

GENDER-SENSITIVE RESPONSE AND RECOVERY

An Overview



Non-food items being distributed at Kalma camp, Sudan. A group of displaced women proceed out of the distribution area, balancing buckets full of clothing and household items on their heads. Aisles are laid out with ropes and sticks and rope to keep the distribution orderly. © Marguereite Hondow/Oxfam.

The number and complexity of hazards and disasters are increasing rapidly; and there is ample evidence that women and girls are often more vulnerable to disasters than men and boys. The papers in this collection consider the progress made and the challenges we still face in humanitarian and disaster risk reduction (DRR) interventions, in responding adequately to the needs and priorities of all affected people, men and women, boys and girls. Achieving long-term change that transforms the lives of those living in poverty needs to specifically address gender inequalities. Through reflection, analysis and documentation of experience, this collection of papers can have value beyond their own contexts and by sharing the lessons learned, will help to make future work more effective.

Oxfam Programme Insights

www.oxfam.org.uk/policyandpractice



OXFAM

THE GENDERED NATURE OF DISASTERS

'We were always bound to our customs and never free from worries, but these floods had made us more vulnerable after the war against terrorism. Our tolerance level was finished during this flood.' – Sanga Mai, member of the Damghar community

'Oxfam Internal Gender Learning Review of Pakistan Flood, 2010–2011'

Statistical data and qualitative analyses have amply demonstrated that disasters are not gender-neutral. Despite deficiencies in the collection and uses of statistical evidence, we know that in most disasters women die in large numbers,¹ although this is not the case in situations of armed conflict, where combatants are usually men.² We also know that the effects of humanitarian disasters have marked gender characteristics whatever their causes and whether they are of fast and unexpected onset, such as an earthquake, or of chronic duration, such as the food crises that have wrecked the lives of many communities and countries in parts of Africa in recent decades.

This means that women and girls are often more vulnerable to disasters than men and boys are. Women's greater vulnerability – the extent to which they are likely to be affected by a hazard – is due to the widespread disadvantage, and at times formal discrimination, that they experience in many societies. Their access to and control over resources, social or economic, are more limited than those of men; their earnings are usually lower, even in most Western countries; and the burden of caring for family members falls mostly on their shoulders. Exclusion from decision making, limited mobility, and the threat and experience of various forms of violence against women and girls are all pre-existing conditions that determine their greater vulnerability in disasters and crises. Age, class, ethnicity, caste, marital status, sexuality, and disability all combine with gender to determine an individual's vulnerabilities. In addition, women from certain marginalized groups experience particular problems: among pastoral communities, for example, according to local norms women are permitted to own and sell only smaller animals which command much lower prices and prestige. During periods of drought, such women, and their households, experience severe destitution.

The increasing and often multiple natures of hazards and disasters add urgency and poignancy to this situation, as the quotation above exemplifies.

Opportunities for change

Despite the destruction and tragedy that they cause, in some instances natural disasters and situations of conflict open up opportunities for positive change, enabling women and men to take on new and more progressive gender roles: for example, when men have to share caring responsibilities, or when women assume prominent roles in peace building and mediation. This seems to be the case even for some of the most intractable problems, such as gender-based violence (GBV), if they are approached with sensitivity and determination. For example, the idea of 'women-friendly spaces' has been developed in Sri Lanka (and then adopted in other situations) to create an opportunity for women to voice and share pressing and often unspoken concerns about GBV. When adopted, this solution has also led to the emergence of much-needed local women leaders.³

Seizing opportunities that crises offer requires one key change in mind-sets: the recognition that women and girls – like men and boys – possess great skills (and can put them to use) to prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters. The widespread recognition of their vulnerability has perhaps tended to prevent policy makers and practitioners from valuing and employing women's skills and readiness to act.

Formal responses

Most humanitarian agencies are aware of the way in which women suffer disproportionately from the consequences of disasters. As an article in the journal *Gender and Development* observes: *'the gendered impacts of disasters are now widely acknowledged, if not fully understood, and most organizations involved in humanitarian responses, as well as in disaster risk reduction, now recognise their obligation to support women's rights and promote gender equality through their interventions'* (2012: 205).⁴

With recognition comes the development and (less rapidly and consistently) the implementation and use of policies and strategies. Globally the UN has formulated a range of resolutions which address the gender-based impact of disasters: from Resolution 1325 calling for the implementation of international humanitarian and human-rights law to protect the rights of women and girls during and after conflicts, to the more recent Resolutions 1820, 1888, 1989, respectively addressing sexual violence, the appointment of a Special Representative of the Secretary-General to coordinate UN efforts to respond to conflict-related sexual violence, and women's leadership in peace processes. Other agencies have been equally forthcoming. Specifically for disaster-risk reduction (DRR), the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) includes among its priorities for 2005–2015 the aspiration that *'A gender perspective should be integrated into all disaster risk management policies, plans and decision-making processes, including those related to risk assessment, early warning, information management, and education and training'*.⁵ In 1999 the IASC (Interagency Standing Committee) issued a Policy Statement for the Integration of a Gender Perspective in Humanitarian Assistance⁶, which has been bolstered by a variety of projects, tools, and resources.

Oxfam envisions that many more women will gain power over their lives and live free from violence as a result of changes in gender relations, and through increased levels of women's active engagement and leadership in institutions, decision making, and change processes. In addition, Oxfam, among other agencies, has gradually made commitments to accord gender equality a central place in its humanitarian and resilience work. This commitment has been restated in the recent (2011) 'Minimum Standards for Gender Equality and Women's Rights in Emergencies', produced to support staff and partners in improving humanitarian practice. Such Standards build on existing policies and guiding documents used throughout the Oxfam confederation, including the IASC guidelines on gender and gender-based violence in emergencies, and the Sphere Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response (2011)⁷.

Despite such clear commitments, many interventions still seem to be beset by limitations and problems in their implementation, in the use of available tools and approaches, in increasing the resilience of women and girls and promoting their rights. This collection of Programme Insights papers on 'Gender Equality in Emergencies: Practical Lessons', documents some of these problems, alongside the successes.

The choice of contributions to the collection is in part dictated by the availability of material, and in part by the intention to cover both humanitarian interventions and DRR, a variety of sectors (water, sanitation, and hygiene or WASH, cash transfers, protection, livelihoods, etc.), and advocacy campaigns as well as programmes on the ground. The selection is also intended to emphasize the importance of context in determining what gender-sensitive actions are possible and necessary. For example, the urban slums of Nairobi are very different from the Dadaab camps, although both are in Kenya; and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), characterized by weak state authority and long-term insecurity, differs greatly from both West Sumatra and Vietnam, places that are prone to natural disasters but where considerable strides have been made in poverty reduction and governance. The critical truth is that *'Understanding how gender roles interact with context is key to contributing to positive change. Not understanding it, or adopting a simplistic approach, risks doing significant harm'* ('Protecting Communities in the Democratic Republic of Congo: Understanding gender dynamics and empowering women and men', this collection).

LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCE

Real learning?

Much is made of the need to learn from experience in development programmes, humanitarian response, and DRR. Publications such as this are produced with exactly this purpose in mind: to offer reflections on what has worked or not worked in the past, and thus make suggestions for future practice. At times this translation from lesson to practice does not take place, and similar mistakes are repeated over and over again.

The modalities of distributions of sanitary protection to women and girls are an example of mistakes that are often repeated. This was certainly the case for Oxfam's work at the Dadaab refugee camps in Kenya, the largest in the world, where Oxfam provides clean water and sanitation, with gender mainstreaming as a core component. During the initial stage of the response, a household kit that included disposable sanitary pads was distributed to newly arrived families. However, most women threw the pads away, and they could be seen littered all over the camp. Oxfam, among other stakeholders, then held separate focus-group discussions with men and women to determine the appropriate contents of a standard hygiene kit and appropriate protocols for distribution. One young woman said: *'We thought the packets contained something to eat, and when we open and find another thing we do not understand, we throw it away.'* Findings from the discussions led to a switch from disposable to reusable sanitary cloths, and further consultations led to the discovery that women preferred single dull-coloured cloth instead of the white cotton with coloured patterns originally included in the kit. This information was fed back to the NFI working group, and changes to the type of cloth were agreed on.

This example echoes a similar case in Pakistan, as reported by a Project Manager: *'In August last year, SAFWCO used white thin sanitary cloth as part of the hygiene kit... during post-distribution monitoring visits women beneficiaries informed us that the white colour and thin fabric is not appropriate for sanitary purpose and they were using this cloth for covering water pots or dusting. This was shared with Oxfam Technical Leads and thick coloured fabric was suggested and the women beneficiaries received in September-October 2010.'*⁸

The articles in this collection report other weaknesses, half-hearted attempts, and even failures to respond to the different needs and perspectives of women and men (and boys and girls) living in crises. Although shaped by local circumstances, such problems are rarely unique, as in the case of the sanitary-protection distributions. How and whether we have learned from the successes and positive experiences reported here, is also hard to document.

So why do we struggle to learn, whether from positive experiences, from problems, and from failures? Putting this publication together has given us a sense of the many different issues associated with collecting and sharing the experiences from which lessons could emerge. First of all, we struggled to identify authors willing and able to write about their experiences. Some of this reluctance must be due to the fact that working in emergency responses is very hard to combine with reflective practice such as writing. Humanitarian personnel tend to be very mobile, with frequent changes of location and organization; consulting them in an attempt to deepen our understanding of past experiences or fill gaps in information was hampered by this mobility.

Written records of programmes or projects (reports of assessments, evaluations, etc.) tend to be rather descriptive and contain information of *what* was done, rather than *why*, and they often offer simplistic speculations about cause and effect. When problems are identified (whether related to gender analysis, the participation of women, or the benefits that they derive from an intervention), it is often at the conclusion of a particular project, and little is known about what was done, if anything, to rectify the situation. In existing accounts, the emphasis is frequently on positive steps and outcomes (with some exceptions: see, for example 'Cash-Transfers in

Nairobi's Slums: Improving food security and gender dynamics' in this collection), and problems are understated. Several reasons explain this tendency, one being that in certain organizations and for some individuals criticisms of performance on gender equality are not taken kindly, since such a concern is experienced as externally imposed or superfluous; this is compounded by limited efforts to make staff and managers accountable.

In this collection of papers we have relied on written and oral accounts to provide evidence and reflections on both positive (of which there are many) and problematic experiences, in the belief that we can learn from our mistakes as well as our successes, and that we have an obligation not to repeat the mistakes that are so damaging to the wellbeing, dignity, and rights of the men and women we work for, and the reputation of our organizations.

Working in partnership to increase long-term impact

Oxfam staff work with local communities and organizations, national governments, and international bodies, the private sector, and others to bring about sustainable change for people living in poverty. Our reports give indications of what is helpful to ensure that the aim of gender mainstreaming or the promotion of women's rights is shared and achieved through such collaborations.

Following the food crisis of 2008–9 in Kenya, Oxfam and Concern Worldwide developed a joint proposal to address the emergency. Both worked with local organizations: Concern with the Redeemed Gospel Church in Korogocho, and Oxfam with the Mukuru Slums Development Project in Mukuru. The two local partners had years of experience of working in the respective slums and were able to build on their established relationships with the communities. In the DRC, Oxfam moved away from working with large partner organizations to working with smaller-scale partners operating at a more local level. The partnership was found to be more productive when partner staff come from and live in the targeted communities, and when they have a long history of acceptance, both by local authorities and by women and other community members. In both cases, a careful choice of partners with local knowledge and connections went a long way to support gender work.

One of the challenges in the post-flood response in Pakistan was that many staff lacked prior experience of working in similar programmes. However, Oxfam sought to build on their existing relationships with partners for the early recovery programme, so that support to communities would be as timely and relevant as possible. Each partner covered a specific district in which they had prior experience, and their involvement added much to the understanding of the local context. Again, a thoughtful approach to partnership allowed for better overall results.

Being truly participatory

Another clear lesson surfaces from this collection: rigorous, gender-sensitive, community consultations are essential. At the same time, the proper representation of women's views in the identification of problems and of solutions suitable to needs and contexts is one of the main challenges in humanitarian and DRR work, sometimes in a very direct way: *'I was talking to a man and inquiring him about the number of females at his home, he stood up with anger and he shouted that if you asked about our females again, we will kill you'* (Zulfiqar Ali, Public Health Promotion Office, Oxfam)⁹.

This is part and parcel of what makes a gendered approach necessary, since gender, combined with other dimensions of inequality (race, class, etc.), shapes not only vulnerability to disasters but also the ways in which individuals, households, communities, institutions, and humanitarian actors respond to them.

Being truly participatory is key to overcoming the problems that this creates, not only by adopting obvious practices such as holding separate focus-group discussions (between men

and women, or older and younger people), but also by having the sensitivity, courage, and creativity to stay faithful to our principles while respecting local customs. As shown by the examples of sanitary-protection distributions from Kenya and Pakistan, comprehensive community participation that involves women and men will help to ensure that responses meet actual and not perceived needs.

In the DRC, Oxfam has been carrying out, since 2006, annual protection surveys in the conflict-affected areas in the east, to make sure that our interventions are based on sophisticated and up-to-date information, and that they reflect shifts in the conflict and the different ways in which men and women experience the transitions that conflict may undergo. Participatory, regular, and in-depth research has led DRC staff to conclude that, as shown in the paper included in this collection, Oxfam's aim of 'putting poor women's rights at the heart of all we do' is, in some situations, only possible when we address men's rights as well.

In this difficult context, Oxfam's protection programme has established Protection Committees, with equal numbers of men and women, to discuss and reach agreement on their problems and possible solutions to them. A separate space (the Women's Forum) enables women to focus on their own priorities, on which they are rarely consulted. This combination has led men to be more attentive to the needs of women, and has empowered women to be more active in non-traditional roles. Another truly participatory aspect of the project is its 'referral' system, through which men, women, boys, and girls affected by violence and abuse are provided with advice and support.

In our WASH programme in Dadaab in Kenya, intensive participatory consultations with communities revealed that pressure on resources can lead to tension between host and refugee groups. As a consequence, in the host communities neighbouring the camp, in 2010 Oxfam distributed donkeys and carts to selected women. To date these women use the donkey carts to fetch water and firewood for sale, as well as to meet other needs.

A genuine gendered approach requires paying attention also to the participation of men. Our experience in Nairobi shows that failure to involve men effectively can reduce the impact of programmes. Although efforts were made in the slums to be truly participatory, feedback indicated that it was not a comfortable process for men who were living alone, or were sick or had responsibilities for children, because of the perceived focus on women.

Not only a numbers game

Women's empowerment is not a mere question of numbers: assessing the percentage of women participating in training or other activities, for example. And yet even this basic approach can yield very positive results, especially for women who are extremely marginalized – not only by their gender but also by caste.

Oxfam's work in Nepal included activities that built women's confidence and leadership. For example, the formation of Drinking Water and Sanitation Users' Committees (DWSUCs) was often led by women; it included ensuring that women constituted 50 per cent of Village Maintenance Workers, who became involved in construction work in their communities. The Participatory Learning Centres (PLCs) held discussions on sanitation and hygiene and other issues, including domestic violence and caste and gender discrimination. Participating in such activities not only enhanced women's confidence and status in the community, but also began to modify some discriminatory practices. For example, it became possible for women to start abandoning *Chaupadi*, the social custom that forced them to stay in cowsheds during their menstruation and prevented them from consuming milk and milk-based products.

Even ensuring the equal numerical participation of women (in committees, training, and other project activities) is not a simple matter. What percentage is fair and realistic? Why did the Pakistan project described here end up with women constituting only 25 per cent of

beneficiaries? In asking households to register only one household member, we should perhaps have foreseen that the choice would have favoured male members.

What is the right approach to deciding whether or not women should be asked to participate in conventionally male activities, and perhaps embark on a process of transformation? In the Cash-for-Work programme in Pakistan, both women and men in affected communities prioritized repairs to irrigation canals; but this is traditionally a male activity, and it was not possible to encourage women's involvement. As a solution, Oxfam and partners worked with women to identify other activities suitable for cash-for-work. Repair of homes was also seen as a major concern for many communities, and where possible work teams of women were established, and they rehabilitated many houses. Despite the restrictions, women's groups were present in approximately 120 villages out of a total of 553.

Policy changes stay

International and national policies and institutional mechanisms provide important, but often neglected, means of raising and promoting the rights and interests of women and girls in disaster response or preparedness.

Oxfam's response to the earthquake in West Sumatra (Indonesia) in 2009 was able to use advocacy to embed gender considerations in the local government systems and thus ensure their effectiveness in the long term. Thanks to its work with local partners, a week after the earthquake Oxfam developed and started work on shelter, WASH, livelihoods, and advocacy for improved emergency response and DRR, and conducted research on the earthquake's differential impacts on men and women.

Oxfam worked with national women's organizations, UNFPA, and IASC (the Inter-Agency Standing Committee) to encourage local civil-society organizations to establish and support a Gender Working Group (GWG). Members of the GWG held several lobby meetings with provincial officials. The Governor eventually issued a provincial decree to institutionalize the GWG as a part of the provincial government's Women Empowerment and Family Planning Office. The provincial decrees provided a 'legal' base from which the GWG can work in the future, and gave them legitimacy in their dealings with senior government officials.

Working systematically across institutions

The importance of embedding gender-sensitive humanitarian and DRR approaches into national institutions is also well illustrated by the Vietnam case study in this collection. Women and men living along the Mekong River suffer greatly from annual flooding. Oxfam and the governments of Vietnam and Australia worked together to develop a Participatory Disaster Management programme. The programme has yielded considerable positive results and boasts high levels of women's participation in all its activities. What is noticeable in this collaboration is that responsibilities to promote gender equality were made clear for each of the various levels at which activities took place: national, provincial, district, commune, and village.

Oxfam identified the Women's Union (WU) as one of its key partners: at the national level. The mandate of the WU is to support the equality and development of women in Vietnam and we worked together to develop training material on gender and DRR, conduct research on gender-equality policy, and train WU's staff, government officials, and community-based disaster-risk management (CBDRM) practitioners. At provincial, district, and commune levels, the WU was a partner in designing and implementing project activities; many women at village level who were project beneficiaries were also members of the WU and were strong in mobilizing community members.

Resilience: the link between development and humanitarian response

Building resilience is concerned with reducing disaster risk at every level – households, communities, organizations, and states – and providing the links between humanitarian and development programming. Several papers in this collection reflect on the gender approach that they have adopted.

The West Sumatra and Vietnam examples provide interesting insights into the task of linking humanitarian and long-term development interventions: collaboration with and support for women's organizations that, as a rule, have considerable reach and legitimacy in communities (especially among women), while at the same time needing support to enhance their humanitarian response skills and their ability to navigate the complexity of humanitarian systems.

Our interventions in Pakistan, as summarized in this collection, have linked post-earthquake response and recovery phases, i.e. emergency shelter, WASH, and livelihood recovery, with advocacy for improved, gender-sensitive emergency response and disaster-risk reduction (DRR). More could perhaps have been done to make use of the social capital created by the 'We Can End Violence Against Women' campaign across many of the areas affected by the flood, and especially the potential contributions of the individuals who, in the course of the years, have acquired new consciousness and skills by being Change Makers in the campaign.¹⁰

The cash-transfer work in Kenya, a partnership between Concern, Oxfam, and community and faith-based organizations, made this connection explicit and aimed, in Phase One, to reduce the impact of the food crisis and to follow it up with a medium-term response based on cash-for-work activities alongside skills development, aiming finally to launch coordinated advocacy initiatives to encourage the government to invest in social protection for vulnerable urban populations. The overall approach was one that did not pre-define women as 'vulnerable' or 'victims', but supported them in their long-term role as providers, in addition to their caring duties.

This work seems to have missed a precious opportunity to play a more transformational role, in the sense of helping 'to unleash the agency and organization of hitherto excluded groups (on the basis of gender, caste or ethnicity)'.¹¹ Given an environment where women's efforts to support their families received the approval of male household members, the community at large, and male community leaders, opportunities for a more transformational approach were lost, and thus the sustainability of the project benefits was compromised. Perhaps this is due to the fact that the projects never had the objective of gender equality, did not carry out an initial gender analysis, and never consulted women's groups. At the same time, the Kenya programme may be more transformational than at first it would appear. Its use of mobile phones to transfer cash was innovative and had considerable benefits, including allowing privacy and thus averting the risks that arise when women collect money. For women, access to cash (*'the money changed everything'*, as one woman said) and to effective technology can indeed be a step towards many more transformational changes.

When is the time right?

A common thread in analyses of humanitarian and DRR intervention (and to a lesser extent development) is the frequency with which problems in responding adequately to the needs of women and girls (as well as those of men and boys) are revealed to have fairly obvious causes, and to be rooted in the failure to adopt a genuine gender-sensitive approach *from the start*.

In our case this is exemplified, for example, in the report from Pakistan, telling us that *'Unfortunately there was no Gender Advisor available at the project outset or implementation period'*, which prompts one to ask why such a resource was not available. Not surprisingly,

then, it was later found that staff had assumed that, for example, business grants should be offered to men, while the less valuable poultry inputs should be offered to women. Similarly in Kenya, resource constraints prevented an early gender analysis (although women were the main recipients of the cash transfers), leading to confusion over terminologies and social realities. In DRC the experiences of communities living relatively close to each other can be surprisingly different, emphasizing the need for gender analysis from the start to ensure that we avoid making generic assumptions about how women and men can be included in humanitarian projects.

This does not mean that, as mentioned earlier, local conditions (for example, the illiteracy of Somali women that prevented them becoming workers in the camps) do not present obstacles to the adoption of a robust gendered approach, but the problems often appear more related to weak accountability and commitment within some institutions.

CHANGE OR TRANSFORMATION?

In the papers in this collection we consider the challenges that we face and the impact that we achieve when responding to emergencies.

The papers remind us of the fundamental principles of effective gendered humanitarian interventions: the need for good gender analysis, appropriate financial resources, and genuine forms of participation. They show through their examples the importance of partnership with organizations which have sufficient knowledge and appreciation of gendered local circumstances and credibility within communities. They provide useful examples of and reflections on the fact that women's participation in project and programme activity needs to go beyond a question of numbers to include the search for creative solutions to overcome the resistance that gender-sensitive development and humanitarian interventions often generate. The point is also made – in several of the papers – that men's participation is equally important to promote their rights and the effectiveness of our interventions. A lesson that emerges from Oxfam humanitarian and DRR work – for example in West Sumatra – is that adopting a policy-influencing approach to gender-equality issues is an extremely effective way to make positive change take root and outlive the emergency response. A similar lesson is evident from the way in which our work in Vietnam embedded gender-equality considerations at all levels of the country's organizational structures. These two examples also illustrate an equally important element for success: the need to involve and support women's organizations in humanitarian work.

An overall lesson from the collection is that, to ensure long-term change that transforms the lives of women and men living in poverty, programmes need to specifically tackle the gender inequalities that shape women and men's roles, responsibilities, and status in their complexity. They also need to do so from different angles and sectors, and through sustained and long-term efforts involving a wide range of actors. For example, a 2012 evaluation of the Protection programme in DRC recognized its tangible gains in women's political engagement. It also highlighted the need to continue addressing wider barriers to women's participation, for example through access to literacy training. The notion and practices of resilience are also a promising avenue towards a more systematic promotion of transformation.

The contents and activities associated with this publication have also reminded us that reflection, analysis, and documentation of our work are essential for making sure that experiences have value well beyond their own contexts, and that they can help substantially to disseminate the lessons that we learn from them, and thus make future work more effective.

NOTES

- ¹ Eric Neumayer and Thomas Plümper (2007) 'The gendered nature of natural disasters: the impact of catastrophic events on the gender gap in life expectancy, 1981–2002', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 97 (3), pp. 551–566.
- ² 'Armed Conflict Deaths Disaggregated by Gender' (Christin Ormhaug, in collaboration with Patrick Meier and Helga Hernes, PRIO Paper, November 2009).
- ³ *Arrows for Change*, 17 (2), Asian–Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women, 2011.
- ⁴ J. Hoare, I. Smyth, and C. Sweetman (2012) 'Introduction: post disaster humanitarian work', *Gender and Development*, vol. 20, July 2012.
- ⁵ Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters, *Extract from the final report of the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (A/CONF.206/6)*p7, http://www.unisdr.org/files/1037_hyogoframeworkforactionenglish.pdf
- ⁶ Inter-Agency Standing Committee Policy Statement for the Integration of a Gender Perspective in Humanitarian Assistance, 31 May 1999
http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/pageloader.aspx?page=content-subsidi-tf_gender-default
- ⁷ The Sphere Project: Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response, <http://www.sphereproject.org/>
- ⁸ Oxfam Internal Gender Learning Review of Pakistan Flood Response 2010–2011', September 2011.
- ⁹ *ibid*
- ¹⁰ The Change Makers are a defining characteristic of the Campaign. They are individuals who pledge to transform their own attitudes on the causes and consequences of violence against women and to encourage those around them to do the same.
- ¹¹ Duncan Green's blog, 22 June 2012: <http://www.oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/?s=Transformation&x=19&y=8>

© Oxfam GB, October 2012

This paper was written by Ines Smyth. Oxfam acknowledges the assistance of Stephanie de Chassy, Tess Dico Young, Tom Fuller, and Claire Harvey.

This publication is copyright but the text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. E-mail policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk.

The information in this publication is correct at the time of going to press.

Published by Oxfam GB under ISBN 978-1-78077-188-5 in October 2012.

Oxfam GB, Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, UK. Oxfam GB is a member of Oxfam International.

OXFAM

Oxfam is an international confederation of 17 organizations networked together in 92 countries, as part of a global movement for change, to build a future free from the injustice of poverty.