

Reimagined in America: What Can the World Teach Us About
Building a Culture of Health?

Episode 12

Advancing Gender Equity

WEBINAR TRANSCRIPT

On the March 11, 2022, episode of RWJF's [Reimagined in America: What Can the World Teach Us About Building a Culture of Health](#) webinar series, Chimaraoke Izugbara of the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) and Erin Bromaghim of the City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office, discussed how U.S. communities can learn from places abroad to build gender equity policies that improve health and well-being for all.

A full transcript of the discussion can be found below.

Please note: Transcripts are produced by a third-party transcription service and may contain discrepancies.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Greetings everyone. I hope you all had a chance to take the Blue Marble Quiz that we had up on screen, or that you might spend a few minutes after the webinar taking it. It's super fun, and if you enjoy it, please share it with others. I'm Karabi Acharya, and I lead the Global Ideas for US Solutions team here at the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. I'll be your moderator today for our, if you can believe it, 12th episode in the Reimagined in America webinar series. If you're returning to the series, welcome back. For those of you joining us for the first time, we're really excited to have you. Before we begin, I want to take this opportunity to recognize and acknowledge that Philadelphia, where I'm based, is the ancestral lands of the Lenape people, also called Leni Lenape. The traditional stewards of what is now Delaware, New Jersey, Eastern Pennsylvania and Southern New York. The Lenape were the first tribe to sign a treaty with the United States.

Despite many Lenape being forcibly removed from their ancestral homes and relocated to Western states, the Lenape's presence and resilience in Pennsylvania continues to this day. This land acknowledgement is one small act to pay respect and honor the original caretakers of this land from time immemorial until now and into the future. Recognizing the histories of land theft, violence, erasure, and oppression that have brought us here. Before we dive in much further, let me go over a few quick reminders. If you would like to turn on live closed captioning, simply select the live captions button on the bottom of your screen. This webinar is being recorded and everyone will receive an email next week with a link to the recording and any other resources that we talk about today. Finally, we ask that you submit your questions for our speakers using the Q&A button on the bottom of your screen. On that note we found that with our webinars, we're often in the middle of amazing conversation just as the webinar comes to an official close.

We know that many of you might need to drop off after about an hour, but for those of you who want to and are able to continue the conversation a little longer, we'll keep the line open another 15 or 20 minutes and continue the Q&A with the speakers. As you may know, the Global Ideas for US Solutions team at RWJF is charged with learning from the world and bringing those lessons back home to help all of us in our efforts to improve health and wellbeing and build a culture of health. Today, on the heels of Tuesday's International Women's Day and during Women's History Month, I'm excited to facilitate a conversation with our two terrific speakers about advancing gender equity. Gender equity is a global issue, perhaps that one consistent social bias that cuts across all cultures and geographies. Yet the ways in which places around the world are working towards gender equity varies quite a bit. Which means there's a lot that we in the US can learn.

We know that the US has made good progress. For the first time ever, we have a woman vice president. Our assistant secretary of health is open transgender. We have a national strategy on gender equity from the white house. But the mass exodus of women from the workforce during COVID and the assault on trans rights that we're seeing in Florida and

Texas are stark reminders that there is still so much more that needs to be done to ensure that people of all genders have a fair and just opportunity to thrive. In the US for example, we still wonder what would it look like if women were paid the same as men or had the same job opportunities? What if men taking paternity leave was the norm and not the exception? What if kids had more trans role models to look up to in the boardroom or Congress? All of these things would improve health and wellbeing in our communities, and that's why we're looking at gender equity on the Global Ideas team.

While no country has fully achieved gender equity, some places around the world have made of these what ifs a reality. Like the UK's pay equity or Morocco's home worker benefits. Their creative ideas, their incredible progress will be the focus of today's conversation and I can't wait to learn more. But first, we always want to start by hearing from you. You'll see two questions that should pop onto your screen. Take a look and click on your answers. The first question, how do you see your community advancing gender equity? Please check all that apply. Then if you scroll down, you'll see the second question. Which is, why did you join today's webinar? Again, please check all that apply. We'll give you a few seconds to complete that poll. Kyle, let us know when we've reached a quorum on those responses.

PRODUCER: Kyle McLoughlin, Burness

Sure. Can do. (silence)

I'll be leaving the poll up for another minute. We're at about 60% responding.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Great. (silence)

POLL

How do you see your community advancing gender equity? (Check all that apply)

- Making a stronger link between gender equity and health
- Expanding representation in local government and leadership positions
- Ensuring economic participation and opportunity for all
- Lowering maternal mortality rates, particularly for BIPOC birthing people
- Providing affirming and comprehensive care for LGBTQ+ people
- Improving access to higher education and STEM programs for women
- Ending gender-based violence
- Investing in care infrastructure—including childcare, paid family and medical leave, community-based care, etc.
- Other

Why did you join today's webinar? (Check all that apply)

- I want to know more about advancing gender equity
- I'm looking for solutions that I can bring to my own community
- I want to understand what we can learn from other countries
- I never miss a *Reimagined in America* webinar if I can make it!

PRODUCER: Kyle McLoughlin, Burness

Okay. Last call, the polls ending in about 10 seconds.

I'm going to cut off the poll now.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

All right. Let's see what the poll told us. Wonderful. Well, very interesting. That, in terms of how you see your community advancing gender equity, there are lots of different ways. The front runner is making a stronger link between gender equity and health at 63%. But then there's a number that is really between 40 and 50% lowering maternal mortality rates, ensuring economic participation, investing in care infrastructure. That's fantastic. Really it sounds like all of the above for many of you. Then why did you join today's webinar? 74% said you want to know more about advancing gender equity. 56%, you're looking for solutions that you can bring to your own community. 68%, what can we learn from other countries? Which is fantastic. Only 8% never miss a *Reimagined in America* webinar. But there's room to improve there. My personal favorite answer.

Thank you all for doing that poll. Let me introduce our two speakers now. Dr. Chima Izugbara is the Director of Global Health, Youth & Development research at the International Center for Research on Women. A research and advocacy organization focused on advancing gender equity. ICRW recently released a report looking at gender equity policies around the world to see what solutions might work for the US. They surfaced a ton of interesting policies and practices in places like Iceland, Tunisia, and Rwanda that I think offer us a lot of inspiration. Chima, welcome. Erin Bromaghim is with the Los Angeles mayor's office. She's been a driving force behind CHANGE, a network that's helping cities around the world apply a gender lens to their services and systems. From LA, to Mexico City, to Tokyo, they're bringing a number of cities together to share models for implementing gender inclusive policies, develop indicators to measure progress and create opportunities for joint advocacy.

If you both want to turn on your videos, really thank you so much for being with us today. What I'll do is I'll kick things off with just a few questions of my own, and then really we spend most of the time in these webinars with the audience Q&A. If you have a question, please submit a question by clicking on the Q&A button at the bottom of your screen. Chima, the US has made tremendous progress towards gender equity, but there's many other nations that are much closer to closing the gender gap. ICRW has been looking at what these front runners are doing and what has made their progress possible. Tell us,

what did you find and are there some key insights that the US could learn from? Don't forget to unmute.

GUEST SPEAKER: Chimaraoke Izugbara, International Center for Research on Women

Yeah. Thanks very much, Karabi, and thanks everybody for joining us today. It's actually a very big honor for me to be part of this event. Karabi, let me start by emphasizing the point you just made, which is that the US has made tremendous progress towards gender equity in the past few years. A century ago, women in this country were not able to vote. But they fought and won that right to vote about a century ago. Then again, in 1965, the Voting Rights Act was passed, which expanded voting rights to women, particularly women of color. We've also seen in recent times a very massive expansion in the number of women who are in formal employment, as well as some efforts to close the gender gap in terms of wages between men and women. As we speak today, you also have more women who hold PhDs and doctorate degrees than men in this country.

These are all major and substantial areas of progress in this country. Then many of us will not also ... I mean, we may remember many of us may not remember, that same sex marriage is also another area that there's been substantial progress. Just from one state in 2004, same sex marriage is now legal in all 50 states in this country by 2015. But like you said, there are still major areas where the US is behind, where it's lagging. Our study sought to identify those areas that the US is lagging in terms of gender equity and other issues related to women's health. The key question our study actually asked was, which countries have made the most progress in these areas where the US is lagging? Which policies did they implement to be able to achieve this progress that they have made?

It was more of a global review looking at different countries, but also focusing on the policies they've implemented to be able to achieve this progress. Particularly in respect to gender equity and isolating progress for women. Our first port of call was the Global Gender Gap Index, which is produced by the World Economic Forum. What this report does, what this index does, is track progress globally in terms of closing gap between women and men across four key dimensions. This index has been published and produced since 2006 and it's produced annually. The four dimensions it specifically looks at are economic participation and opportunity, educational attainment, health and survival, and political participation. I think the last time I checked, progress in over 150 countries was being monitored. I wouldn't want to waste your time divvying into the methodology that we use in choosing the countries and the policies that we've focused on.

But those are all well applied in the report that we just produced. But at the end of the day, we focused on 15 top ranked countries that made the greatest progress over the last 10 years in terms of closing the gap between men and women in different dimensions. There were of course instances, I think I have to say, where that index was

not very effective, and was not very relevant in terms of the US context. Particularly in the areas of health and education. In some of those issues, the US had cemented some of the indicators. For those instances, we had to rely on other globally available and robust measures and reports as well. But specifically speaking, we focused on, in our review and the study ... Sorry. In addition to that as well, we've conducted lots of interviews speaking with different policy makers, speaking with different policy actors, policy researchers and other stakeholders in different countries that we ultimately decided to focus our attention on.

But at the end of the day, there we have about five key issues that we focused on in terms of our specific research and inquiry. These were female participation in politics, economic opportunity and participation, GBV, which is a major issue in the country, maternal mortality. If you have time to get to that, you will see that there are actually countries where that have made major advancement in terms of reducing GBV compared to the US. Then female enrollment in STEM. By STEM, I mean, science, technology, engineering and mathematics. That's also another area, particularly in terms of female enrollment in the field where the US is lagging behind other countries. Female participation in technical and vocational training education is also another big issue in the country where other countries have made progress.

Again, to make it quite brief, let me just focus on one of the key things that we looked at, which is female political participation. In our review, we found that Iceland and Rwanda have achieved near equal participation and representation of women and men in top political positions through electoral gender quota policies. These are policies that specify a minimum number of women candidates that must be on an electoral list. That is something that we need to think about and is something that we found, not just in these two countries, but in other countries too that we ultimately looked into. But to specifically tell you this story of Rwanda, many of you know something about Rwanda or a lot about Rwanda. In the late '80s, and I think moving into the early '90s, women in Rwandan politics were actually demonized. They were portrayed as people who were undermining the culture, the tradition and the way of life of Rwandans and the country.

Very few women participated in politics. Very few women sought electoral positions on the electoral list. But after the genocide of 1994, Kagame and the new government committed to ensuring equal rights for men and women in national development. There have been from the constitution, a series of reforms that have been made to ensure that during each round of elections and even in government appointments, that you've got equal numbers of men and women running for political positions. To cut the long story short, as we speak today, women in Rwanda hold 64% of the Rwandan government seats. This has just been achieved through that policy of electoral gender quotas. Let me pause there for the moment.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

I mean, it's just incredible, isn't it? To think that the same approach or very similar approach is being used in Rwanda and Iceland, two very, very different countries, I think

is absolutely fascinating. But Erin, let me bring you into this conversation. CHANGE is an international network of cities dedicated to advancing gender equity. Members include Freetown, Barcelona, London, Mexico City, Tokyo, and LA. Erin, can you tell us a little bit about why LA is part of this effort and what the city hopes to learn from the other countries? What are some of the interesting things that you've found that cities in the CHANGE network are doing to advance gender equity?

GUEST SPEAKER: Erin Bromaghim, City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office

Well, thank you so much, Karabi and Chima, and all our friends and partners at the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. As Chima said, it's such an honor to be here with all of you. I can tell you that five, six years ago, I did not necessarily have local government service on my own personal bingo card. But what I've learned in the last couple years is just how much where we live defines our journey. I really wanted to be more personally involved in shaping that for my own community here in Los Angeles. When I did, I found how much there is to learn from everything else that's happening in cities, particularly cities, neighborhoods, and regional governments around the world. Our journey on gender equity in Los Angeles really began back in 2013 with Mayor Garcetti's election, and then subsequent work that he led with Mount St. Mary's University here in Los Angeles to conduct a state of women in girls report. Which was an effort to really baseline what was happening around LA with respect to the status of women and girls.

What that led to was a set of data from which we could begin to measure progress. I think that was a really key first step because it then led to an executive directive, number 11, where the mayor took action to really mainstream gender equity throughout city operations. That each department's required to designate a gender equity liaison, to establish a gender equity action plan, to begin tracking their own goals and metrics for progress. Particularly around three lenses, which are operations, services and leadership. Understanding how we were performing with respect to equity in those three categories. What we found in doing that was that other US cities began to reach out to learn more about what we were doing in this mainstreaming approach. That really opened up a chance to share those lessons with other cities. Then as we established the Mayor's Office of International in 2017, the office of which I'm a part, we noticed that we were highly engaged with city networks. City networks focused on climate action, on migration, on safe cities and public spaces, but there was no city network led by or for cities focused exclusively on gender equity.

My leadership are to be mayor of international affairs, working with London and a couple other key partners in our kind of city network space, our city diplomacy space. I began to explore what this would look like to establish what became the City Hub and Network for Gender Equity or CHANGE. We were planning to launch officially. We worked on the concept through kind of 2019 and planned to launch in March of 2020, just about two years ago. I think we all know what happened then, and derailed a little bit so were able to launch online with a virtual event in November of 2020. But continued the work and growth with cities globally. You mentioned we have seven current member cities. We're

growing to hopefully include between three and five additional cities this year. What we really learned from this is just how much is happening in other cities around the world, and how much influence cities and local regional governments can have on the lives of women and girls and marginalized genders.

I'll give you just a couple of examples that I really find extremely compelling and that have informed the work plan that we have set out for CHANGE over the course of the next year. I would point to Barcelona, which if anyone's familiar with urban planning, you know kind of what an environmental impact review is or an EIR. Barcelona has mandated almost the equivalent of an EIR for gender. What does a given policy or regulation or city ordinance or strategy, how does that impact gender in the city of Barcelona? It involved really pulling that into a specific look, really to understand more about how persons across the spectrum of gender identity would be impacted by these policies. Just recently in 2020, the city of Bogotá, who we're talking to now about being part of CHANGE, has introduced this district based care system, care blocks. Which are focused on how communities at the neighborhood level can identify collective caregiving resources, both up generation for elder care and down generation for childcare and come together to be able to meet them where they are.

Provide additional capacity, provide education services and mobile health capabilities to really support caregiving in the home and in the neighborhood and across the city. I think that these examples are just so interesting in terms of how we can then adopt those locally in our own cities. We've tried to do that in CHANGE by producing last year, on the one year anniversary of our launch, something we call The Gender Equity Toolkit. Which is about how other cities globally can get involved in applying a gender lens. We've identified a framework that consists really of four different perspectives. The city as an innovator, the city as an employer, the city as a provider, and the city as a connector to other cities around the world. Because my opinion as what I consider to be a city diplomat and someone deeply engaged in the work of city to city connectivity and relationship building, we do and gain kind of three things from one another in this process. We really build these relationships and ties.

So we know who to call and ask questions between city to city. Who's working on this? Who can we reach out to on this? That has proven to be incredibly effective as we think about COVID and the immediate response. Where Mayor Garcetti, due to his relationship with other mayors, could pick up the phone and call the mayor of Milan and talk about what was happening there, or talk to the leadership in Seoul to understand how to quickly implement drive through testing or mobile vaccination opportunities. Then we also, as a result, exchange those best practices and lessons learned. That starts to build a real repertoire of knowledge that exists at the local level that can be applied to a multitude of places and adapted and scaled as appropriate.

Then I think third, most importantly, we start to create an agenda for shared advocacy. We come together and say, "Okay, this is the standard that we want to reach. This is the future we want." We've seen that in the local activation around on things like the Sustainable Development Goals and the UN sustainable development agenda, which LA

has been an active part of. How do we set these goals and then together find ways to kind of challenge each other and set new bars for progress? I'll stop there, but hopefully can continue in the next section.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Thanks so much, Erin. Really very interesting. I have a question for both of you, which is really about what may I call intersectionality. We know that gender inequity is compounded by discrimination, systemic racism, and many other isms in the United States and around the world. For example, in the US, women of color experience poor health and wellbeing than White women. How are places tackling gender equity alongside other forms of discrimination? Chima, maybe I'll start with you on this question and then move to Erin.

GUEST SPEAKER: Chimaraoke Izugbara, International Center for Research on Women

Yeah, sure. I think this is something that emerged from the study that we did. We found that different countries are dealing with different things. Of course we know that countries have unique demographics, they have unique cultures, they have unique histories and unique compositions as well. Sometimes the intersection of all these things will create pain points in terms of development and equity for these countries. I mean, I can just take the example of New Zealand, one of the countries that we studied. Is dealing with a huge, huge problem around the inclusion of the Māori population, which is an indigenous group. Nicaragua is also another country that we looked at in terms of these policies and programs around political participation. It's also dealing with a population that is increasingly being left behind.

One of those groups to be the indigenous people as well, and a minority population of people of African descent. These countries have all kinds of issues that they're dealing with. Canada is also a country dealing with a large population of migrants, people of the First Nation and people from different races. There is no country that it's an easy task to deal with. But one of the things for us that we found that is quite very interesting is that in many of these policies that we studied, there was this inherent openness to change. A modification in the face of realities and new learnings about inequities as they affect different populations. We found that in Rwanda, for instance, I can just give you the example of Rwanda, race is not a big issue in Rwanda, as many of you possibly know. But ethnicity is an issue.

The crisis that happened in that country was seen as targeting particularly women from the Tutsi group. It was seen as the Hutu perpetuated this crisis against the Tutsi women. But over time too, we've seen a rapid rise in the number of Tutsi women in power. With that, came lots of complaints from the Hutus and the Batwa people in that country. But over this period, we've seen new policies emerge to be able to integrate the voices of these people in terms of ensuring inclusion and in terms of ensuring that they're not left behind in the progress that the other women groups are making. One of the things that

emerged as quite very interesting for me in the whole study that we did was the case of Tunisia. The country launched a new constitution in 2014. By 2015, it established a new government unit.

I think it's called the commission for individual liberties and equity. The goal of this commission was to identify and analyze new realities and their implications for the country's commitment around gender equity. Then to synthesize all the information they can find, both locally, globally, regionally, and all that, and then propose new reforms and directions where needed for the government. Countries are conscious of these issues, but mainly the policy we studied had this openness to incorporate new evidence in order to be able to advance progress and inclusion for populations that are left behind.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

All right. Thank you. Starting with that openness. Erin, tell us a little bit about what's happening at the city level and how are places taking sort of an intersectional approach to gender equity.

GUEST SPEAKER: Erin Bromaghim, City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office

I think this is a great question, and I think we often use the term systemic racism domestically in the US, but abroad. As we've been talking about, it's more about kind of systemic discrimination and inequity. I think what we're really talking about is the way in which compounding inequalities prevent individuals from equal opportunities and access. The extent to which we can change or better understand, as public servants and local governments, how we can deliver the services in a way that is not just a one-size-fits-all. But really ensure that folks have the ability to access those services and those systems and public spaces. Not just defined by one aspect of their identity, but by those intersections. So that it truly is an accessible and equity focused solutions set. I think there are two areas where we can do a better job of understanding that intersectionality when we think about local policy making.

The first is really quantitatively, we need to first, as I mentioned, set a baseline. Get the data and understand what that data tells us. You can't manage what you can't measure, is something I hear a lot from my local leadership. I have to say that it becomes really important to disaggregate that data as well into a place that we do understand and start to see where the different demographic and geographic or age based considerations break out and represent a different result for individuals and how they experience that reality. I think in particular, we are, in CHANGE explicitly exploring how to do that disaggregation really starting with the data capture in a way that moves beyond the binary for gender identity and trying to capture that and also understand then that intersectionality with other considerations like race and socioeconomic status, geography and age.

I think when we look at a disaggregated data set locally, if we don't unpack it, we miss things. This is something that we found in our implementation of the Sustainable

Development Goals, which is you have to be able to get down to a layer of disaggregation to see where true inequities exist. That can be incredibly telling, a little scary, and really disappointing in some cases. The example that I use most often is around maternal mortality. I know that RWJF has done some great work in supporting organizations that are looking at the disproportionate impacts of maternal mortality on African American women in the US. We see that at the local level, we see that at the state level, and obviously nationally. Where in California as a whole, you see around 16, 17 deaths per 100,000 live births in looking specifically at maternal mortality, SDG 3.1 for those SDG folks out there. When we look at how that breaks out in the disaggregated context, African American women are closer to 60. The global measure per the SDG is 70 per 100,000.

While the US or California or Los County tends to think of itself as making progress or having kind of solved that one, we're not when you actually disaggregate the data and understand how disproportionate the impacts are for people of certain races and ethnicities. Now, I also want to just flag, the second part of that I think is to really use that data and understand how we can apply it qualitatively. What we're doing in the city with the SDGs and with our work in CHANGE is to think about how we can understand the lived experience of an individual as they enter into public services or the system in which they interface with the city in particular. We've done a couple projects. One I'll point to is called struggling to stay housed, where we looked at how different people experience housing insecurity in Los Angeles. Mapping out their journey, not just kind of, tell us your data, or we have data that says 60% of people are experiencing extreme rent burden.

But what does that mean in terms of how they are able to find and access the services that can support them so that they can stay in housing or find the types of benefits or public services that can support them through the process of that struggle. That's something obviously we want to solve housing insecurity all together. But in the way of doing that, we have to understand that people approach that and find those services differently. We need to tailor our public response as a result. I think it's really key that we begin to think both about baselining the data, understanding the data in a disaggregated context, and then being able to understand how that translates into the lived experience of someone who is that data. I think if we don't do that, we'll be missing huge opportunities and we'll end up leaving people behind.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Yeah. Thanks, Erin. Such important points you've made. The data piece is so critical, and I really appreciate that you brought in the lived experience aspect of it. That is a very important source of data and information that you can use. I do want to open it up to the audience for your questions. If you have a question, please put it into the Q&A function at the bottom of your screen. We will try to get to as many questions as we can. Let me turn to the first question. Erin, this is for you. The question is, "I'm reassured to hear that LA is using the SDGs." Maybe just give folks a brief sentence on what the SDGs are because I know not everyone is familiar with the SDGs. "I'm reassured to hear that LA's

using the SDGs to help address the challenges in gender. In my experience, there's a subtle belief that the SDGs are not relevant to developed countries. What are your thoughts about how to change this perspective?" Erin.

GUEST SPEAKER: Erin Bromaghim, City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office

Well, we could go on for hours about that. Full disclosure, I am an SDG zealot. I believe deeply in the goals, and particularly in the relevance to this question, the fact they're a universal agenda. The SDGs did differentiate between "developed and developing countries". This is an agenda that we all pledge to support, understand and implement. I think the most important part of it is something I referenced in the last question, which is to leave no one's ethos behind it. We are not done until all of the goals are met for everyone everywhere. That includes not just us in the city of Los Angeles and the residents of our city and our region really, but the world and how we can play a role in supporting one another in getting there. Now in terms of how that impacts our policy, and just to go back to answer Karabi's question, the Sustainable Development Goals are an agenda of 17 goals that define the future that we want.

They're a UN endorsed agenda that was adopted by all 193 member states at the United Nations at the end of 2015, and went into implementation in 2016. What I would say just for the US audience in particular is that, as part of adopting that agenda, everyone pledged, all member states of the UN, pledged to report regularly on their progress towards that agenda. At present, the United States is the only of any of the OECD countries and one of only a handful of countries remaining that has not produced what we call a voluntary national review, or continued to track their own progress on the sustainable development agenda. It's something that I've been working hard and trying to raise attention to because we are doing it at the local level. That's where the action has been. Domestically in the US, there are a number of cities that have taken us on. Starting with New York and Los Angeles, but also in smaller cities like Orlando and Pittsburgh. We're seeing Minnesota, Seattle, Phoenix get started, and Atlanta working on their own implementation of the SDGs.

This is truly an example of what I think is really important about the sustainable development agenda. Which is the acknowledgement that we have a lot of work to do within our own cities. If you want to try to talk about the universality of it, there are, in Los Angeles, a number of people experiencing homelessness who are unhoused, who do not have access to clean water and sanitation or public restroom facilities. Development, as we talk about it in the US, so often gets referred to as either fundraising type development or something USAID does somewhere else. But development is what happens in our communities every day. The goals provide a common language and a framework and a set of metrics against which we can measure our progress. In LA, we've done a lot to try to report locally. We've pretty two voluntary local reviews.

We've built a community index to try to capture community based input and activities so that folks can more easily find each other if they're working on the goals. We openly

publish our data on a dashboard against, now, I think more than 155 of the 240 SDG indicators. Many of which have been localized to our context here in LA. If anybody wants to talk about SDGs, I'm happy to do it. I don't want to go in forever about that, but I would say in particular with respect to CHANGE, what we've done is make SDG 5 and gender equality, as well as its connectivity to the other goals, including SDG 8 and 16, as well as SDG 1 and 3, we've made that a key focus for CHANGE. We'll be, I think, in the coming months, talking more about exactly how we intend to implement that with some additional reporting on what the CHANGE cities are doing with respect to SDG 5. Thank you.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

That's fantastic. I'll also just mention that we've been supporting the Brookings Institution and Tony Pipa, who has been, I think, a real advocate for using the SDGs at a city level as an opportunity for change and an opportunity to really join this global conversation and global sort of change agenda. I would refer you to the website of Brookings if you want more information on that as well. All right. Chima, let me start with you. I think this is probably to both of you, but Chima, let's start with you on this. This, I think, is a great follow up question to the question about SDGs. But the question is, in what ways are countries and cities that you're familiar with keeping themselves accountable to the stated goals around gender equity? I'm curious what you've seen. Any innovations that have particularly struck you in your research?

GUEST SPEAKER: Chimaraoke Izugbara, International Center for Research on Women

Yeah, I mean, our work operated at the national level and at the policy level, but we also found that quite a number of states, municipalities, depending on how they're defined in different countries, would begin to domesticate whatever government has defined at the national level in terms of policies and programs. But one of the things that also struck us is the fact that there were very little in terms of evaluation mechanisms for those work at the county, state and committee levels in terms of interventions that were being implemented. But it is through that for us from our review and study, that a major, major aspect of pursuing gender equity in the different countries that we studied was the need for a formal national gender policy. Where that did not exist, it tended to have patchworks of different activities and the interventions happening at different levels.

It just became quite difficult for them to be coordinated for people for their impact to be measured. We saw in instances where municipalities, states, counties, however, we define them depending on the states, whether they were a bit more effective, they tended to build their interventions, construct and frame their interventions to align with a national kind of federal policy framework that has already defined what gender equity would like, the different ways to be implemented, how it would be achieved and how it would be monitored. Where that did not exist, there were major issues. That led us to the

conclusion in our work that there must be a national commitment in the form of a guiding formal gender equity policy.

That is what the US just achieved with that framework that was just launched. It was this document, and for us, it was a strategic document, and we found it in many places, that it would demonstrate the government's commitment to gender equity as a moral and strategic imperative. It also tended to define and channel government's funding, remote accountability, encourage the government to bring other people to participate, and ensure that investments were actually going in the direction that the government wanted. I think that's just the response I would have for that question you're raising.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Thanks so much, Chima. The idea of a national agenda, I think, is critically important. Erin, I wonder if you want to add anything from a city perspective around this idea of how are you staying accountable? How are you measuring progress?

GUEST SPEAKER: Erin Bromaghim, City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office

Sure. I think that's incredibly important, is to set up both a strategy, but then also specific and measurable targets and goals to understand both where you've been and where you want to go. I think when we look back at the gender equity work within Los Angeles, what we've seen is, first I mentioned this Mount St. Mary's study that helped us baseline that work back in 2015. One example that we found is, in our Department of Recreation and Parks, we saw that girls were only about 26% of the total participants. We had to dig in again, using that qualitative lens, to understand why. What was happening? We know that there's a drop off in active sports and team based participation in girls around the ages of 11, 12, 13. So what we started to do was create more lasting cohorts, cadres, and set up a program called Girls Play LA. Where we had coaches who stayed with the same group of girls year over year, which definitely created greater retention, and also started looking at other ways to bring young women and girls into the recreation and park system.

Through fitness classes, as well as more traditional sports leagues that you would see at a traditional city rec department. This has been really effective and we've been able to, over the last couple years with the success of Girls Play LA, increase that percentage from 26 to close to 45% participation. We're near parity now. I would say from CHANGE, from the perspective of what we're doing as a city network to really focus on this, we are currently in the process of developing a set of gender equity indicators for cities. This is work that has not necessarily been done before. They exist in various kind of ad hoc or individual reports.

We are trying as a network to build out that set of gender equity indicators, and then publicly report on a dashboard our progress towards those indicators. Those will range across five major themes that run from social to economic considerations, as well as public safety. We're really interested in continuing to grow the CHANGE network, grow

the reporting and the disaggregation of that data, as well as being able to connect it to other external reporting frameworks. I know that UN Women among others are in the process of developing additional gender equity indicators and indices. We're hoping to pilot some of that and see how it lines up with the work that we're doing specifically through CHANGE.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Thanks so much. I think just to pick up on your last point, the resources available through a variety of UN agencies is tremendous. I think it is one that too many folks in the US are either not aware of or do not tap into. Just to reinforce that point. All right. We've got a number of questions. Chima, let me give this one to you, to go a little bit deeper around the issue of gender based violence. This particular question says, gender based violence is a serious issue in South Africa, and there are faith-based leaders in Cape town trying to address it in their community. Do you have any advice for us that would be supportive? I'm thinking about, in your report, what are some of the lessons that you learned around gender based violence?

GUEST SPEAKER: Chimaraoke Izugbara, International Center for Research on Women

Gender based violence was also a very big issue in our work, and very few countries have actually made substantial progress in terms of addressing it. But we were able to find a few countries that despite the criticisms around what they've been doing have made substantial progress. Canada is one of such countries. Of course, Canada has been in the news recently and we all know that in terms of the treatment that the people of the First Nation have received. But when we compared the statistics on GBV with others ... Particularly, remember we are doing this in comparison with the US. Where the US is and where Canada is and a number of other countries are. If I have them I will mention them. But one of the things that we think that has been quite very interesting in terms of pushing the agenda of GBV prevention, care and support in Canada has been a whole of government approach to dealing with this problem.

That is the approach that Canada has adopted. What this means is that there is seamless coordination by diverse ministries, public administrations, agencies, and even industry to push the agenda of GBV prevention at multiple levels. That is one of the things that we found. Of course, I know South Africa and what happens particularly in Johannesburg, which has also been in the news as a very difficult place, particularly for women and rape. Judging by the experience of Canada, I think this is the kind of approach where the government gets involved, seamlessly involving different departments and moving this into industry ... By industry, we are not just looking at where goods and services are manufactured. We're also looking at people who provide services like security services in the city.

Like she said, those services, those industries, all the different arms of government, municipalities, have to be involved. They all have to have a shared vision of where things

are going. It also involves a lot of work. I know that is happening already in Canada. Where the police department, the health department, security agencies, communities are all involved at different levels to ensure that it's not just a patient of prevention, but there is also care and support and services for survivors of ... The criminal justice system is also heavily involved in the efforts that we found that are being made in Canada. I think the other thing we also, of course, South Africa is a signatory to the CEDAW ... What is it called?

It's a signatory to the CEDAW. But the US is not. Canada is, Estonia is, Singapore. These are the countries where progress has been made. Progress has been made in terms of massive reductions in the prevalence of GBV. I know that South Africa is, but I think what is left in South Africa is that, at least judging from the experience of Canada, is that whole of government approach that brings industry and ensures that efforts at prevention, service, care and all that are mainstreamed at all levels and at multiple ends.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Thanks so much, Chima. I mean, I think that is one of the challenges of so many gender equity issues, is that it doesn't fit neatly into one governmental sector. It crosses multiple sectors. Erin, anything you'd like to share around what you all are learning around gender based violence from a city perspective?

GUEST SPEAKER: Erin Bromaghim, City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office

I mean, I think we know we need to do more. What we've done locally in Los Angeles is to try to create a multifunctional stakeholder set of kind of a team based approach to supporting survivors of both gender based violence in terms of sexual assaults, as well as in intimate partner violence within a domestic context. We've created what are called sexual assault response teams and domestic assault response teams. Both of which are a partnership between public service workers, social services workers, as well as law enforcement, as well as pro bono legal support, to try to understand how to create kind of a team based approach to dealing with all the needs that survivors face. Particularly in terms of the immediate aftermath, but also in continuing to seek kind of legal protections for themselves and their families.

I would say, I think key to that is something that I've learned a lot in the context of understanding more about how to capture lived experience in policy making. Which is that, so often in the United States, in particular, we have these various systems. Everyone has their process, and you force an individual to go through each of those systems or each of those processes without that integration. Which is in itself traumatic because they are forced to relive their trauma each time they go and ask for help. What you see as a result is people dropping out of looking for that type of support. It's not worth having to relive my trauma for each of these individual agencies to be able to give me what I need. What can we do to identify and work across some of those systems that exist to streamline those processes and really focus that on the individual as opposed to

on the agency? I think that's what we learn when we look at these qualitative lived experience informed approaches to delivering services at the local level.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Such a good point. Such a good point. Whose experience are we centering? Are we centering the victims or are we centering the agency? Such an important point. I think we have time for one more question within the formal part of our webinar. Then of course, as I said, we have more time in the after party, since I know some people will need to drop off. Erin, this is actually a good question for you. How is change measuring some of the cultural aspects of equity? For example, parity of home, domestic, work and care, for example? How does public opinion polling on equity factor into your work?

GUEST SPEAKER: Erin Bromaghim, City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office

Sure. I'll start with the first part of that question, which is that cultural context is important. But what we also have as kind of a core principle of CHANGE is that we are inclusive of women, girls and marginal genders. Which for some communities, is not how they approach the dynamic. For us, that's a value that we hold central. Is that we are inclusive of all folks who identify as women or non-binary and marginalized genders. This is kind of a no negotiation point for us. If cities are not open to including or being gender inclusive in their language or in their policy making or their approach to achieving gender equity, we feel like that isn't a fit for the network. We've been very deliberate in terms of working specifically with cities that are on the same page with respect to that approach. In the context of how we use that to inform the data collection and measurement, I would say that time use is a really interesting dynamic.

There's been increasingly good work over this in the last couple years. I remember looking four or five years ago and it was really tough to find a well-informed metric of what the disparity was between, let's say, men and women in this context within a kind of domestic work. We've seen a lot of good work on that in the last couple years. I would point to the fact that one of our CHANGE cities, Barcelona, just recently hosted the Time Use conference. Which actually one of focus areas, is on being able to kind of quantify that discrepancy between men and women in the household and in household labor. But what we know obviously is that caregiving in particular is something, as well as domestic work, that falls directly more often on women and girls, as well as people of marginalized genders. This is where we still see an incredible discrepancy.

Now, that statistic is a perfect example of where we then need to connect it to policy. What are they spending their time on? Okay. Well, they're spending their time on caregiving. In some cases they're spending their time finding access to food or portable water. So what can we do as service providers, as public servants, to understand how to meet their needs in that context to reduce the burden of time, or to better kind of make equitable the distribution of labor within the household context? This is difficult because this is where you start to go from kind of what a government can do to how individuals

interoperate in their interpersonal dynamics. This is where policy making always gets really tough.

I would say, I would point to Mexico City who has an amazing program where they're using rainwater capture cisterns. This was a program that was originally not started as a gender equity initiative, but an initiative started by the city to help support access to clean water for households that were not otherwise connected to public utility. That rainwater capture system ended up reducing the amount of time that women on average were obligated to go get clean water for their household, for cooking and bathing and cleaning services. This, in and of itself, became kind of a gender focused program. By realizing who the main beneficiaries were and being able to quantify the difference in their daily workload based on the availability of fresh water at the home.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Yeah. That is such a great example of a solution that Beth Sawin calls multisolving. Where, with one solution, you're solving multiple problems or addressing multiple problems. Thanks for that, Erin. I know some people are going to need to drop off now, and as a result, I just want to thank both of you for your participation so far. If folks are able to stick around, as I said, we will keep the conversation going. We still have a number of questions to get to. But if you do need to jump on off, I just ask that you fill out the very short survey that's going to pop up on your screen. We will follow up with more information about Erin and Chima's amazing work. I also want to say, if you are a US public servant working at any level or sector and interested in incorporating a gender lens into your work, there is an organization called Apolitical funded by RWJF in part.

They're organizing a Gender Equity Learning Exchange for up to 60 people to learn from approaches around the world. The link is in the chat, and it's an amazing professional development opportunity and it's available at no cost. If anyone is interested, we will also follow up with more information about that in a follow-up email. As I said, we will make this recording available to anyone so you can listen to it again if you want. You can share it with folks. With that, let me turn back to the questions. Let's see. Chima, this is a question for you. What countries would you describe as peers for the US in the areas that ICRW looked at? Who are our peer countries? I wonder if there maybe some surprises in there.

GUEST SPEAKER: Chimaraoke Izugbara, International Center for Research on Women

Yeah, actually that was a consideration we thought about initially, which are the countries that we'll consider peers to the US. So that we are comparing oranges with oranges and not apples with oranges. We had that consideration. Of course, our question was slightly different in terms of what the peers of the US would be in terms of countries. But let us see peers. We wouldn't say Rwanda is a peer socioeconomically speaking, and in terms of different areas of development. We wouldn't say Rwanda is. We wouldn't say Nicaragua is. But the comparable countries here of course would be Iceland. Not in

terms of demography, of course, but in terms of other areas of development. It's difficult to say this is the peer of the US, because the US has different characteristics. But we are all posing the same problem. Canada is also a very solid peer for the US in terms of different areas. It's a country just next that a lot can be learned from. Slovenia is a very advanced country in technology. They are ahead of many countries and it's a Northern European country.

But it also, I mean, it might not be as racially diverse as the US. In that sense, it's not a peer. It depends on what we are looking at in who we talk about in terms of ... But the US is not peerless. I think that's the point that has to be made. It's not peerless. There are countries, and depending on what we are looking at, that we can find very comparable countries for ... I've spoken about Iceland, I've spoken about Estonia. Slovenia it's also another country. Canada is there for the country to learn from. Spain is also another very solid country that we also studied in terms of women's advancement, politically in terms of political participation. Of course, things are different, racially speaking, historically speaking, in terms of demographic and all that. But we are dealing with an issue that it's perverse with, which is gender inequity. These countries have made progress using a number of important policies. Those policies are not out of this world. They can be domesticated in this country. They can be captured for progress to happen.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Thank you, Chima. I love that. The US is not peerless. We should all remember that. That's a fantastic statement. This next question, I think both of you could address, but maybe we'll start with you, Erin, which is about the gender wage gap. In terms of indicators for gender equality, the gender wage gap is often lifted up. How should we think about the framing of this indicator? For example, the gap can sometimes be explained by a woman's personal choice. How do we connect the gender wage gap to health? Erin, do you want to start? Then Chima, you can chime in.

GUEST SPEAKER: Erin Bromaghim, City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office

Yeah, I think I have a lot of thoughts about this, and I don't know that they're particularly well organized, so I'll just kind of rapid fire on this one. First off, I think the gender wage gap is only helpful if you're considering women in the formal workforce and women in the workforce at all. We've seen a tremendous loss of employment for women in particular since COVID. We need to reconstitute that to truly have an appropriate sample size, so to speak, to really understand where we're doing and where we're making progress on the wage gap. I think also we've seen, particularly when we look to our partner cities around the world, that there's a tremendous informal economy of which women are disproportionately a part. As a result, you not only have a disparity in wages, you also have a disparity in the social services that accompanies formal employment.

We're talking about not just unemployment, should you lose that job, but also kind of the healthcare benefits, the other benefits that surround kind of more formal employment. I think when we consider the wage gap, what I would love to see is some sort of data that

actually accounts for that true kind of across both formal and informal sectors, as well as in domestic, caregiving and other types of domestic household responsibilities, how we account for the time and the lack of compensation for the disproportionate work that women, girls and people of marginalized genders do. I think that's incredibly important. I also think that what we found in Los Angeles when we've dug into that is to see actually some interesting data where there's a tremendous difference in the wage gap based on race, based on geographic location within the city, based on sector.

Actually some sectors in the US, I point to the tech sector in particular, where women actually make more than men in some cases. That is reassuring, I guess, but also problematic because a lot of the roles in that sector are very much at kind of what you would consider highly educated and disproportionately White kind of presence. We need to find ways to kind of see what has worked in that sector and replicate that throughout kind of both other sectors of employment, as well as across kind of the panoply of the work that people do. Last, I would just say that with the International Women's Day on Tuesday, I was following a lot of events, watching what was happening globally, and I found there was a bot on Twitter where companies or corporations, I think it was particularly in the UK, that were tweeting out or kind of expressing social media support for International Women's Day, the bot would tweet back the gender pay gap within that organization.

As a result, you saw a bunch of companies or corporations, or even nonprofit organizations kind of take down or otherwise remove those tweets. Which I thought was interesting because in some cases, the bot was actually showing that they were in an organization where women were paid more, and in some cases it was dramatically different. I think that this kind of real time kind of fact checking, or I don't know if it's trolling, but it was an interesting look at how we're starting to talk about these issues in terms of action, as opposed to just in terms of public support and virtue signaling.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

That's really fascinating. I did not see that Twitter thing. We'll try to find it and maybe include a link in some of the follow-up materials. Chima, I'm curious about your report. What are some of the things that you found about how countries are approaching the gender wage gap?

GUEST SPEAKER: Chimaraoke Izugbara, International Center for Research on Women

Yeah. I think in many of the countries we looked at, of course specifically speaking, one of the arms of our review looked at women's participation and economic opportunities, and so dealing with the wage gap was a frontline issue in some of those countries. But we found at least if I recall very well now, looking at Iceland, Spain, and Nicaragua, and to allow to some extent as well, New Zealand and the UK, that it all goes back to the question of not just retaining women in formal employment, but also ensuring that you

have a strong pipeline of women who can participate in formal employment. Those two things were central in terms of the effort that these countries were making. One way they have been able to do that is to support paid family leave.

That is something that, and I think I was looking at the statistics in the US, I think it goes only for 12 weeks. Maternity leave is about 12 weeks. That is if you're eligible, and not many people in the US are. That is one of the things that many countries have done to be able to do this. In many instances too, there are women targeted credit schemes that allow women who have their own businesses to expand their businesses, to formalize them and then take them to the next level. That's also something that is quite very important in terms of closing the wage gap. Then there is a strong attempt in a number of countries to protect the rights of migrant women workers. But it also contributes to the wage gap for many of them who work. Because they're underpaid, even if they work in the formal sector.

They may not have strong capacity and position to negotiate very strong wages for themselves. That's also something that we need to think about. We also saw in a number of countries strong and institutionalized opportunities for career advancement, particularly for low wage workers. In the US, that's something that might exist in a number of places, but it's something that we need to give strong consideration to that kind possibility. I think those are some of the things that we saw in terms of closing the wage gap. But we also need to remember that this is a pipeline, what we see at the end of the day. So it also depends on what you have fed into the system. That is why the example of New Zealand becomes very important in terms of TVT, and the UK as well, in terms of TVT.

Because TVT is for instance, a place where you've got so many women who are not participating actively, but many of the jobs in the TVT sector also pay very high. How do you get women to enter the pipeline and get training that they require to participate in those often exclusively male professionals and occupations? Creating that pipeline, and then ensuring that at the end of the day, there are also opportunities when they begin to work in those sectors for advancement, for support and for growth, is something that emerged from our work.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Thank you so much. Erin, I wanted to bring up a question that's actually a very hot topic globally, which is around gender equity around menstruation. One of the questions that came in was around girls' sports participation, and whether the decline has been due to dealing with menstruation and not being comfortable discussing it. Perhaps not having access to appropriate products, things like that. I wondered if you want to comment on that and around equity issues around menstruation more broadly.

GUEST SPEAKER: Erin Bromaghim, City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office

No. Thank you, I do. I think it's a really important topic and I'm remorseful for not having said this earlier, that menstrual health equity is a project that CHANGE has taken on as part of our work plan for this year. We're currently working with two universities, Occidental College and Pomona College, and two teams of students led by two professors that are working together to identify what's happening at the local level across the menstrual health equity space. They've done some amazing work. Their undergrads, really deeply invested in this, and I'm super impressed. We do this a lot. It's something we started doing in partnership with our university partners on the Sustainable Development Goals. We've now parlayed those types of student teams and project based teams into the work that we do with CHANGE, as well as on a number of other fronts. All the way to kind of looking at equity and the implementation of street assets.

Like bus benches and street lights and things like that. It's been a really interesting process of working with university partners. Specific to menstrual health equity, what we've seen is the need to kind of understand this across a couple different dimensions. There's access to products and access to the kind of evolving set of menstrual health tools that we have, cups and another means of being able to capture the bleed. I think there's also the need to train and educate folks on how to use that, what menstruation is, what's normal. That includes both girls as well as boys, as well as people who are non-binary and nonconforming. I think extending that education and then the kind of normalcy of the fact that half the population menstruates is really, really important. I think there's also the need to talk about the access to facilities and wash capabilities, which is a core part.

Not just wash facilities, but just private spaces where women can safely and healthily, cleanly change their products as they need. Then the broader link to healthcare. How do all of these together constitute a healthcare service that we do not in any way provide for within local government, regional government or federal or state government? This is something that is not officially kind of considered as part of the healthcare services when we think of how we access or secure healthcare. It's very much, you're on your own, good luck, use what you can find. This extends the fact of when we think about the taxation on menstrual healthcare products. We've started to see legislation and regulation in the US, at least in California and at the national level, to look at both access to public ...

Sorry. Access to products in public healthcare, or sorry, in public facilities. Starting really with K through 12 schools, but then also extending out into community centers and other types of public facilities. Then I think the taxation issue is something that we also need to tackle and lobby for. Why are we being taxed on these essential health products? Why are they not universally available? How do we ensure that they are for folks who may not have regular access to them? I just plug and say, come May time frame, if you do check the city's [change.org](https://www.changela.org) website, we expect to have a report from our students that will be up to share what they've learned. They've done some really, really interesting work in

trying to create a taxonomy of terms and structures around this issue as a whole. I'm eager to share that with everyone.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Thanks so much, Erin. For anyone who might be new to thinking about issues of menstrual health equity, it is such a lever for change, I think in my personal opinion, and has such dramatic impacts on the health of menstruating people. In terms of access to education, in terms of their own health. My own kind of personal plug on that as such an important issue. Coming into our last question. Chima, I'm going to throw this one to you and let you close us out. This is really around ... Obviously Erin, if you want to chime in, that's more than welcome. To what degree have you found that educational institutions in the United States have intentionally incorporated gender into the curriculum, women's achievements, inequity, bias and gender minority issues. I don't know how much you may be familiar with US educational institutions, but for either of you, I would welcome your comments. Internationally too. Sorry. I misread the question. In the US and internationally, and whether you see that as a differentiating factor. Chima, do you want to start?

GUEST SPEAKER: Chimaraoke Izugbara, International Center for Research on Women

Yeah. That's a difficult question to ask, I mean, within the context of the work we did. Which again was looking at what other countries have done in particular areas where the US is not making as much progress. There were two key educational related indicators that we focused on. One is female enrollment in STEM. That is science, technology, education and mathematics. Then the second one was female participation in technical and vocational educational training. I can speak based on evidence from our review. Which also indicates how other countries are consciously thinking about what parity would look like in those sectors. It goes back to the point Erin was making about how even for menstrual kits, other countries factor that into policy these issues at least at a very high level.

Then municipalities and states would translate and domesticate those policies based on the realities that they find in their space. In New Zealand, for instance, Māori kids who are taking activity have access to some kind of a government support for their own health and personal use. That can be put into different things. Those could be for menstrual kits, it could be for whatever it is, but those things that will facilitate them to participate in those programs. Join classes and do what other people are doing in their countries.

The same thing applies to what we find in the UK where there is a strong focus on migrant young people, migrant youngsters, particularly from Eastern Europe. I think when I look at that, who may not have the language, the education, the basic skills to participate in English based classes. Our women have struggles in terms of their personal needs, hygiene needs and other. There is some support to also facilitate their

participation at the end of the day in some of these programs. I am not an authority on the US educational system, but our experience reviewing these other countries shows that gender is a basic consideration in some of these countries. In terms of at least these two indicators that we focused on.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Thanks, Chima. Erin, did you want to chime in on this question?

GUEST SPEAKER: Erin Bromaghim, City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office

I think Chima did a great job. I want to just have him have the last word on that. I think it's great.

MODERATOR: Karabi Acharya, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

All right. Well, I want to thank you, Erin and Chima so much for such an incredible conversation. Really appreciate you both taking the time to share your thoughts and your wisdom with us. For those of you who joined us, thank you so much for this conversation. Obviously your questions make it interesting, and so thank you so much for your participation in that. As you sign off, please do take a quick minute to fill out our short survey. We do use that feedback in planning all of our webinars. As always, stay safe, be well. Take the Blue Marble Quiz, and I hope to see you on the next Reimagined in America webinar. Bye-bye.