

The primary objective for our approach is that all trans (in the widest sense) and intersex are able to record themselves to their own satisfaction and that everyone else can too. We found that to achieve this requires a two-question approach.

- Inherent to our two-question approach is that the answers to both questions need to be analysed together in order to determine the sex and gender diversity of the respondents (looking at Stonewall's two-question approach, they too would have to cross-reference both of their questions if they wanted to understand, say, the number of trans women and trans men).
- On the plus side, such an analysis of our questions is straightforward, using an application like Excel with "IF, AND, OR" queries will generate the analysis.
- Additionally, our approach enables a much deeper dive than just the counting of trans and intersex staff, it enables a much more nuanced recording that could include, say, intersex people who have additionally transitioned or non-binary folk with masc or fem identities (as just a couple of examples).

We recognise that being transgender is not in itself a gender or a sex, i.e. it is not the same as being male, female, intersex or non-binary. For many trans people who have transitioned it is part of their history but is not necessarily who they are now. Unfortunately, many monitoring surveys ask if someone is trans or transgender in a way that effectively fixes this as their 'identity', which is then further compounded if, out of expediency, an analysis is used which incorrectly treats the response as one of the 'sex and gender' categories.

Conversely asking the same question of someone who is mid-transition may indeed elicit the answer that yes, they 'are' transgender, which shows we must be careful not to conflate transitioning with having a transgender history. Given that many of trans and intersex workplace policies concern themselves with adjustments around transitioning it is easy to see how the conflation can occur, with "are you transgender?" actually meaning "are you transitioning or likely to transition?".

There are two further points we would advise organisations to consider. The first is that it should not be compulsory to answer either of our questions in order to be able to proceed to further questions in a survey. To make them compulsory would effectively force someone to out themselves in order to be able to complete the questionnaire.

The second point to consider is the reasons for asking sex and gender monitoring questions in the first place.

If the reason for asking is to improve inclusivity by being able to offer workplace adjustments (mainly for transitioning) and measures to eradicate bullying, harassment and discrimination (BHD) then the sex and gender questions need to be accompanied by BHD monitoring questions, but if a survey is asking just the sex and gender questions without the BHD questions then it will only be gaining data to help address provision for transitioning.

If BHD questions are asked, then wider diversity information will also be required. But even within the direct intersection of BHD and sex & gender there is a lot of nuance that is often not picked up by the questions. For example, a trans woman who 'passes' but reports BHD may do so for a completely different set of reasons to a 'visibly trans' woman who reports BHD. But to pick this up in a monitoring survey would mean asking some very intrusive and questions with a lot of subjectivity around the answers.