The ENI Gender Database:

Lessons Learned and Next Steps

A project funded by the Office of Women in Development, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research, U.S. Agency for International Development under contract number FAO-C-00-96-90005-00 and FAO-Q-00-96-90006-00 with Development Alternatives, Inc.

November 1998

WID TECH

1625 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Suite 550, Washington, D.C. 20036 USA
Tel.: 202-332-2853 Fax: 202-332-8257 Internet: info@widtech.org

A Women in Development Technical Assistance Project

Development Alternatives, Inc. ● International Center for Research on Women ● Women, Law and Development International
Academy for Educational Development ● Development Associates, Inc.

This publication was made possible through support provided by the Office of Women in Development, Bureau for Global Programs Field Support and Research, U.S. Agency for International Development, under the terms of Contract No. FAO-0100-C-00-6005-00. The opinions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

The ENI Gender Database:

Lessons Learned and Next Steps

November 1998

WID TECH

A Women in Development
Technical Assistance Project

A project funded by the Office of Women in Development, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research, U.S. Agency for International Development under contract number FAO-0100-C-00-6005-00

PREFACE

In the spring of 1998, the ENI Bureau (the Bureau) approached G/WID and the WIDTECH project to ask for assistance in creating an electronic Gender Database. The Bureau identified three reasons to systematize data collection about how USAID's activities engage women in the region:

- To gain a more comprehensive understanding of how the Bureau has been reaching and benefiting women;

- To know of best practices and successful activities for women in anticipation of requests from Congress and other USG entities to report on USAID activities that directly benefit women; and

- To develop future programming to meet the needs of women in the region, or to enlist their participation in achieving social and economic goals.

This report describes the establishment of a highly functional, flexible system. The process required a great deal of work—in fact, about twice as much as the budget really covered—but the result is a system that is an excellent tool and resource for the Bureau.

The WIDTECH team would like to thank all from the ENI Bureau who participated in this process, including Mary Ann Riegelman, Bobby Herman, James Watson, Valerie Estes, Mary Jo Lazear, and Blair Cooper. We would also like to acknowledge a number of particularly helpful people. Bob Wallin, the Russia desk officer, made a special effort to provide contact information for U.S. and local PVOs. Chuck Rheigans, designated by the COTR for the Farmer to Farmer program, used the personal touch to reach all their sub-grantees, and drafted a program overview for the gender database.

Further, a number of people in the field particularly applied themselves, and invested extra time and effort to submit their information. In Russia, Faith Galetshoge was tenacious in her efforts to submit a number of activity reports. Ann Beasey submitted four questionnaires from Hungary that were very well-done. And Irena Kibickaja in Lithuania did her research carefully and presented lessons learned effectively.

This Project Led to One Major Technical Conclusion and One Key Substantive Conclusion

From a technical viewpoint, this sort of web-based system is ideal for two reasons:

(1) It avoids the possibility of receiving documentation that is difficult to access because of different software, older or newer versions of programs, or opening attachments. (2) It takes advantages of a data collection mechanism to provide an information-sharing mechanism for USAID staff and implementing partners.

Substantively, the system can do more than collect data. It is a tool for educating the USAID community about how women may or may not benefit from mainstream activities. While the benefits of women's projects for women are obvious, many forget that other projects, i.e. the lion's share of USAID programming, are not intended for men only. Thus conversations aimed at collecting data or clarifying new submissions may offer opportunities to talk to the USAID community about where women figure in their mainstream activities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND

In June 1998 the Bureau signed a contract with Development Alternatives, Inc. for a 15-week activity to "design and implement an electronic 'Gender Reporting System'." Starting with a planning meeting on June 23 WIDTECH launched the design and implementation of a database. At that meeting, it was agreed that with the level of effort and time allocated for the task, the WIDTECH team would be able to set up the system and gather a first round of information. Once that was accomplished, it would be up to the Bureau to use the new mechanism to gather and analyze information.

WIDTECH has designed and operationalized a database to collect information about USAID's work in the ENI region that has benefited women. Key features of the system are:

- State of the Art Technology: The database makes use of Lotus notes, Internet and Web access. Because it utilized the web, usage by the general USAID community does not require any particular software (e.g. WordPerfect versus Word, etc.) Similar databases that have been developed for the ENI bureau include www.socialsector.net and www.enitraining.net

- Simple to Use: Through Lotus Notes, designated staff of the ENI Bureau (and G/WID) may access information by different criteria through a simple selection process. As set up thus far, they may view information by 10 different criteria: annual obligation, country region, status (e.g. completed, ongoing), sub-region, strategic objective, target population, title, US implementing partner, % of women. The database manager may easily receive, review and approve information from the field on an ongoing basis. Others in the USAID community may access basic information through a simple, web-based mechanism.

- Efficient Information Gathering: The system offers a mechanism that can take advantage of information from the "push" side—that people or organizations who know their own programs or activities may submit information regularly to the system. By enabling people to volunteer information, it enables the Bureau to focus its efforts on cases where the "pull" side of information-gathering is required.

- Ready for Evolving Needs and Opportunities: The database has been set-up to gather and organize data that may not be available now, but that the Agency is encouraging partners to provide, e.g. sex-disaggregated data. It is capably of soliciting and storing information for future needs.

Additional features of the system include:

- Information management, such as approving newly submitted information, can be done only by a designated USAID person who receives an Access I.D.

- It is possible to use the system to establish cross-links with web-pages for USAID partners (so that people can see the other work, more detail, etc.) See, e.g. CNFA, where the web address is included.

The creation of the database included the following steps:

1. Providing a draft request for Don Pressley to send an e-mail to Mission Directors asking that they designate a point-person to receive the questionnaire and provide information. That e-mail was sent on July 8, 1998.

2. Developing a questionnaire as the basis for collecting information. Development included a first draft, revisions with the Bureau, revisions based on field input, and revisions to clarify and improve the functioning of the system (10 revisions).

3. Meeting with USAID IRM personnel

4. E-mailing the designated Mission contacts to provide the questionnaire and instructions for providing information via the Internet. (See Appendix B.)

5. Creating the database platform and putting the questionnaire on the web site.

6. Working with Mission representatives to answer questions and help complete the questionnaire. (See Appendix B for record of people contacted.)

7. Collaborating between substantive specialist and technical specialist to adjust/revise/improve platform

8. Trying to accommodate the wish of certain Mission respondents to be able to work on-line, save and then return to an incomplete questionnaire for additional data entry. WIDTECH experimented with creation of an "incomplete" record capability. Unfortunately, this approach did not work effectively and had to be eliminated.

9. Sending a follow-up e-mail to the Mission contacts with an extended deadline.

10. Identifying a variety of activities that are not monitored and reported by Missions, identifying partners and sources of information, e.g. Regional programs or U.S. Implementing partners, and sending e-mails to them with the questionnaire and instructions for submitting information via the internet.

11. Researching and creating activity records in the database.

12. Reviewing and approving Questionnaires submitted by Missions.

13. Developing "views" by which Bureau representatives may look at different slices of the database. (See Appendix C for copies of views, such as Activity by Country, by Strategic Objective and by Target Population.)

14. Presenting the electronic database to the Bureau and soliciting requests for final modifications.

15. Developing an Instruction Manual for users. (See Appendix D.)

Beyond actually establishing the database, the process has resulted in several noteworthy successes:

- Sending a Message from the Top: While there is discussion about gender throughout the Agency and the Missions, many seem to view the mandate as one of lesser priority. Don Pressley's e-mail sent a clear message to all ENI Mission Directors regarding Washington's commitment to providing assistance to women.

- Disseminating the Message Broadly: The process of establishing and compiling the database involved contact with over 300 people (including every major PVO working in the ENI region). The database project and those communications reinforce a message regarding gender integration and impacts on women that some may have previously viewed as more rhetoric than reality.

- Information-sharing Among Partners: There have been ongoing inquiries from quite a number of PVOs (and others) asking about how they might put their information into the system (including someone with information about USIA's work with women). This system offers a great way for the "public", i.e. USAID's partners, to tout their good work—and to get gender information at the same time. This takes some pressure off of the Missions to produce yet more information, and becomes a public "bragging board" to enable partners to demonstrate what they have been doing for women. If developed and promoted, this system has the potential to become an excellent resource for researchers, donors, women's groups, etc. in the region.

Raising Awareness of Gender Impacts

Each communication about the kind of information that should be submitted to the Gender Database has been an opportunity to talk about gender impacts and benefits. Conversations included discussions of why USAID wants or the information and what sort of information is important. Most importantly, there have been many opportunities to explain that USAID activities may, and should, provide benefits to women not only because women are beneficiaries (e.g. for maternal healthcare), but also in cases where women have been "players", participants or resources. Such conversations have included a range of USAID partners, such as IESC, the Enterprise Funds and Chemonics.

THE SYSTEM: LESSONS LEARNED ABOUT DESIGNING AND MANAGING THE DATABASE

DRAFTING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The objective was to craft a questionnaire that would gather the sorts of information the ENI Bureau currently needs *or expects to need*. Therefore the process began with a review of how various representatives from the Bureau expected to use the database. To move from generalities to specifics, the WIDTECH team presented a draft questionnaire. This was a way to determine what information was actually needed—and what was not.

Not surprisingly, there were some differences of expectation. It was important to the process that there was time to voice those expectations, compare them, and arrive at consensus about what the system should do. It was also important to be realistic about what kind of system could be developed with the limited resources available for design and implementation.

The discussion of the questionnaire involved five people from Bureau, and resulted in a number of revised drafts. Several issues were addressed and decided:

- <u>Quantity of Information</u>: The group considered how much information is needed now, versus what may be useful in the future. The group was certainly concerned about not asking for too much information so that the process of responding would not be unduly burdensome. It was decided, however, that much of the requested information requires only checking boxes; and that the information that would require some searching or research, e.g. funding information, numbers of participants and the success stories, was in fact that which is really needed.

- <u>Availability of Information</u>: The group recognized that some gender-related information is not currently available. For example, there are still many USAID partner organizations that are not collecting sex-disaggregated data. Similarly, many have failed to capture success stories about women participating in and benefiting from their activities. It was agreed, however, that *the questionnaire should not be limited to that which USAID and its partners are now collecting–but that it should anticipate what they ought to be collecting.* It was understood that some of the most critical information would not be provided in 1998, but that such information should be increasingly available.

- <u>Raising Awareness by Asking New Questions</u>: It was recognized that the questionnaire might ask for information or ask questions that would surprise or confuse people who might not have the requested information or understand the relevance. But it was agreed that by asking the questions, the questionnaire raises awareness of the importance of the information. For example, activity managers might not be paying attention to the multiple target populations that their activities reach. But an activity supporting NGOs working on healthcare might address NGOs, women of reproductive age, young people at risk of HIV/AIDS and journalists writing about health issues. Further, and more important for

> the database information, many would not think about the percentage of women benefiting in each of those categories. Maybe women are the beneficiaries of the healthcare, but are they managers of the NGOs, healthcare providers, officials in the Ministry of Health, or journalists writing about healthcare?

To test the questionnaire, the Bureau submitted it to several people in the field for input. Their changes were incorporated into the questionnaire. Over the course of design and implementation, feedback from people submitting information led to additional revisions. For example, in response to some questions, the WIDTECH team changed the questionnaire language regarding “Target Beneficiaries” by adding the word “direct” to the question that asks for the number of male and female beneficiaries. Respondents have suggested some new “sub-sectors”, such as advocacy, women’s health and sexual harassment. It may be helpful to add “women” as a general target population. (The final questionnaire may be found in Appendix D.)

EXPERIMENTING WITH “DRAFT” SUBMISSIONS

The database utilizes the internet/web for three reasons:

(1) To avoid putting the inefficiency and burden of expecting one person in the Bureau to input information provided by fax or e-mail into the system;

(2) To avoid the problems of different word-processing systems and generations, such as WordPerfect versus Word and 5.2 versus 6.0; and

(3) To make the database more broadly viewable and usable.

But as a result of this mechanism, when someone begins completing a questionnaire to file an activity report, it is necessary to submit it right then. In other words, there is no way to save a draft version and come back to the document later. This is typical of any document that is completed and submitted via the Internet—such as order forms for commercial products or questionnaires. For some Mission staff, this was a frustration if they began filling out a questionnaire, but then discovered they were missing information or were called away, and therefore were unable to complete the questionnaire. In an attempt to address this in an innovative way, the WIDTECH team tried to create a mechanism for drafts. In the end, however, this system was not workable. Thus instructions to people who are submitting information now advise people to use a copy of the questionnaire to gather all of their information in advance—and then completing the questionnaire on-line and clicking on “submit” should take only 5-10 minutes.

LESSONS REGARDING COLLECTION OF DATA

Gaining Information from Missions:

- Requiring responses While Respecting Workloads: Gaining the cooperation and input from Mission staff was a critical concern in setting up the database—both in terms of getting the initial information, and in terms of establishing a system that would be more a resource than a burden, and therefore enjoy consistent input. The WIDTECH team anticipated two hurdles: (1) the general information-providing exhaustion at the Missions and (2) an assumption that WID-related requests or issues are not high priority. Consequently, while eager to get the Missions to submit their information, the WIDTECH team tried to be considerate of factors such as work priorities, other reporting requirements, and other pressing demands.

- Beginning with a Narrow Scope, but Anticipating Broader Follow-up: The first step of those who were asked to submit information to the database was to identify activities that met the three criteria for gender benefits. Yet two factors complicated this process. First, once people think beyond the activities that target women to activities that engage women along with men, but still benefit women, there are potentially many activities to report in the database. Second, it became apparent that USAID staff rarely think about how mainstream activities engage or benefit women. Therefore little, if any, information was available. Recognizing that the initial request might be confusing or overwhelming, the WIDTECH team suggested that Missions begin by providing 3 or 4 of their best examples of successes. While this may have limited the amount of information gathered in the first round, it was an approach intended to ease people into the process and to set the stage for the ENI Gender Advisor's follow-up.

  Recommendation: This gender database is not only a tool for storing information, but it is a valuable way to raise awareness and instruct USAID staff about where and how USAID activities may engage and benefit women. The Bureau's Gender Advisor has an opportunity to use this system not only to collect and retrieve information, but to build relationships with people in the Missions and to raise awareness of gender impacts across and throughout sectors.

- Identifying the Right Point of Contact or Source: It is important to think carefully about whom to designate as the contact or source of information at the Mission level. It is common to suggest that WID Officers be responsible for providing the information. The WIDTECH team recommends against this for 4 reasons: (1) WID officers tend to know about activities that focus exclusively on women, but less about mainstream activities that engage women; (2) The people who have the knowledge to identify mainstream activities that engage women are project officers on SO teams; (3) The people who know the activity information, success stories and names of contacts with implementing partners (who may have even better information) are the COTRs or other activity managers; and (4) The process of filling out the questionnaire and thinking about gender impacts is one that should be instructive for all activity managers.

Recommendation: It would be most effective for the ENI Bureau to expect activity managers to submit the information themselves, but to work with the WID Officers so that they may help their colleagues identify appropriate activities and report their successes.

While the limited response rate from the Missions might be interpreted in a number of ways (e.g. that they might have provided more information if pushed more, or that the timing of July /August was bad), we believe that there are three basic reasons for the level of response:

- Because people have not been tracking their activities' impacts on women and do not have the information to submit, they cannot provide the requested information.

- People do not understand that their work may benefit women when it does not target them exclusively. USAID staff tend to be aware of gender or women only in two ways: if a project is for/about women, or if they are counting the number of participants, male and female, in a training course.

- People do not really expect the Agency to credit them for having substantial or significant impacts on women. Since the ENI Gender database would enable them to be credited with their successes vis-à-vis women, one would have expected them to take advantage of a way to tout their work. The lack of interest implies that they do not think the Agency really cares so much about it.

Recommendation: The response to the database (in terms of both the number and quality of submissions) indicates that there is a need to work with Mission staff to improve their understanding of

- The Agency's commitment to women's participation,

- How women may already be benefiting but USAID is failing to track or capture that information, and

- Where USAID Missions may be ignoring the needs of women in their countries.

Improving Existing Entries:

- Incomplete Submissions: In this first round with the launching of the information request, very few reports provide all information. People either do not have the information, or do not take the time to complete the questionnaire in its entirety. It is to be expected that this will improve over time, but it will depend in part on the extent to which Bureau and G/WID staff encourage greater attention to gender.

- Narrow Definitions of Impacts on Women: The initial round of responses suggests that people tend to take the concept of "women targeted" or "women benefiting" too literally. Few Mission contacts seemed to understand the concept of gender impacts or integration within a mainstream project that did not explicitly or exclusively target women.

- Getting Sex-disaggregated Data: Indications at this stage of data collection point to a general lack of sex-disaggregated information. The issue is two-fold: first that it is not required of implementing partners, and second that it highlights the difference between women's activities (that are 100% women) and mainstream activities where women are some percentage of participants or beneficiaries. The activities that do not require disaggregated data because they are only for women represent only a fraction of those activities that must be engaging women. The instances when sex-disaggregated data has been collected seem to be more common among PVOs than among the for-profit community of contractors.

Recommendation: Since the NGOs and PVOs seem to understand how women's participation relates to tracking their results better than the contractors or consulting companies, it might be helpful to target the latter for guidance on why sex-disaggregated data is useful for implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

- Target Populations: Few respondents were able to provide percentages of female beneficiaries for particular types of beneficiaries, e.g. students, journalists or government officials. This certainly is not surprising—and in fact there was discussion during the process of crafting the questionnaire about whether such information would be available. It had been agreed, however, that this kind of question would be helpful to get people to think which women, and in which kinds of contexts, are benefiting. If, for example, women as unemployed are benefiting from business training courses, but women as business-owners are not benefiting from credit facilities, then it is not women in the aggregate who are not receiving USAID assistance, but women in certain social, political or economic positions.

- Funding Levels: This information is absent from many of the questionnaires compiled to date. It may be that the persons providing the information, e.g. WID officers, had difficulty accessing the information. While most programmatic information, including "obligated funding" was accessible to informants, FY funding was usually only available through the financial officers. Getting this information may require that the Bureau and Mission directors make sure that all staff understand that they should be helping to gather this information. (If this raises the problem of Mission staff feeling that Washington is asking them to provide too much information too often, then perhaps there is a way to determine where such information is otherwise available, i.e. in the Bureau's own records).

Alternative Mechanisms for Data Collection

The Internet is by far the preferred vehicle for transmitting questionnaires. E-mailed questionnaires suffer from formatting distortions in program conversions which makes reading them tedious. Additionally, with the exception of narrative fields, information must be hand keyed into all other fields adding to time burden. Faxed questionnaires are burdensome to input, especially if they are hand-written.

Recommendation: The work of gathering and inputting information to the database would be most expeditiously achieved by having people at the Mission level and implementing partners submit data directly into the system. To encourage this, it would be best to eliminate the option of faxing questionnaires. All those who have access to the Internet should be encouraged to use this technology. Exceptions can be made as needed—but with the understanding that e-mailed information not only leaves the ENI Bureau with more work, but also runs the risk of receiving attachments that cannot be opened.

UPDATE AND CHANGING ENTRIES

While USAID Missions and Implementing partners can submit new activity reports on an ongoing basis, periodic updating of existing entries will require a planned process. The WIDTECH team offers two possibilities:

(1) The Bureau could ask Missions and partners to update their entries once a year. To do this, the Bureau would:

- Decide a time of year or date for launching the update process;
- Make a copy of each entry;
- Send the activity report to the Mission/COTR/PVO with a new questionnaire;
- Ask them to send updates to the Bureau; and
- Make changes or modifications at the Bureau.

For this to work, it will be important to track the person who initially inputs the information because that is the person to contact for follow-up (understanding, of course, that USAID staff move frequently). Inputting the revised or updated information would be a process that the WID Advisor would oversee, but might be done by a temporary person who could simply input the information.

(2) A better possibility, which again delegates the responsibility to the Missions each to do a limited number of updates rather than having the whole process fall to the Bureau, is to give each Mission responsibility for updating their entries/information once a year. For this, the steps would be:

- The Bureau makes a copy of the existing database to safeguard the information (so that the modification/change process does not allow for inadvertent loss of information);
- Give each existing entry a code #, so that it can be matched with an updated version;
- Give each Mission and COTR in D.C. a password for authorization to modify; and

- Inform Missions and COTRs of the particular time period (4-6 weeks) during which they will be able to update their entries.

Summary of Recommendations for Others Establishing Such Databases

- The process should begin with agreement on the objective, about how the client needs or wants to use the system.
- Based on the objective and the resources that will be available, it is important to build consensus about what information is needed.
- Because information should be submitted by a variety of users, it is advisable to allot time to develop interest in and commitment to the mechanism from the field, PVOs, etc.
- In asking others to submit information, it is important to advise about whose time should be used to get information. It is not efficient for someone who does not know the project/activity to do it, e.g. WID officers. Those who know the activity, e.g. activity managers, COTRs or implementing partners should be the ones to gather and submit information.
- Note: If those who are needed to provide information do not buy-into the system and see its value, then the system will be of very limited use. A database is only as good as the data that is put into it. To increase comfort with this system, the gathering of this sort of information should be integrated into existing processes of monitoring and evaluation. If people are collecting this data for the R4s anyway, and regularly require sex-disaggregated data, then putting data into this system will require minimal effort.

Need for Adequate Resources and Support

The process of developing a database, collecting the information and addressing deficiencies is time-consuming and labor-intensive. As was recognized at the outset, the resources for this project were not sufficient to complete all aspects of the scope of work. There was too much to do within too short a time period and with too little LOE. To be thorough and participatory, significant time is needed to develop, test, modify, retest and re-modify the database structure and the collection instrument. Thereafter, a significant amount of time was needed to address questions and find solutions to problems encountered by a few individuals at the missions as they attempted to use the new reporting system. While some of these frustrations might have been avoided had sufficient time been dedicated to adequately pre-testing the questionnaire (in its various formats) along with the new state-of-the-art database technology, some were inevitable in developing and introducing a new technology-based tool.

Further, it was important that the substantive person who was soliciting and receiving information spend time collaborating with the technical person designing the system on an ongoing basis. The process needs to be one of constant feedback.

Finally, developing a database that is responsive to the needs of the ultimate users requires ongoing collaboration with them. This process began well with input regarding the questionnaire, assistance testing it with several Mission representatives, and the drafting of an initial e-mail from Don Pressley. The process suffered to some extent thereafter because key personnel who represented the interests and preferences of the client, i.e. the Bureau, were not available while on TDY and vacation.

the same time, however, it should also be noted that while a number of PVOs collect sex-disaggregated data, their representatives do not always know why. Instead, their responses are sometimes mechanistic—lacking a real understanding of why women's participation is important in terms of efficacy and results as well as equity.

Other U.S. implementing partners, such as consulting companies, projects focusing on economics and business and some educational institutions (e.g. Abt, Chemonics, the American Enterprise Funds), tend not to collect sex-disaggregated data and not to be aware of how much they engage or benefit women. It should be noted, however, that there was an overall receptivity to the topic. For the most part, however, they were unprepared to respond to the questions because they did not seem to have anticipated them in their reporting (or implementation). Until the issue *and its relevance to their work* were explained to them, they did not see how it applied to their work. The people contacted in this first round of introducing the gender database did not object to the discussion, and were quite gracious.

Recommendation: The Bureau can purposefully utilize the gender database and efforts to get people to submit data as a way to educate them about what the questions mean and how they can analyze their existing activities to consider the contribution or participation of women.

NEXT STEPS

PENDING DECISIONS REGARDING THE DESIGN AND USE OF THE SYSTEM

Use of the System:

- Based on what has been done so far, what can be done, and a current assessment of Agency needs, what does the Bureau want to do with this system? Is it for "blurbs", is it to track data, is it to get names/contacts as initial sources for follow-up?

- How will the system be kept updated—to track changes in information already submitted versus ensuring that new activities are entered?

- What does the Bureau want to do about "housing" the system. It can be housed at DAI for a minimal charge of $100/year. Or, USAID can take the system at any time. Certain tasks, e.g. changing the web site text, can only be done where the database is housed.

Management:

- Who will follow-up with data collection, clarification and improvement?

- Are there any additional sub-sectors, e.g. "advocacy" and "sexual harassment" that the Bureau wants to add?

- Are there additional "views" that would be helpful?

POSSIBLE NEXT STEPS FOR ENLARGING AND ENHANCING DATABASE CONTENT

Follow-up:

- With Missions: After review and decision-making regarding use of the system, maybe issue follow-up e-mail from Don Pressley. (Note: Giving people the benefit of the doubt and recognizing problems with summertime leave, we decided against a reminder from Don Pressley in September. Instead WIDTECH sent out an informal reminder.)

- With desk officers and COTRs: As them to look at the database, find their country, see what is there—and identify what is missing, especially regarding funding.

- With partners: Send an email to all persons contacted during this first phase of resource identification and information collection, and suggest that they go on-line to view the database, search for their country or organization and review the activities listed. At the same time, ask them to identify and provide information for any additional activities that should be included in the database.

www.socialsector.net. Note: This is not a database, but an web page to encourage and facilitate exchange of information. In contrast, the ENI Gender Database is a database system that can both collect information and share it.

- Look at the list of Technical Assistance Providers on the ENI Training Assistance web page (www.enitraining.net/tac.htm), and contact them to encourage them to submit information to the ENI Gender Database.

Establish Some Data Collection Procedures:

- Develop a policy regarding regional program reporting. To accommodate the potential need for an overall picture of a regional program like Farmer-to-Farmer, the WIDTECH contractor created a record that provides overall information and identifies the U.S. partner organizations. A note explaining this is included in the record's narrative. It would be helpful for the Bureau to decide how it wants to accommodate big picture information in a database that focuses on discrete activities.

---

[1] At the point where it was clear that the contractor's LOE had to be used carefully and strategically, WIDTECH advised her to keep a list and/or file of tasks that had been started, but that could be completed by the ENI bureau later.

- Develop a policy about how to treat information about an activity that is taking place in two or more countries by the same organization. Additionally, how to report funding (total obligation, FY and spent to date) becomes problematic in these instances - e.g. double counting of funds or incorrect reflection of spending levels may be left out of one activity record and included in another.