

A Long Way To Go:
An Analysis of the Proposed Engagement of
Men and Boys in 13 Country
Implementation and Action Plans

**Authors: Christopher Hook (he/his), Karen Hardee, Tim Shand,
Sandra Jordan, Margaret E. Greene**

29 May 2019
IGWG Plenary

EVIDENCE



RECOGNITION

1999 - ICPD+5 “Men play a key role in bringing about gender equality.... It is essential to improve communication between men and women on issues of sexuality and reproductive health, and the understanding of their joint responsibilities...” (4.24)

2015 - Family Planning 2020: Rights And Empowerment Principles For Family Planning— “attention needs to be paid to empowering and informing clients so they know, understand, claim their rights and can become pivotal partners in ensuring the realization of right in future family planning and health development initiatives.”

2018 – Guttmacher-Lancet Commission – “we recognize that SRHR is too often considered a women’s issue, and so this report acknowledges men’s needs and the part men can and should play in supporting women’s rights and access to needed health services.”

2019 – RW Blum and colleagues, Journal of Adolescent Health (2019) “... if SDG #5 is to be achieved by 2030, we cannot ignore boys and men in the name of supporting girls and women.”

OUR METHODOLOGY

Country CIPs examined:

DR Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Niger, Nigeria + 3 states, Pakistan + 4 states, Senegal

CIP Domains

- Policy and Advocacy
- Financing & Governance
- Demand Generation
- Service Delivery / Human Resources
- Measurement

Extras:

- Gender norms
- Men's services including methods

Analysis does NOT capture:

- Non-FP2020 country documents
- Progress made on *implementing* male engagement
- What's *not* in the plans but *is* being done

OUR FINDINGS

Few policies, norms, and protocols reinforce targeted behavior change at individual/family/community levels

Advocacy with leaders does not *explicitly* target *male* leaders

Strong demand generation programming engaging men lacks focus on gender norms/power

Adolescent-friendly services offered, but *not* explicitly gender-responsive (addressing boys' needs as different from girls)

Measurements don't include behavior/attitudinal change related to male engagement and gender equality

Male methods/services absent

A LONG WAY TO GO?

- Why didn't we find more male engagement approaches in CIPs?
- How do we square these results with the stated commitment to a rights-based paradigm?
- What other research is needed to help us understand **the practical considerations** around the implementation of ME approaches at country / regional level?

Thanks

Christopher Hook, MSPH
Consultant, Promundo
c.hook@promundoglobal.org