

## Gender Gap Assessment at City Level: Rationale and Data Requirement

*For the project: Intersectionality-Informed Framework for Implementation of Effective Gender Integration in WSH in India*

### Introduction

The basic concept of gender equality rests on the premise that every human being regardless of their gender is able to get equal access to opportunities and resources. This idea is further resonated in the Right to the City approach. More recently, the Sustainable Development Goals (especially SDG-5 seeking to achieve gender equality) has put measurable targets for countries to achieve the gender equality agenda. Moreover, research substantiates the role of inclusive and equitable urban infrastructure and service delivery, especially WSH, in achieving SDG-5 and 11, the later seeking to create inclusive cities. In this context, measurement of gender equality becomes an important step in both drawing a baseline and assessing impact of interventions implemented to reduce gender inequality. Gender Gap Assessment (GGAP) is a widely practiced framework which helps in measuring gender inequality through a set of key outcome indicators.

The project 'Demonstration of an intersectionality-Informed Gender Mainstreaming Framework for WSH in Andhra Pradesh' attempts to create equal conditions for accessing opportunities and resources for different gender and beyond (i.e., other excluded groups such as occupationally and socially marginalised population, persons with disability, elderly etc.) through inclusive and equitable sanitation planning and service delivery in three cities of Andhra Pradesh. The experience of working in the three cities reveals that there is absence of disaggregated data to assess differential access to sanitation for different marginalised groups. However, in order to reduce gender gap through sanitation planning, cities need to be able to correlate sanitation access issues with gender gap indicators and hence make targeted interventions. Thus, this note suggests three broad heads of data requirement as following. A detailed data template is attached in annexure-1. The various modalities and tools that could be deployed for periodic collection of data is explained in the Operational Guidelines for IIGMF.

#### A. Disaggregated population data

This data set captures detailed demographic break-up of the population both at city level as well as in urban poor pockets. The groups mentioned in the table are identified to specifically capture exclusions exiting outside conventional gender binary of men and women. Some of the categories can be further divided based on specific types of excluded groups residing in a city. While Census captures most of these data, it is essential to update these from time to time and also maintain slum-wise data to indicate both wide and concentration of exclusion.

a) Total population/ male/ female/ transgender
b) Total no of Persons with disability/ male/ female/ transgender
c) No of people belonging to Minority castes (SC/ ST/ OBC/ other religious minorities)/ male/ female/ transgender

d) No of belonging to different age groups (total/ male/ female/ Transgender)
e) No of households (total/minority casts/women headed/ BPL/ any other excluded)

\*Partial indicates inadequate access due to design issues, lack of availability of water, lighting, shared toilet, lack of desludging facility etc.

## B. Disaggregated data on access to sanitation

A review of existing MIS databases and reporting requirements for various urban sector programmes reveal that though there has been enhanced capacities in data collection and reporting, disaggregated data for access to sanitation is still largely unavailable. Such generalised representation of access hinders problem identification for inclusive and equitable sanitation and therefore make targeted interventions. Therefore, it is recommended that the ULB maintains the datasets indicated in the following table and updates the same periodically.

a) Access to HH toilets for different population groups (Total/ slum/ BPL/ Minority castes/other excluded groups/ HH with transgender persons/ HH with disabled persons) under three qualitative categories (yes/ partial*/no)
b) Access to toilets at workplace for different population groups (Total/ slum/ BPL/ Minority castes/other excluded groups/ HH with transgender persons/ HH with disabled persons) under three qualitative categories (yes/ partial*/no)
c) Access to toilets in public places (toilets with universal accessibility design, male/ female/ transgender disaggregated)
d) Access to toilet in school (separate toilets for male/ female)
e) Access to MHM in school (availability of sanitary MHM facilities) in government and private schools
f) Average no of days adolescent girls missing school due to menstruation (govt school and private school separately, also separately for slum population)
g) Have to regularly hold back while outside home (total population, slum population)
h) No of incidences of violence against women, girls and transgender persons while accessing sanitation facilities (total/ in slums)

## C. Data for Gender Gap Assessment at city level

Standard metrics for GGA as adopted by World Economic Forum for reporting gender gap at country level includes four broad categories: a) Economic participation and opportunity; b) Educational attainment; c) Health and survival; and d) Political empowerment. This reflects largely similar categories measured for assessing Human Development Index (HDI), Gender Development Index (GDI) and Gender Inequality Index (GII) reported periodically by the United Nations. The proposed indicators in the table below are suggested for reporting Gender Gap at city level in a pragmatic manner cognizant of data availability as well as urban governance structures.

<b>Educational attainment</b>
Female literacy rate over male (expressed in ratio, benchmark 1)
Female net primary education enrolment rate over male (expressed in ratio, benchmark 1)
Female net secondary education enrolment rate over male (expressed in ratio, benchmark 1)
Female net tertiary education enrolment rate over male (expressed in ratio, benchmark 1)
<b>Health and survival</b>
Sex ratio at birth (female over male)
Sex ratio in adult population (expressed in ratio, benchmark 1)
Female healthy life expectancy over male (expressed in ratio, benchmark 1)
<b>Economic participation</b>
Female workforce participation rate over male (expressed in ratio, benchmark 1)
Wage difference between women and men for similar work (expressed in ratio, benchmark 1)
Total unpaid work hours spent by female over male (expressed in ratio, benchmark 1)
Female average earned in come over male (expressed in ratio, benchmark 1)
<b>Representation and agency</b>
Number of females in administrative/ decision-making position in the ULB over male (expressed in ratio, benchmark 1)
Number of female councillors in ULB over male (expressed in ratio, benchmark 1)
Number of years with a female head of the municipality over male (expressed in ratio, benchmark 1)

Any monitoring framework adopted at a city level to measure inclusive sanitation outcomes need to include all the three buckets in order to provide useful guidance for designing interventions as well as mid-course correction.