



GBA+ Toolkit

Co-authored by the members of the GBA+ Team of the Defense & Security Foresight (DSF) Group:
Maya Eichler, Yolande Bouka, Vanessa Brown, Nadège Compaoré,
Tammy George, Andrea Lane, Leigh Spanner, and Victoria Tait

GBA+ Team Goals

The DSF Group is comprised of regional thematic teams and the GBA+ team. Members of the GBA+ team work collaboratively with regional teams to incorporate gender and intersectional analyses in defence and security foresight research. The GBA+ team has co-authored this GBA+ toolkit to support regional teams as they integrate gender and intersectional considerations in their work from the initial stages of their research to the development of evidence-based findings and recommendations. The GBA+ Toolkit provides a series of key questions for regional teams to consider. A gender-liaison from each regional team is in continuous consultation with members of the GBA+ team to work through the questions provided in the Toolkit. These consultations are intended to support regional teams in their application of GBA+, a central component of each working paper produced by the DSF Group. Examples of completed GBA+ applications can be found on the [DSF website](#).

Background & Context

In 1995, Canada was a signatory to the [Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action](#), which outlines a commitment to enhance gender equality and empower women through policies and programs. Subsequently, the government of Canada created an approach called gender-based-analysis (GBA) to be implemented across departments and agencies. GBA was later amended to GBA+ to include not only gender but also intersectional considerations, such as race and sexuality. In 2016, DND-CAF adopted GBA+ in response to United National Security Council Resolution 1325 and related resolutions, which acknowledge the need for the integration of gender perspectives in conflict, post-conflict and peacebuilding processes, and women's participation in decision making. GBA+ training through the [Status of Women Canada](#) (Department of Women and Gender Equality Canada) online course is mandated for most DND-CAF employees.

Key Concepts

- I. **GBA+:** GBA+ is an analytical tool to advance gender equality and diversity outcomes for all policies, programs, and services.
- II. **Sex & Gender:** Sex and gender are distinct. Sex refers to biological classification on the basis of anatomical, hormonal, and chromosomal distinctions that are used to assign people to male, female, and intersex categories. Gender refers to socio-cultural norms, expectations, and roles associated with masculinity and femininity. It is a social construct that is attributed to individuals on the basis of perceived sex. Gender is a primary way of organizing relationships of power in societies. Distinguishing sex and gender allows for a more comprehensive employment of GBA+, one that does not conflate gender with women. Additionally, one must look beyond gender as a binary in order to capture experiences across the spectrum of gender identity.
- III. **Intersectionality:** Intersectionality is a framework developed by Black feminist legal scholar [Kimberlé Crenshaw](#) that demonstrates how gendered insecurity, oppression, and marginalization intersect with and are compounded by experiences of racialization, ethnicity, sexualities, Indigeneity, abilities, and more and operate along multiple dimensions, including individual, symbolic (i.e. on the level of stereotypes), and institutional. GBA+ has its roots in an intersectional feminist approach, with the "plus" highlighting that gender-based analysis ought to go beyond gender to include the examination of a range of other intersecting identities.

Guiding Questions

I. Agenda-Setting

1. Who is taking the lead on the research and **deciding on the priorities** for the research agenda? What type of consultation is being undertaken to set the research agendas and priorities? Whose perspectives are represented on the research team and whose perspectives are missing? How has this shaped the **research questions**?
2. What **type of data** are you relying on for your analysis? What variables and factors could be missed as a result of your reliance on this data? What other data is available that may be more inclusive?
3. Are your **concepts** conceived in broad and inclusive ways to account for the experiences and perspectives of those not well represented in research and power structures? If not, how could you consult with stakeholders that are not well represented in existing research?

II. Research Development

1. Which voices are represented in the scholarship you are relying on, and which ones are left out?
 - i. Can you identify **biases** in the sources you're using? Where do your authoritative texts come from? Whom has the research that you use traditionally served? Are you drawing primarily from academic resources? What about locally situated knowledges?
 - ii. Who collected the **data** that informs your foresight analysis, and how may the researcher's positionality (e.g. gender, race, ethnicity, class, nationality, or regional identity) have affected the data collection? Have you consulted with underrepresented groups to inform the questions used for data collection (e.g. Indigenous peoples, women, racialized groups, differently abled, sexual, or ethnic minorities)?
2. Whose stories are being told?
 - i. Who are identified as **key actors** in your analysis? On what bases were actors included and excluded from your analysis? Does the research include first-hand accounts of diverse experiences?
 - ii. What histories are underrepresented in the foresight analysis? What **assumptions** do well represented histories perpetuate? Whose experiences are included or missing from the chosen histories?

III. Findings and Recommendations

1. How does your foresight analysis reinforce or challenge **existing power relations**? Who will benefit from the implementation of the outlined recommendations (e.g. foreign actors, local citizens, or local political elites)?
2. **What groups** will be involved in responding to and implementing the recommendations that flow from your foresight analysis? Who is undertaking this work? What power dynamics are likely to be produced by the implementation of your recommendations? Have there been any consultations with the groups in question?

IV. General Reflection

1. Was it **useful** for you to try to employ GBA+ in your foresight analysis? If not, why not? If yes, how has your foresight analysis benefited from including GBA+?
2. What did you find most **challenging** about the process of employing GBA+? What has a GBA+ analysis **enabled** you to see that you would otherwise have missed?

For more information, contact: Dr. Maya Eichler, Centre for Social Innovation and Community Engagement in Military Affairs, Mount Saint Vincent University, lead of the GBA+ team: maya.eichler@msvu.ca. **Suggested citation:** M. Eichler, Y. Bouka, V. Brown, N. Compaoré, T. George, A. Lane, L. Spanner, and V. Tait, "GBA+ Toolkit", GBA+ Team of the Defense & Security Foresight (DSF) Group, 2020, available online at <https://uwaterloo.ca/defence-security-foresight-group/>