is there a mention of M/F target group in impact statements and agreements?

INDICATOR 4c	The presence and nature of gender-specific objectives and commitments (or gender strategy) in transboundary agreements.
---------------------	--



Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of gender strategy; interviews with key informants as identified through fact finding.

Questions:

4c.1 What is the process for integrating gender issues in shared/transboundary water agreements?

4c.2 If there is a gender strategy, what issues are identified in it? What is the process of preparation and adoption of the gender strategy?

4c.3 List the gender-specific objectives and commitments and discuss their applicability with key informants.

Objectives	Not effective	Effective	Very effective
Commitments	Not effective	Effective	Very effective

4c.4 If there is no gender-strategy, what is the reason for its absence? What are the constraints in adopting gender objectives and commitments?

INDICATOR 4d	Intensity of M/F participation in (sample/representative) meetings of trans-boundary meetings, including outcomes such as: ratio of contributions in decision-making meetings by women and men; percentage of decisions adopted from women’s contributions in meetings.
---------------------	--

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of meeting reports and participators list; interviews with key informants as identified by fact finding; participant observation.

Tip: Consult ‘Skills of a participant observer’ in the Methodology section of the Guideline.



○ **Questions:**

4d.1 What is the number and frequency of M/F participation in the meetings held in order to take decisions regarding trans-boundary issues?

Meeting	Number of M/F	Frequency of participation M/F

4d.2 Identify the number and type of contributions of M/F in decision-making meetings, and the possibility of M/F contributions being adopted.

○

M/F	Number of contributions	Type of contributions	Possibility of adoption

4d.3 State the age, educational background and qualification of M/F who participate in these meetings.

M/F	Age	Educational background	Qualifications

○ 4d.4 Are informal meetings held to discuss different issues? What is the evidence of contribution made by M/F participants in informal meetings, if any.

INDICATOR 4e	How are gender issues integrated in your shared water projects/infrastructural investments? What are your gender-specific objectives and commitments with regard to these? Please specify and evaluate.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding through a review of project documents and stated commitments; Interviews with members of the projects/investments, either through group discussions or individual interviews (interviewer/researcher decides what is more appropriate).

○





Questions:

4e.1 What is the process for integrating gender issues in your shared water projects/ infrastructural investments?

4e.2 What are your gender-specific objectives and commitments with regards to these? Please specify and evaluate.



INDICATOR 5 | WATER FOR INCOME GENERATION FOR INDUSTRIAL AND AGRICULTURAL USES, INCLUDING UNACCOUNTED-FOR LABOUR

INDICATOR 5a	% irrigated farms in region under survey; % irrigated farms managed by/owned by M/F.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding from census and other government/non-government records. Interviews for ownership information.

Alert: Depending on where the questionnaire is administered, the researcher will have to decide how to obtain relevant information regarding % of irrigated land, ownership, and average size of irrigated farm. Verification of records may be necessary before doing household and community level interviews. Interviews may be necessary with key informants.

Questions:

5a.1 What is the % of irrigated land in the region? (can use FAO data)¹

5a.2 State the ownership M/F and ownership type (private/family/business/common land/type of association/cooperation/etc.)

Ownership M/F	Ownership type

INDICATOR 5b	Average size of irrigated farms run by/owned by women/men.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding; interview with head of each individual farm.

Alert: Depending on where the questionnaire is administered, the researcher will have to decide how to obtain relevant information regarding % of irrigated land, ownership, and average size of irrigated farm. Verification of records may be necessary before doing intra-household and community-level interviews.

¹ <http://www.fao.org/nr/water/aquastat/main/index.stm>



Questions:

5b.1 What is the average size of irrigated farms? Disaggregated by M/F and distinguish between owned by or managed by.

M/F	Size of farm	Owned or managed by

INDICATOR 5c	Gendered division of labor related to irrigated-farming: gender-specific tasks related to irrigated crops, by nature of tasks; gender differentiated daily time-use of household members involved in irrigated farming work.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Interviews with both M/F household members

Tip: Ensure plenty of time for obtaining this information; this cannot be done in a hurry.

Questions:

5c.1 Identify the tasks in irrigated agriculture disaggregated by M/F

M/F	Task

5c.2 Describe the location of the plot in terms of terrain (uphill, downhill, valley, etc.) and source of water for irrigation (RWH, groundwater, surface water, open well, etc.) as well as the distance from water source (use of pumps, pipeline, channels, etc.)

5c.3 Identify the roles and responsibilities for M/F in irrigated farming (including maintenance of irrigation system) with time schedules.

M/F	Role	Responsibility	Time schedule



○ 5c.4 What is the nature of irrigated farming? (single/different household member/s, household, family business, cooperation, etc.)

INDICATOR 5d	Decision-makers and participants in household-based decision-making process regarding irrigation (M/F informants/perceptions); decision re-allocation of time and financial resources; crops to be irrigated.
---------------------	---

○ **Methodology:** Interviews with household members, assess whether it is appropriate to interview all household members in a group or to do interview on an individual bases.

Tip: - Ensure plenty of time for obtaining this information; this cannot be done in a hurry.
- If the researcher happens to be a direct observer of the decision-making process, then take note of this process.

Questions:

○ 5d.1 What is the process of decision-making at the household level? What are the M/F perceptions regarding the process and the decision-maker.

○ 5d.2 Is part of the household income used for growing irrigated crops? (such as purchase of inputs) If credit is used for this purpose, what is the source of the credit? (bank, family, community funds, etc.)? Are there any documents available regarding the credit obtained? Is there an informal or formal agreement regarding the credit (if taken from family/friends/community)?

○ 5d.3 For what purpose is the money, obtained through credit, used? Which household member M/F is eligible to get the credit? How will the money be repaid to the institution, or person from whom the credit is taken? Who is responsible for repaying it?



INDICATOR 5e	Decision-makers and participants in community-based decision-making process, if any, regarding irrigation (M/F informants/perceptions); decisions re allocation of time and financial resources; crops to be irrigated.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding through interviews; Focus Group Discussion with Water Users Association or Water group; Interviews with key informants such as community leaders, farmers and government officials; Validation through records on collection of fees.

Questions:

5e.1 What are the crops grown in the area, the availability of irrigation water, time schedules regarding the distribution of irrigation water, and what is the system of allocation? How this irrigation system managed and what is the M/F involvement in the management and decision-making?

5e.2 What are the perceptions of M/F farmers regarding the use of resources and management systems?

5e.3 Are there any fees charged for irrigation? If yes, what is the process of collection?

INDICATOR 5f	M/F perceptions of gender discrimination (or equality) regarding women’s participation in decision-making in relation to irrigation.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Focus group discussions; Interviews with individuals as required; direct observation on whether or not women attend meetings and if they provide input during these meetings.



○ **Questions:**



5f.1 What is the suitability of time schedules for M/F farmers? What is their perception regarding allocation of water and irrigation time schedules (scale 1-10)?

M/F	Suitability	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10



5f.2 On a scale from 1 to 10, how much do you think women farmers are discriminated in water decision-making in irrigation? (10= highly discriminated)

○

M/F	Position	Perception of discrimination from 1 to 10



5f.3 What are the opportunities for interventions and the uptake of suggestions of women and men?

○

INDICATOR 5g	M/F access to support services for irrigation; participation in technical training; M/F access to bank loans/credit; and incentives for the development of irrigated agriculture.
---------------------	--

Methodology: Fact finding through review of records and documents; interviews with selected M/F farmers, government officials, bank officials and extension workers; Observation.

Questions:

5g.1 What are the types of extension services available to M/F farmers?



5g.2 What are the levels, type and nature of technical assistance/formal education/information education/training available to M/F farmers?

Name	Level	Type	Nature M/F

5g.3 State the type and qualification of the trainers.

Trainer	M/F	Type*	Qualification


*From government department, NGO, training institute, community, etc.

5g.4 What is the extent of participation by M/F farmers in extension? Identify the constraints to M/F participation in extension and training.

5g.5 What methods are used to announce the training, the location and the process, and what is the suitability for participation by M/F farmers?

5g.6 What is the ease or difficulty in obtaining credit for M/F farmers? What is the accessibility to banks for M/F farmers for credit?



○  5g.7 What is the extent of gender-sensitivity of government resolutions and bank resolutions regarding incentives, extension and credit?

INDICATOR 5h	M/F membership and intensity of participation in community-based irrigation communities.
---------------------	---

○ **Methodology:** Fact finding through community records in order to identify members; interviews with individual members, community leaders and office bearers; Participant observation by attending meeting(s) of the specific community; (Focus Group Discussion only if participant observation is not possible).

Tip: Participant observation is the preferred methodology here; therefore the researcher should make an effort to attend a community meeting.

Questions:

5h.1 Analyse the process for collective decision-making on water allocation and use for agriculture (refer to the five levels of participation, as explained in the Guideline). Identify the level of participation by different members who attend the meeting.

○ 5h.2 What are the constraints in participation for M/F members?

5h.3 How is the final decision taken? Who takes the final decision? Is an external (limiting) factor (formal or other authority) present? Are there opportunities present for participation by M/F members as reflected in the rules and regulations?

○



INDICATOR 5i	% of directly water-related industries managed by/owned by M/F
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of government records and industry owners.

Tip: Information about management may not be reflected in ownership records. This information can be obtained directly from the owners.

Questions:

5i.1 Identify the number and percentage of industries owned and/or managed by men and women.

M/F	Number owned	Number managed	Percentage

INDICATOR 5j	% M/F employees in water-related industries.
---------------------	---

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of employment records.

Tip: If records are not complete, please interview key informants to fill in the information gaps.

Questions:

5j.1 Identify the number of M/F staff and their positions.

M/F	Number of staff	Position

INDICATOR 5k	Presence of women’s cooperatives in water-related industries.
---------------------	--

Methodology: Fact finding through desk study of government records.





Questions:

5k.1 Identify the number and type of women's cooperatives.

Name of cooperation	Number	Type
1.		
2.		
3.		





Government of Italy



Umbria Region