



GRASSP ANNEX

An Investigation of Gender Mainstreaming in Social Protection Policy

Understanding the processes, actors and institutions that shaped integration of gender into social assistance policy reforms in Viet Nam

Nicholas Mathers, Mathilde Van Drooghenbroeck, Eszter Timár and Tran Nhu Trang

June 2024

I. Changes in Decree 20 compared to Decree 136

| Article | Change |
|--|--|
| Chapter 1 | |
| Article 1. Scope | |
| Article 2. Interpretation of terms | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longer list of definitions. • Removal of definition of “HIV infected person without working capacity” and addition of “force majeure event”, “serious consequences due to natural disasters, fire, traffic accidents or other force majeure events” and “individuals holding obligations and rights to take care of elderly”. |
| Article 3. Basic principles | |
| Article 4. Standard social support amount | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard amount increased from VND 270,000 to VND 360,000. • Discretionary extension of support in surplus provinces: “other individuals facing difficulties not specified under this Decree” (in addition to the existing option to increase benefit levels). |
| Chapter 2 | |
| Article 5. Social assistance beneficiaries eligible for monthly social benefits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HIV-infected people: Split of children and adults into two separate categories and removal of “no monthly pension or social allowance” requirement for HIV-infected children in poor households. • Addition of “near-poor” single parents. (In Decree 136, it was only poor.) • Older persons: Extension to 75–80 in poor or near-poor households living in ethnic minority communes, hamlets and mountainous regions. • Persons with disabilities: The wording now says “severe disabilities”, but the description of eligibility still refers to what is stipulated in the Law on Disabilities (no substantive change). • Children under 3: Introduction of transfers for children in poor and near-poor households living in ethnic minority communes, hamlets and mountainous regions. |
| Article 6. Monthly social benefit | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of coefficients for newly included beneficiary groups. |
| Article 7. Dossier for monthly social allowance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The names of the forms to be filled out are specified in Decree 20, whereas Decree 136 states “the Form specified by the Ministry of Labor - Invalids and Social Affairs” and a list of what it should contain. |
| Article 8. Procedures for implementation and suspension of entitlement to monthly social allowance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application review by the Social Support Approval Council removed from Decree 20. |
| Article 9. Issue of Health Insurance Card | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simplified list of eligible people: Instead of listing various independent categories, Decree 20 states that “<u>social assistance beneficiaries</u> shall be issued...”, but there is no meaningful difference. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exception: Decree 136 mentions “people with serious disability and particularly serious disability”, but it is likely that this was only removed from the new decree due to duplication with the Law on Health Insurance. |
| Article 10. Support for education, training and vocation | |
| Article 11. Funeral cost support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decree 136 states: “Where the subjects specified in Paragraph 1 of this Article are given the funeral cost support with different rates, they shall be entitled to the highest rate.” This does not appear in Decree 20. Specification of the application form number. |
| Chapter 3: Emergency social support | |
| Article 12. Food and necessity support utilizing state budget | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While Decree 136 only mentions food support (15 kg rice/person), Decree 20 includes the option of in-kind “necessities” such as tents, blankets and motorized boats. |
| Article 13. Support for injured individuals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difference in amount of support to be provided: In Decree 136, it <i>equals</i> 10 times the social assistance standard; in Decree 20, it is a <i>minimum</i> of 10 times the social assistance standard. |
| Article 14. Financing of funeral support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased funeral support rate in Decree 20: 50 times the social assistance standard versus 20–30 times in Decree 136. |
| Article 15. Financing for house construction and repair | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased support (ranging from 20,000 to 40,000 VND in Decree 20 versus 15,000 to 20,000 VND in Decree 136). |
| Article 16. Emergency support for children whose parents are deceased or go missing due to natural disasters, fire, diseases or other force majeure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decree 136 states that the application procedure should follow the funeral cost support procedure. In Decree 20, the application procedure follows the urgent necessities support procedure. |
| Article 17. Support for job creation and production development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional clause in Decree 20 giving discretion to People’s Committees to provide support for particularly serious situations/emergencies. |
| Chapter 4: Care and nurture in the community | |
| Article 18. Eligibility for receiving care and nurture in community | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change, except for the addition of a sentence specifying that the People’s Committee should request long-term care after the maximum duration of temporary care from the Department of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs. |
| Article 19. Policies for individuals provided with care and nurture | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change, except for the renaming of food expenses to allowances. |
| Article 20: Policies for households and individuals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower coefficient for carers of abandoned children aged 4–16, and lone older persons (Coefficient 2.5 in Decree 136 and Coefficient 1.5 in Decree 20). Coefficients for cases of disabilities: Decree 136 simply refers to Decree 28/2012 to determine coefficients; Decree 20 specifies coefficients for households caring |

| | |
|--|---|
| providing care and nurture | for persons with disabilities, and for persons with disabilities in specific life situations (e.g., a person with a disability who is also a caregiver of an older person or a child, or pregnant womanexpectant). |
| Articles 22–23. On procedures and eligibility for providing care and nurture | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Merging of articles on providing care and nurture and providing urgent care and nurture (→ one less article in Decree 20). • In Decree 20: More detailed guidelines on how to initiate care and administer beneficiaries and care providers, who is suitable to provide temporary care and what their responsibilities are, and under what conditions their eligibility for care provision will be terminated (e.g., violation of child’s rights). • In Decree 20: ‘Kinship care’ (although not referred to as such); requirements are more lenient for immediate relatives of the person receiving care (exceptions are provided for relatives). |
| Chapter 5: Care and nurture at the social protection establishments or social houses | |
| Article 24. Social assistance beneficiaries receiving care and nurture in social support facilities and social houses (hereinafter referred to as ‘social support facilities’) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of category eligible for social housing in Decree 20: “3. Minors, individuals no longer capable of working eligible for receiving care and nurture in social support facilities according to regulations and law on imposing penalties for administrative violations.” → The exact meaning of this is not clear, as it is separate from the previous list of people eligible for urgent support. |
| Article 25. Policies on care and nurture in social support facilities | No change, except that Decree 20 no longer defines coefficient for people aged 16–60 years. |
| Article 26. Education, training and job creation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Decree 20, “whichever comes first” is new addition to “2. Children specified under Clauses 1, 2, and 3 Article 24 hereof of 16 years of age or older pursuing formal education, vocational education, professional secondary education, college, or formal higher education shall continue to receive care and nurture in social support facilities until they finish education or until they are 22 years of age (whichever comes first).” |
| Articles 27–30. On procedures, admissions, service contract, termination etc. in social support facilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More detailed guidelines about the steps to take when admitting someone in need of emergency protection in Decree 20 (e.g., assessment of level of injury etc.). |
| Chapter 6: Approval Council of Social Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Decree 136, Chapter 6 was about the Social Assistance Approval Council. Since this was eliminated in Decree 20, there is no chapter about it. |
| Chapter 7: Expenditure on implementation | |
| Article 31. Expenditure on implementation of regular social support policies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of a sentence on budgeting responsibility: Decree 136 states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) “For the social protection establishments or social houses which are under the management of any level, the budget of such level shall ensure the social expenditure estimate. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>b) For the non-public social protection establishments or social houses, the provincial budget shall ensure the social expenditure estimate.”</p> <p>Decree 20 states: “Social support facilities of an administrative division shall be guaranteed by budget of respective government in social affair expenditure estimate.”</p> |
| Article 32. Expenditure on emergency support | |
| Article 33. Management of expenditure on social support | |
| Chapter 8: Implementation | |
| Article 34. Payment for monthly social support policies and financing for provision of care and nurture in the community | Delegation of professional payment providers (e.g., e-payments) added to this article. |
| Article 35. Responsibilities of ministries | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change in the responsibilities of the Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs. • Decree 20 elaborates on the responsibilities of the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Agricultural and Rural Development and the Ministry of Planning and Development (mostly reviewing responsibilities), while Decree 136 contains only a general sentence stating that other ministries should help with implementation based on their duties. |
| Article 36. Responsibilities of People’s Committees of provinces | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of a sentence to Decree 20 on preparing monitoring reports: “1. Organizing implementation of social support policies for individuals specified under this Decree. Assigning Labor – War Invalids and Social Affairs Authorities to consolidate and submit reports on implementation results of social support policies using Forms 10a through 10d attached hereto.” |
| Chapter 9: Implementation provisions | |
| Articles 37–39. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since this chapter only deals with when the decree comes into effect and what it replaces, there is no substantive content/change to mention. |

II. Topic guides

Topic guide (policymakers)

Start the recording.

Informed consent

Hello, my name is _____. We have sent you a copy of the following statement by email prior to this meeting, along with our contact details in case you have any questions.

You have been invited to take part in a research study that is being conducted by the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) Office of Research in collaboration with the UNICEF Viet Nam Country Office and the Department of Social Assistance at the Ministry of Labour, Invalids and

Social Affairs (MOLISA). Although your participation in this study is voluntary, we hope you will agree to answer the questions since your views are important.

The study aims to understand the process of developing recent social assistance policies, specifically Decision 488 and Decree 20, and how gendered vulnerabilities and inequalities were considered during the conception, drafting and approval of these policies.

You will not receive any personal benefit or incentive for participating in the study. However, the findings of the research will be published and contribute to a wider research study on gender-responsive age-sensitive social protection, which aims to improve social protection policy and implementation in Viet Nam and other countries.

The interview should take approximately 1 to 1.5 hours. Your name and each individual answer you provide will be confidential and will not be shared with any other person outside the research team. You will not be identified in any publications.

We do not believe that participating in the interview will cause any risk to you personally.

However, if we ask any question that you do not want to answer, let me know and I will move on to the next one. You can also stop the interview at any time.

- Do you understand the statement and agree to be interviewed?
- Do you have any questions for me?
- Do you mind if we continue to record this interview? (If no, then confirm that the second interviewer will take written notes.)
- Can I start the interview now?

Complete these details in the Master List.

Interview date: ____ / ____ / ____
 day month year

Interviewee's I.D.: _____

Primary interviewer: _____

Secondary interviewer: _____

Introduction (all respondents)

(If necessary) Can you please briefly introduce yourself, including your current and past positions?

We are discussing the recent social assistance reforms, specifically Decision 488/2017 (the Master Plan for Social Assistance Reform and Development) and Decree 20/2021. Please tell me briefly how you came to work on these policies.

We are interested in the different phases of the policy process, including needs identification, policy drafting and opinion-seeking, and appraisal and approval. For both Decision 488 and Decree 20, can you please tell me which stage or stages of the policy process you feel most confident to talk about?

(Note: Decide which policy to focus on for the interview.)

Interviewer to confirm that the informant is involved in:

| | Decision 488 | Decree 20 |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Needs identification | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Policy drafting | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Policy approval | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Part 1. For respondents involved in the needs-identification process

1. *(Ask only if necessary.)* Can you confirm whether you had any kind of involvement in the needs-identification process for Decision 488 or Decree 20?
2. When it was decided that social assistance should be reformed, at the time of Resolution 15/2012, do you recall why it was requested and if there was any demand for the policy to be gender-responsive?
 (Prompts: Were there internal demands from inside the Government/Ministry and/or external demands? What do you know about them? What were the demands about? Was there any gender-related evidence (data, research, evaluations, etc.) that informed the decision to reform?)
3. Policy dialogue can involve both formal and informal discussions between policymakers and different experts and advocates; from a phone call to bilateral meetings, to conferences. Prior to the drafting process (for Decision 488/Decree 20), do you know if there was any policy dialogue about the social assistance reform’s gender-responsiveness? Can you tell me more about it?
 (Prompts: Who initiated the dialogue and who was involved? What was your participation in this dialogue? What were the debates/discussions? Were there any other formal/informal discussions?)
4. Do you know about any gender evidence (data, research, evaluations, etc.) that was used during the policy dialogue prior to the drafting process to support gender’s integration into the social assistance reform?
 (Prompts: What evidence specifically? Were you engaged in any relevant evidence production? Who else was involved in commissioning or producing that evidence [governmental/non-governmental actors]? Was it produced for the sake of the reform [Decision 488 or Decree 20]? Was sufficient evidence produced?)
5. What were your own perceptions of the gender-related recommendations at the time of the policy dialogue?
 (Prompts: Did you think they were necessary/unnecessary, realistic/unrealistic etc.? Were any public or private commitments made to integrate the recommendations?)
6. Are you aware of any other gender-related evidence that was relevant for the reforms?
 (Prompts: What evidence specifically? Who commissioned it and who produced it? Was it produced for the sake of the reform? What were your perceptions of it?)

7. Can you share with us copies of the evidence you have mentioned? If so, we can follow up by email.
8. How could the gender needs-identification process have been improved prior to policy drafting?
(Ask only if necessary and there is sufficient time.) What is your experience of needs identification for the other policy (Decision 488 or Decree 20)? Were there any notable differences in how gender was considered?

Part 2. For respondents involved in the policy drafting process

1. (Ask only if necessary.) Can you confirm whether you had any kind of involvement in the policy drafting process for Decision 488/Decree 20?
2. Can you describe the policy drafting process for Decision 488/Decree 20 and your specific involvement in the process?
(Prompts: Different stages in the drafting; key internal and external actors engaged/consulted; any challenges/delays experienced during the process)
3. Do you know at what points in the drafting process gender vulnerabilities, inequalities and responses were discussed internally within the drafting board and who was involved in that discussion?
(Prompts: How was the Gender Equality Department engaged in the process? Were any other internal actors engaged?)
4. Can you recall the discussion about it? What were the gender-responsive elements included in the draft texts at that point?
(Prompts: What gender-responsive elements were not included in the draft texts? Why not? Which of these seemed important to you? Why?)
5. To integrate gender-responsive elements into the policy being drafted (Decision 488/Decree 20), did you personally receive any form of support? Did you receive advice from any gender experts? Did you use any specific gender integration guidelines or apply anything you may have learned from a past gender training session?
6. As part of the 'opinion-seeking phase', do you recall whether any gender-related recommendations from external consulted actors were incorporated into the drafting process? Please share your experience.
(Prompts: How and by whom were these recommendations made to you and the drafting board? What specific gender-related recommendations were made? Were they included in the draft texts? What recommended gender-responsive elements were not included in the draft texts? Why not?)
7. Can you recall whether the policy was published on MOLISA's portal as part of the 'opinion-seeking' phase or if any gender-related recommendations were received?
(Prompts: What was/were the recommendation(s)? Were they able to be considered in the draft? If not, why?)
8. I understand that the final approved version of the policy text may have differed to the initial drafts. What about the gender-responsive aspects of the text? How did it evolve during the process?
(Prompts: Were any gender-responsive elements included in the draft texts but later removed? Why?)

9. Can you share with us copies of the draft texts/submissions from the drafting process with different recommendations for the policy? These could be comments on the draft texts or other written documents. If so, we can follow up by email.
10. To what extent do you consider Decision 488/Decree 20 to be gender-responsive?
(Prompts: What specific elements do you feel respond to gendered vulnerabilities and inequalities? What would a more gender-responsive policy look like to you?)
11. How could the overall policy drafting process have been improved to better integrate gender considerations?
12. Are you aware of the legal requirement for a Gender Impact Assessment (GIA) of any new law or policy (Decree 34/2016/NĐ-CP)? Was the GIA applied to Decision 488/Decree 20? If so, could you tell us about that process and if it had any kind of impact on the policy text?
(Prompt: When and by whom was the GIA conducted? Did you have any kind of involvement in that process? Are there any particular points you can recall? How was the quality of the assessment? What were the outcomes of the assessment? If it was not applied, do you know why not and when this was decided?)
13. *(To be asked if the GIA was applied)* Can you share with us a copy of the GIA justification attached to the final policy text? If so, we can follow up by email.
14. *(Ask only if necessary and there is sufficient time.)* What was your experience of the drafting of the other policy (Decision 488 or Decree 20)? Were there any notable differences in how gender was considered during the drafting phase?

Part 3. For respondents involved in the policy approval process

1. *(Ask only if necessary.)* Can you confirm whether you had any kind of involvement in the policy approval process for Decision 488/Decree 20?
2. Once the Decision 488/Decree 20 text was drafted, do you know what the specific process was up to government approval? Were you engaged in this process? How? Can you tell us about your experience?
(Prompt: If you were responsible for reviewing and/or authorizing the texts, did you make any changes to the content of the texts? If so, was this related to gender-responsive content? Why/why not?)
3. Regarding the different bodies that were required to review and approve the texts prior to their issuance (e.g., the Ministry of Justice, the Government and the Social Affairs Committee of the National Assembly), are you aware of any recommendations that were made to the policy and whether they impacted the gender-related content of the texts?
(Prompts: Were any gender experts invited to the inspection meeting [led by the Ethnic Council or the Social Affairs Committee of the National Assembly]? What were their recommendations? Were they able to be taken into account?)
4. *(To be asked if the GIA was applied)* Do you know/recall where one of those bodies commented or asked about the GIA outcomes (included as a policy attachment)?
5. How could the policy approval process have been improved to better integrate gender considerations?
6. *(Ask only if necessary and there is sufficient time.)* What was your experience of the approval process for the other policy (Decision 488 or Decree 20)? Were there any notable differences in how gender was considered?

Part 4. 'Gender' knowledge and perceptions (for all respondents)

1. How could the policy (Decision 488/Decree 20) have been more gender-responsive?

2. How could the policymaking process have been more gender-responsive?
3. In your opinion, what is the role of social protection in addressing gendered vulnerabilities?
What about the role of social assistance more specifically?
(Prompts: How do you understand gender inequality? How does gender inequality manifest in Viet Nam?)
4. How would you define 'gender mainstreaming'? In your opinion, is gender mainstreaming useful in making social protection policies gender-responsive?
5. Do you know if there are any gender mainstreaming processes within MOLISA or if any gender mainstreaming mechanisms embedded within the Ministry were engaged during the Decision 488 and Decree 20 policymaking processes?

(Final SNOWBALLING question)

Can you recommend any other person involved in the policy process who we might be interested in speaking to? (*International organizations, NGOs, academics, independent experts, etc.*)

End

Topic guide: Gender advocates

Start the recording.

Informed consent

Hello, my name is _____. (*Brief introductions.*) We have sent you a copy of the following statement by email prior to this meeting, along with our contact details in case you have any questions.

You have been invited to take part in a research study that is being conducted by *UNICEF Innocenti – Global Office of Research and Foresight* in collaboration with the UNICEF Viet Nam Country Office and the Department of Social Assistance at the Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA). Your participation in this study is voluntary but we hope you will agree to answer the questions since your views are important.

The study aims to understand more about the development processes of recent social assistance policies, specifically Decision 488 and Decree 20, and how gendered vulnerabilities and inequalities were considered during the conception, drafting and approval of these policies.

You will not receive any personal benefit or incentive for participating in the study. However, the findings of the research will be published and will contribute to a wider research study on gender-responsive age-sensitive social protection, which aims to improve social protection policy and implementation in Viet Nam and other countries.

The interview should take approximately 1.5 hours. Your name and each individual answer you provide will be confidential and will not be shared with any other person outside the research team. You will not be identified in any publications.

We do not believe that participating in the interview will cause any risk to you personally. However, if we ask any question that you do not want to answer, let me know and I will move on to the next one. You can also stop the interview at any time.

- Do you understand the statement and agree to be interviewed?
- Do you have any questions for me?

- Do you mind if we continue to record this interview? (If no, then confirm that the second interviewer will take written notes.)
- Can I start the interview now?

| | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Complete these details in the Master List. | | | |
| Interview date: | _____ | / | _____ |
| | day | month | year |
| Interviewee's I.D.: | _____ | | |
| Primary interviewer: | _____ | | |
| Secondary interviewer: | _____ | | |

Introduction (all respondents)

(If necessary) Can you please briefly introduce yourself, including your current and past positions?

We are discussing the recent social assistance reforms, specifically Decision 488/2017 (the Master Plan for Social Assistance Reform and Development) and Decree 20/2021. Please tell me briefly how you came to work on these policies?

We are interested in the different phases of the policy process, including needs-identification, policy drafting and approval. For both Decision 488 and Decree 20, can you please tell me which stage or stages of the policy process you feel most confident to talk about?

(Note: Decide which policy to focus on for the interview.)

Interviewer to confirm that the informant is involved in:

| | Resolution 15 | Decision 488 | Decree 20 |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Needs-identification | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Policy drafting | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Policy approval | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Part 1. For respondents involved in the needs-identification process

1. *(Ask only if necessary.)* Can you confirm whether you had any kind of involvement in the needs-identification process for Decision 488/Decree 20?

2. When it was decided that social assistance should be reformed, at the time of Resolution 15/2012, do you recall whether there was any demand for the policy to be gender-responsive?

(Prompts: From whom? Do you know why? Were they different kinds of demands? Did your organization have any specific demands about this? If so, what was your organization's demand/position?)

3. Policy dialogue can involve both formal and informal discussions and events between policymakers and different experts and advocates. Prior to the drafting process (of Decision 488 or Decree 20), do you know if there was any policy dialogue about the reform's gender-responsiveness? Can you tell me more about it?

(Prompts: Who initiated the dialogue and who was involved? What was your participation/engagement/position in this dialogue? What were the debates/discussions? Were there any other formal/informal discussions?)

4. Do you know about any gender evidence (data, research, evaluations, etc.) that was used during the policy dialogue to support gender's integration into the social assistance reform?

(Prompts: What evidence specifically? Were you engaged in any relevant evidence production? Who else was involved in commissioning and producing this evidence (governmental/non-governmental actors)? Was it produced for the sake of the reform? Was this evidence produced specifically and sufficiently/adequately to influence the proposed reform?)

5. What, to you, were some of the most important recommendations from this evidence for the design or implementation of social assistance?
6. How do you think these recommendations were perceived by the government officials responsible for social assistance policy reform at the time, and why?

(Prompts: What public and private commitments were made? Did the discussions have any influence on the way gendered vulnerabilities and inequalities were considered when social assistance was reformed?)

7. Are you aware of any other evidence or channels that were used to influence the gender-responsiveness of the social assistance reforms?

(Prompts: What evidence specifically? Who commissioned and who produced it? Was it produced for the sake of the reform? What were your perceptions of it?)

8. Can you share with us copies of the evidence you have mentioned? If so, we can follow up by email.
9. How could the process of gender needs-identification have been improved prior to policy drafting?
10. *(Ask only if necessary and there is sufficient time.)* What was your experience of needs-identification for the other policy (Decision 488 or Decree 20)? Were there any notable differences in how gender was considered?

Part 2. For respondents involved in the policy drafting process

1. *(Ask only if necessary.)* Can you confirm whether you had any kind of involvement in the policy drafting process for Decision 488/Decree 20?
2. What do you know about how the policy drafting process went for Decision 488/Decree 20?
3. What do you know about how gender and gendered vulnerabilities/inequalities were considered in the drafting process (for the different versions of the texts)?
4. Were you consulted during the drafting process? Please tell us about your participation in this process.

(Prompts: At what stage? Formally or informally? On which text/version of the text? One or several times?)

5. What were your gender-related recommendations and to what extent were they incorporated into the draft policy?

(Prompts: If not incorporated, why do you think this was?)

6. Were other external actors consulted? What do you know about their gender-related recommendations for the texts?

(Prompts: Were their recommendations different from yours? Were they taken into account? If yes, do you know why? If not, why not?)

7. Do you know whether any gender-responsive elements were included in the draft texts during the drafting process but later removed?

(Prompts: If so, why?)

8. Can you share with us copies of your submissions to MOLISA during the drafting process with recommendations for the policy? These could be comments on the draft texts or other written documents. If so, we can follow up by email.

9. To what extent do you consider Decision 488/Decree 20 to be gender-responsive?

(Prompts: What elements do you feel respond to gendered vulnerabilities and inequalities? What would a more gender-responsive policy look like to you?)

10. How could the process of policy drafting have been improved to better integrate gender considerations?

11. Are you aware of the legal requirement for a GIA of any new law or policy (Decree 34/2016/NĐ-CP)? Was the GIA applied to Decision 488/Decree 20? If so, could you tell us about that process and whether it had any kind of impact on the policy text?

(Prompt: When and by whom was the GIA conducted? Did you have any kind of involvement in that process? Are there any particular points you can recall? How was the quality of the assessment? What were the outcomes of the assessment? If it was not applied, do you know why not and when this was decided?)

12. *(Ask only if necessary and there is sufficient time.)* What was your experience of the drafting of the other policy (Decision 488 or Decree 20)? Were there any notable differences in how gender was considered?

Part 3. For respondents involved in the policy approval process

1. *(Ask only if necessary.)* Can you confirm whether you had any kind of involvement in the policy approval process for Decision 488/Decree 20?
2. What is your understanding of the approval process, from MOLISA's drafting of the Decision 488/Decree 20 texts up to approval?
3. Regarding the different bodies that were required to review and approve the texts prior to their issuance (e.g., the Ministry of Justice, the Government and the Social Affairs Standing Committee of the National Assembly), are you aware of any recommendations that were made to the policy, and if they impacted the gender-related content of the text?
4. Were you invited to speak up at the inspection meeting (led by the Ethnic Council or the Social Affairs Standing Committee of the National Assembly)? Did you make any gender-responsive recommendations, and were they adopted?
(Prompts: Why/why not? Could you tell us your experience of this process?)
5. To your knowledge, were any gender experts invited to the inspection meeting (led by the Ethnic Council or the Social Affairs Standing Committee of the National Assembly)? What were their gender-responsive recommendations? Were they able to be taken into account?
6. How could the process of policy approval have been improved to better integrate gender considerations?
7. *(Ask only if necessary and there is sufficient time.)* What was your experience of the approval process for the other policy (Decision 488 or Decree 20)? Were there any notable differences in how gender was considered?

Part 4. 'Gender' knowledge and perceptions (for all respondents)

1. How do you understand gender inequality?
2. How does gender inequality manifest in Viet Nam?
3. In your opinion, what is the role of social protection in addressing gendered vulnerabilities? What about the role of social assistance more specifically?
4. How would you define 'gender mainstreaming'? In your opinion, is gender mainstreaming useful in making social protection policies gender-responsive?
5. Do you know if there are any gender mainstreaming processes within MOLISA, or if any gender mainstreaming mechanisms embedded within the Ministry were engaged during the policymaking processes for Decision 488 and Decree 20?
6. In your opinion, how could the policymaking process be improved to make it more gender-responsive?

(Final SNOWBALLING question)

Can you recommend any other person involved in the policy process who we might be interested in speaking to? *(International organizations, NGOs, academics, independent experts, etc.)*

End

II. Codebook

| 1. What actions and opportunities with the potential to affect integration of gender-responsiveness into policy construction occurred during the policy reform process? | |
|---|--|
| 1.1 Generic process | This theme relates to any description of the general or typical policymaking process. It includes any descriptive explanation of policy processes, regardless of relation to gender, that are not related to a specific policy (i.e., Resolution 15, Decree 20 or Decision 488). This will help to build a complete understanding of the policy formulation process in addition to the processes described in the Law on Laws and other relevant texts. |
| 1.2 Resolution 15 | This theme relates to any explanation about Resolution 15. Given the relatively scarce information on R15, this code does not need to be subdivided by stages of the policy process or gender-related content. |
| 1.3 Policy process Decision 488: Evidence; consultation; drafting; approval Decree 20: Evidence; consultation; drafting; GIA; approval | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This theme relates to any description of a distinct stage of the policymaking process for Decree 20 or Decision 488, regardless of relation to gender. The code is further specified by policy stage: evidence, consultation, drafting, GIA and approval. This will help to build a complete understanding of the policy formulation process, in addition to the processes described in the Law on Laws and other relevant texts, and the generic policy process theme. • Evidence includes research, evaluation, data, study tours, training on social protection, etc. • Consultation refers to pre-drafting consultations, whether bilateral, informal, via workshop, etc. • Drafting/opinion-seeking refers to all process related to document drafting, sharing with the research committee and other external experts, comments received, etc. • GIA refers to the “gender impact assessment”. • Appraisal/approval refers to the dossier, sharing with the appraisal committee members, and subsequent comments/feedback and appraisal by the Government Office. |
| 1.4 Gender action Gender-related action or opportunity in the policy process Decision 488: Evidence; consultation; drafting; GIA; approval Decree 20: Evidence; Consultation; Drafting; GIA; Approval | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This theme identifies specific actions or opportunities of any actors involved in the policy process that can be identified as having an actual or potential impact on the gender-responsiveness of the policy construction (both positively and negatively), including (missed) opportunities. They may include (among others) evidence production, dialogue, consultation, written submissions, drafting, recommendations and directives by any of the actors involved in the policy process. The code is further specified by policy (Decree 20/Decision 488) and by policy stage: evidence, consultation, drafting, GIA or approval. |
| 1.5 Gender recommendation Gender-related action or opportunity in the policy process with specific recommendation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a sub-theme of ‘gender action’, identifying any actions that include reference to a specific gender-responsive recommendation. This will allow analysis of the type and extent of recommendations that were made in relation to what was included in the policy content. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Decision 488: Evidence, consultation; drafting; GIA; approval</p> <p>Decree 20: Evidence; consultation; drafting; GIA; approval</p> | |
| <p>2. How did the interests (gender ideologies) and influence of key actors determine the integration of gender-responsiveness into the policy construction process?</p> | |
| <p>2.1 Ideology</p> <p>Gender (Drafting board, appraisal committee, gender advocate [governmental]) and other governmental, international and social organizations)</p> <p>Gender mainstreaming (Drafting board, appraisal committee, gender advocate (governmental) and other governmental, international and social organizations)</p> <p>Poverty and vulnerability (Drafting board, appraisal committee, gender advocate (governmental) and other governmental, international and social organizations)</p> <p>Social protection (Drafting board, appraisal committee, gender advocate (governmental) and other governmental, international and social organizations)</p> <p>2.2 Influence</p> <p>Drafting board, appraisal committee, gender advocate (governmental) and other governmental, international and social organizations</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This theme identifies all key actors (individuals) involved in the policy reform process and examines their gender ideologies on gender-responsive social assistance and their ability to influence the process. • Ideologies and interests will be identified through <i>explanations of the rationale</i> behind any recommendations that were made and any other revealed knowledge and attitudes towards four distinct themes: gender; gender mainstreaming; poverty and vulnerability; and social assistance. References to gender and social assistance will be coded to social assistance. This may require double coding with ‘gender recommendation’, but only where a rationale is given. • Influence will be identified through actors’ own and others’ perceptions of their level of influence in the process, including recollection, acknowledgement and acceptance (or not) of recommendations, and references to actors’ credibility. Actors’ influence is also subject to institutional factors, which are examined in RQ3. We code for influence in general (not only in relation to gender integration). • Extracts revealing actors’ ideologies or influence will be coded by the actor type to which the view or action refers (i.e., not necessarily the respondent). Government experts (e.g., retired Department of Social Assistance officials) should be included in “other governmental organizations”. |
| <p>3. How did institutional factors norms affect the opportunities, interests and influence of actors in integrating gender-responsiveness into the policy construction process?</p> | |
| <p>3.1 Policy process</p> <p>Understanding and application of laws and policies governing the policymaking process</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This theme focuses on how policymakers’ understanding and application of laws and policies governing the policymaking process, including gender mainstreaming, shapes (enables or constrains) the gender-sensitivity of the policymaking process. This theme focuses on analytical ideas about what affects the dynamics of the policy process. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Many of these insights will come from opinions on how gender mainstreaming in the policy process could have been done better.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This theme is distinct from ‘gender-related actions and opportunities’ during the policy process (RQ1) that relate to specific actions (or opportunities) that may have affected the content of the policy. It is also distinct from organizational characteristics (e.g., mandate, ideology and resources) in that it focuses on the policymaking <i>process</i> rather than specific organizations and on <i>how things are done (application)</i>, which can be based on prevailing norms (rather than just resources). |
| <p>3.2 Organizational resources for gender mainstreaming Financial resources, human resources, technical resources and evidence resources</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This theme focuses on how the availability of financial resources, human resources (availability, knowledge and skills of gender specialists, and knowledge and skills of policymakers), technical resources (training and guidance) and evidence (research and data) affects the gender-responsiveness of the policymaking process. This theme is also interested in the specific budget allocated to the policy process in general and to gender mainstreaming activities in particular. • This code will also feed into “political commitment to gender mainstreaming”, which will also capture ideas about ‘higher’-level commitment to gender mainstreaming beyond a specific organization’s resources. |
| <p>4. How did wider political ideas about gender, social protection and the role of the public policy affect the integration of gender-responsiveness into the policy construction process?</p> | |
| <p>4.1 Other laws and policies</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This theme focuses on how the requirement to align with existing laws and policies (national target programmes, the National Strategy on Gender Equality and competing mandates of different ministries) shapes the gender-responsiveness of the social assistance policies. |
| <p>4.2 Political commitment to gender mainstreaming</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This theme focuses on how wider-held ideologies about, and political commitment to, gender mainstreaming (including financing) affect the gender-sensitivity of the policy construction process. |
| <p>4.3 Political commitment to social protection</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This theme focuses on how wider-held ideologies on, and political commitment to, social assistance (including financing) affect the gender-responsiveness of the policy construction process. The focus is not only gender-responsive social protection, but also social protection for poor and vulnerable people. |
| <p>4.4 Other contextual factors</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anything that does not fit in with the above. |

About us

UNICEF works in the world's toughest places to reach the most disadvantaged children and adolescents — and to protect the rights of every child, everywhere. Across 190 countries and territories, we do whatever it takes to help children survive, thrive and fulfil their potential, from early childhood through adolescence. And we never give up.

UNICEF Innocenti – Global Office of Research and Foresight tackles the questions of greatest importance for children, both current and emerging. It drives change through research and foresight on a wide range of child rights issues, sparking global discourse and actively engaging young people in its work.

UNICEF Innocenti equips thought leaders and decision makers with the evidence they need to build a better, safer world for children. The office undertakes research on unresolved and emerging issues, using primary and secondary data that represents the voices of children and families themselves. It uses foresight to set the agenda for children, including horizon scanning, trends analysis and scenario development. The office produces a diverse and dynamic library of high-level reports, analyses and policy papers, and provides a platform for debate and advocacy on a wide range of child rights issues.

UNICEF Innocenti provides, for every child, answers to their most pressing concerns.

Published by

UNICEF Innocenti – Global office of Research and Foresight

Via degli Alfani, 58
50121, Florence, Italy

Tel: (+39) 055 20 330

Email: innocenti@unicef.org

Social media: @UNICEFInnocenti on Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn, YouTube and X (Twitter)

Suggested citation

Nicholas Mathers, Mathilde Van Drooghenbroeck, Eszter Timár and Tran Nhu Trang, 'Annex', in *An Investigation of Gender Mainstreaming in Social Protection Policy: Understanding the processes, actors and institutions that shaped integration of gender into social assistance policy reforms in Viet Nam*, UNICEF Innocenti, Florence, April 2024.

© United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), April 2024

for every child, answers